

# EASTON ROYAL PARISH COUNCIL PARISH COUNCIL MEETING

Held in the Village Hall

Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2023 at 19:00

## DRAFT MINUTES

Beverley Turton, 07790889729/ [beverleyturton@eastonroyalpc.org.uk](mailto:beverleyturton@eastonroyalpc.org.uk)

### Agenda

1. Apologises for absence
  2. Declaration of Interests
  3. Planning application PL/2023/03421
  4. Matters arising
- 

75 attendees including Parish Councillors

Anna Patterson (AP) Chair of PC welcomed the villagers and informed them that this is an Extraordinary Parish Meeting (EPM) to discuss the Planning Application PL/2023/03421 of 3 dwellings. AP said that this is an official PC meeting after which the PC will consider the application. AP said that she would outline some policies and frameworks that could be considered in relation to the application and then invite questions.

#### **1. Apologises for absence**

Peta Puyo, James De Pass. Jerry Kunkler also as local councillor is not present. JK said as he sits on the Wiltshire Planning Committee he would be conflicted to attend.

#### **2. Declaration of Interests**

Beverley Helps – as an interested party and PC will not be part of council deciding whether to object or not to PL/2023/03421

#### **3. and 4. Planning application PL/2023/03421 and matters arising**

AP informed villagers that the application can be viewed under the Parish council website, 2023 planning, and each tab will show parts of the application.

AP informed villagers that Meredith Baker (MB) said people should comment on the access as well as the potential development – even though the planning at this stage does not give much detail about the development.

AP informed villagers that the PC does not comment in their personal capacity but on considerations of impact to the village. AP said that those objecting should try to refer to the planning policies and she knew some people had done a lot of work to consider these.

AP said the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is one to consider and the application relies heavily on this. AP said the premise of the NPPF is that the planning application must be considered in accordance with LA development plan on housing and if you cannot evidence they have met their housing land supply, consent should be granted. However, there are exceptions and we feel these are highly relevant:

1. Reason to refuse is that they must protect special assets such as an ANOB which ER is.
2. Can refuse if adverse impact of granting consent significantly outweighs the benefit. PC view is the adverse impact is that the proposed building is in a conservation area, greenfield site, there are no employment needs for housing and no public transport.

AP said we believe these have been glossed over in the application.

**AP said another policy to consider is the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS)**

AP said this designates ER as a 'small village'.

AP said that the development then is limited to that which is need for housing needs and to improve employment opportunities and services – which we feel are not relevant.

AP said infill is allowed but this is more than infill.

AP said another consideration is that the area is a conservation area. AP said the plot is within the boundary for the designated conservation area and is a specific reference within this that there are no obvious gaps for new development or infill and such a development would adversely affect the village.

AP said she felt the following were also relevant:

- The application does not respect the existing character and form of the village. ER is a linear village and this is of a non-linear nature and introduces a more urban pattern of development.
- The development would be a greenfield site and would destroy a grass field used until March 2023 for sheep grazing as well as destroying the habitat of much wildlife to include barn owls and bats
- The development would severely damage the exceptional views from both EROY11 and EROY09 paths used on a daily basis allowing villagers to step off the main B3087 road into immediate countryside.
- The access to this site will be narrow and covers a footpath that is well used by many villagers including children walking to school. Having increased traffic to and from this access will cause real safety concerns.
- The entrance to the site is from B3087. This is a heavily used road with known speeding and safety concerns. The sightlines are difficult in and out of the site due to cars being parked on the B3087 and the development will further increase risk.
- The development would impact the privacy of the residents adjacent to the site and any reassurances to screen off will be meaningless once the homes are purchased.

AP said that the deadline for commenting on the application date is 8<sup>th</sup> June 2023.

AP said anyone can comment and it can be done under the Wilts Council website. [Planning Application: PL/2023/03421 \(wiltshire.gov.uk\)](#). AP said the PC do not want people put off if they don't know the planning policies etc and to just put in whatever comments or objections they feel are relevant. AP said a paragraph from a lot of people is better than lots from 1 or 2.

AP said if you don't feel comfortable on line you can email or write in.

**Comment by email**

You can send your email to [developmentmanagement@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:developmentmanagement@wiltshire.gov.uk).

## **Comment by post**

Send your comments to any of the three main council buildings:

- Wiltshire Council, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, Wiltshire BA14 8JN
- Monkton Park offices, Monkton Hill, Chippenham, Wiltshire SN15 1ER
- Bourne Hill, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP1 3UZ

### **ACTION; SEND THESE DETAILS TO VILLAGERS**

AP said that villagers can contact JK as well although directly to the application site is more direct.

mail: [jerry.kunkler@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:jerry.kunkler@wiltshire.gov.uk)

### **AP opened to questions and comments:**

Comments were would this set a precedent and is that a reason to object?

AP said that unfortunately that is not a relevant objection according to the policies and frameworks but yes, it is a concern.

Comment was that JK could decide if the application is called in and if it is then it goes to a planning council decision and not an individual officer.

Comments and discussion were had around having a petition but it was determined individual objections would be more effective.

Comments were made around the importance of referring to the fact that this development is not infill as it requires a new access and also non-linear.

Comments were made around objecting to the principle of a building development of any kind as nothing should be built on the land as it is grazing and pastoral.

Comments and discussion were had on the incorrect measurements in the application of the access road and the impact on the public footpath width and width of the new access road. Comments were made that objections could focus on the widths being too narrow and challenge the application on incorrect measurements of these.

Comment was made that the application states that the land is 'redundant' but it has been used for grazing in March of this year.

Comment was made on the historical significance of the land from a heritage point of view as the archaeology work done in 2013/2014 uncovered roman artefacts in that area and it was determined there is a roman villa or other in the area close or under the field. The old roman road was also the path that is the public right of way. Archaeology England have commented that they would be concerned about any development on or around the roman road, altering it and that the land should be inspected before any development for roman ruins and be a watchdog brief.

Comments were made that even if the access road is okay after building has taken place during building the size of the lorries etc required will overrun the access and public path as it is so narrow.

Comments were made about the sewage capacity in the area and that it is already at the limit.

Comments were made that for other applications Highways made a decision without coming on site. AP said that MB has given assurances that she will attend the site. **ACTION: TO CHECK HIGHWAYS WILL COME OUT**

Comments were made that JK may be able to help ensure highways can come out.

A question was raised as to whether the village could also do a formal planning report. AP said this was too expensive for the PC to consider and also we need to be objective.

Comments were made about the access for children, especially from houses on the B3087, into the countryside and that this is a safe passage. Comment was made that this is especially the case for children with poor sight or blind who currently can independently access the route as it is currently safe.

Comments were made about how the application planned to offset the phosphate levels and whether this should be considered in the objections. **ACTION: CHECK THE PHOSPHATE OFFSET**

Comments were made that the access road effectively creates a new crossroads and this is a reason to object.

Comment was made that objections and comments can be made per person and is not limited then to one per household.

---

AP said that considering the strength of objection to the planning from the villagers, did everyone on the PC present agree to object. All PC's raised hands to agree to object to the planning – unanimously.

---

AP thanks all villagers for attending.