

Berwick Bassett and Winterbourne Monkton Parish Council

Minutes of the meeting of the council held at Winterbourne Monkton Church on Wednesday 15th August 2018 at 7.30pm.

Present: Cllr Mark Saunders (chair), Cllr Helen Ramsay
Cllr Andrew George-Perutz, Cllr Gary Higgins
Cllr Jill Petchey, Cllr Lyn Bennet-Nutt
Mrs Janice Pattison (clerk)
7 members of the public

1. Apologies for absence

There were none

2. Declaration of Interests

Cllr Jill Petchey and Cllr Lyn Bennet-Nutt declared an interest as adjoining land neighbours of the applicant and took no part in the meeting

3. Planning application 18/06903/REM

Land to the Rear of Old School House Winterbourne Monkton Wiltshire SN4 9NW

Reserved Matters Application

Erection of 3 bed dwelling (Reserved matters pursuant of 15/02818/OUT relating to appearance, landscaping, layout & scale)

Cllr Saunders introduced the application confirming that planning permission had been given for a 3 bedroom property on this site 17/04666/REM

Land to the Rear of Old School House Winterbourne Monkton Wiltshire SN4 9NW

Reserved Matters Application seeking approval for all reserved matters, including Appearance, Landscaping, Layout & Scale, on application 15/02818/OUT (Erection of 3 bed dwelling)

The Applicant had brought to the meeting detail plans and samples of the bricks and tiles he proposed to use in his new building

The planning officer in this case, Mr Ruaridh O'Donoghue at Wiltshire Council had advised Cllr Saunders that Parish Councillors should consider the new plan as a new application but that the conditions on the previous application would remain. Comments from the Parish Council and members of the public should be submitted by 23rd August

One of the conditions was that all arrangements for the dispersal of surface and waste water should be agreed by Wiltshire Council prior to commencement of building work. The applicant confirmed that the advice of a specialist company had been sought and that the proposals would be put to Wiltshire Council

A resident (1) asked where the new property boundary was. Another (2) queried the material and another (3) queried the length and proximity to the footpath. The applicant replied that the boundary of the property will move 1 metre to the west following investigations into land ownership. The fence will be a low level boundary fence which may run to the boundary of the footpath. This caused concern amongst residents as the erection of a fence in this position would make it difficult to turn into the drives opposite. Residents have been accustomed to using part of the land for the new building and the property adjoining for turning which requires greater space than the width of the footpath. One of the vehicles requiring regular access is a large van.

It was confirmed that the passing bay, which formed part of the plan, would be entirely contained within the applicants property and would be bound by a kerb or fence to prevent users of the passing place driving onto the adjoining property.

It was observed that the lane/footpath is an 'urban metalled footpath' with vehicle access to properties. It is not an adopted highway. Maintenance of the footpath to the width to take vehicles is the responsibility of the landowners adjoining and use of land for turning was a private arrangement between neighbours

A resident (4) observed the replacement of the turning circle on the approved plan with straight parking spaces. The turning circle was a condition of the currently approved application.

Several planning applications have been made for this site. The approved application is for a 3 bedroomed property. The original application was for a larger property. This was originally withdrawn. The new application reverts to the original, larger property. The applicant claimed that the footprint has increased from 123 square metres to 131 square metres with the ridge height 17cm higher although the plans indicate the increases to be slightly larger. Residents observed that the new plan has an additional room upstairs which is named a study but which could be called a 4th bedroom.

Mr O'Donoghue has advised the Parish Council the applicant may submit any number of plans. The plan that has already been approved remains the approved plan until another plan is approved

The applicant expressed concern about the antagonism there was about the plan which he felt was personal. Residents (5) felt that this should be expected as the plan had an effect on so many neighbours and was something that none of the neighbours wished for.

There had allegedly been some inflammatory emails sent to the applicant's agent. Cllr Saunders requested that these be sent to him so that this could be investigated

There was a 15 minute interval to observe and discuss the plans and materials

The applicant reiterated that he felt that the new plan was more in keeping with the neighbouring properties by incorporating the dormer windows of some of the properties. Residents felt that the property was too modern in appearance. Cllr Higgins asked residents what qualities of the neighbouring properties they would

wish to see in the new building. Responses included matching the general terraced cottage style, installation of small windows with timber frames, use of older materials and incorporation of sarsen and flint evident in the construction of the neighbouring properties

Members of the public left and councillors held a brief meeting . It was considered that comments made should be confined to Planning issues. Key Points identified from the meeting were the retention of the turning circle, the passing place and the appearance of the building which should be aged by the use of reclaimed and local materials.

Cllr Saunders will consider the matters raised and circulate a draft response

The meeting closed at 8.55pm

Section 2

Residents attending the meeting were

Mr Drew (1) , Mrs Drew(5), Mr New, Mrs New, Mr Petchey(3), Mr Mace(4),
Ms Hall(2)

The Applicant was Mr New