

**DAUNTSEY PARISH COUNCIL
DRAFT MINUTES**

Council Planning Meeting

held at 7.30pm

Brinkworth Earl Danby's Lower School Hall, Dauntsey

4th June 2018

Present: Cllr Mrs E Blacker (Chairman), Cllr C Barnard, Cllr Miss C Blacker, Cllr Mrs J Cowley (Vice Chairman) and Cllr Mrs R Gregory

Also Present: 8 Members of the Public and Mr V Vines MBE Clerk of the Council

NOTICE OF MEETING – Public Notice of the meeting was given in accordance with Schedule 12, para 10 (2) of the Local Government Act 1972

24/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr N Puntis.

25/18 Declaration(s) of Interest – In accordance with Dauntsey Parish Council's Code of Conduct (Adopted 3rd December 2012) and Standing Orders (Adopted 2nd July 2012)

There were no Declarations of Interest.

26/18 PLANNING Prior to the consideration of each Planning Application the Council had provided the opportunity for Applicants and their Representatives and interested parties to address the Council. Representations were received from Mr John Burgess and Mrs Delia Burgess in regards to Planning Application 18/0444/FUL.

a. Planning Applications:

- a) 18/04444/FUL
Proposed Side Extension and Detached Garage
Fairmeadow Farm, Dauntsey, Nr Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 4HN
For Mr & Mrs J Burgess

Following consideration of the application **the Council resolved to raise objections to the proposal.** Wiltshire Council should be advised that:

In reaching this conclusion the Council was mindful of their representations submitted in regards to applications 17/02026/FUL and 18/02083/FUL which reflected the Parish Council's wishes to retain the historic integrity of Dauntsey and the character of the host dwelling which appeared to have been dismissed as an irrelevance by Wiltshire Council in the final determination. The concept of extensions being a subsidiary element seemed to have been recently lost.

Despite this the Parish Council wished to retain the stance that while acknowledging owners personal requirements this should not destroy the quality of what existed in the Parish, in some cases still being an example of a rural working community. This particular area of the Parish had been a loose knit area leading to the main core of the

village that despite the intrusion of the M4 motorway had still retained a pleasant open rural character, which the Council considered to be worthy of preservation.

The Council felt that unfortunate decisions within the Parish in recent times should not encourage the destruction of remaining elements and Fairmeadow Farm was a typical example of a small utilitarian farm house with farmstead buildings that may have now come to the end of their useful life through neglect and change of circumstances but still remained in historic form and should be respected.

With this in mind the Parish Council had a number of concerns both in principle and detail.

Firstly, in regards to the proposed house extensions. The existing two-storey farm house of brick construction was of a scale and appearance that had remained unaltered since its original construction. Single-storey storage buildings to the rear associated with previous farming activities were attached to the house partly providing a rear entrance/utility area function and were constructed in alien materials. Nevertheless they tended to produce a footprint that created overall a narrow in-depth development form that the Parish Council considered should be retained rather than the elongated frontage form being proposed.

The scale and charm of the host dwelling within the street picture was completely lost with the side extension that although replicated the design character of the original created a dominant built form that destroyed the open character across the site frontage. The Parish Council considered that any extensions should be of a subservient nature that respected the character of the original but to the rear of the existing dwelling rather than to the side. This design format would replicate that of the dwelling at No 61 Dauntsey immediately adjacent.

Secondly, the Council was concerned about the cumulative effect of the development proposals across the site frontage. The proposed extensions to the dwelling created a substantial built form, alongside which was a proposed 3-bay garage block (block 1).

Although set back from the line of the dwelling this continued the built form across the frontage added to which a forecourt parking and turning area was created to the front where garden areas existed. The Council acknowledged that this area could be considered as the residential curtilage and if the preferred location of block 1 was as proposed they felt that a better approach would have been to gain access from the farm yard side as existed at the present time that would allow the open character of the gardens to remain.

The Council had a major concern in regards to the 3-bay garage/store block (block 2), to be sited in the small agricultural paddock to the left of the entrance drive between the drive and No 61 Dauntsey. This land was not part of the residential curtilage and should require a change of use to be agreed before any domestic development was contemplated or approved. In addition the development now proposed would add to the built form across the overall frontage to the detriment of the existing open character of the existing street picture. The Council felt that it was a pity that if the amount of garaging and storage space was necessary then could it not be accommodated within the areas already covered with buildings.

Finally, in regards to block 2 the Council felt that it would be detrimental to the residential amenity of No 61 Dauntsey as the main elevation of that dwelling was only a drive width away from the paddock boundary hedge with block 2 only two to three

metres away. Perhaps a better option, should the paddock become included within the residential curtilage, would be for block 2 to be sited alongside the large garage/store building belonging to No 61 that was not shown on the location and block plans submitted with the application?

In conclusion the Council had no objections to the principle of extending the dwelling and providing garage accommodation but of concern was the manner in which it was being proposed, which the Council believed would be detrimental to the character of the existing dwelling and the area in general.

Cllr C Barnard proposed, Cllr Mrs E Blacker seconded and RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY

- b) 18/04874/PNCOU
Notification for Prior Approval under Class PA – Conversion of Premises in Light Industrial Use (Class B1 c) to a Dwellinghouse (C3)
Workshop, Ridgeway Lane, Dauntsey, Nr Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 4LD
For Mr P Blakiston

Following consideration of the application the Council **resolved to raise no objections.**

Cllr Mrs R Gregory proposed, Cllr Mrs J Cowley seconded and RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY

27/18 FINANCE

The Council received notification of invoices for payment

- a) **Payments:** The Council considered and approved the following payment.

JD Estate Management. Inv 0518. 31 st May 2018	£ 116.00
---	----------

Proposed Cllr Mrs E Blacker, seconded Cllr Mrs J Cowley and RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY that the payment be approved

28/18 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next Meeting of the Council will be **Monday 2nd July 2018 at 7.30pm.**

Signed:

Chairman, Dauntsey Parish Council

Date: **2nd July 2018**