

EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF BOYTON PARISH COUNCIL

on
Monday, 2nd August, 2021 at 18.00hrs
in the Fane Hall, Corton

An Open Forum Meeting to discuss Planning Application
PL/2021/06178
Development of West Farm Buildings, Corton

MINUTES

PRESENT:

Cllr Phil Garratt	Vice Chairman, Planning
Cllr Jill Adams	Infrastructure
Cllr Sarah Pallant	Clerk, RFO (Responsible Financial Officer)

PUBLIC:

20 Parishioners

ALSO PRESENT:

Christopher Wheatley-Hubbard
Cllr Christopher Newbury

1. APOLOGIES:

21/37 Cllr Gary Treherne was unable to attend

2. OPENING of MEETING and DECLARATION of INTEREST

21/38 The Chairman, Cllr Caroline Wheatley-Hubbard declared an Interest in the matter to be discussed. The Meeting was opened by Cllr Wheatley-Hubbard who handed the running of the Meeting to Cllr Phil Garratt, the Vice Chairman.

3. OPEN FORUM

21/39 Mr. James Nimmo, whose property abuts the land in the Planning Application, had prepared a comprehensive document covering 9 distinct sections for comment and 2 maps – one of the proposed development and one showing the current farm buildings, both with notes/comments made by Mr Nimmo. These had been printed out and copies were handed to the Parishioners. There was also a screen and projector showing the map of the proposed development with Mr. Nimmo's notes/comments.

Firstly it was noted that the Application had been registered with Wiltshire Council on the 16th June, 2021 but the Letter of Consultation was not received by Boyton Parish Council until the 14th July, 2021. Equally, the Letter advising Mr Nimmo of the Application was not sent until the 14th July, 2021 and received by him on the 17th.

Mr. Nimmo welcomed Cllr Newbury and thanked him for being able to attend the Meeting. Cllr Newbury replied noting that it was up to the Parish to decide whether it was, or was not, in favour of the Application.

Mr. Nimmo then spoke, talking through the bullet points of his presented document. This included, amongst the 9 areas of concern: the matter of privacy for those close to

the development; the loss of amenities; whether there might be “retro” adjustments to the plans; the possibility of fewer, higher quality, units; the use of the “green” lane; etc.

Christopher Wheatley-Hubbard then spoke. There was no intention to allow traffic on the “green lane” further north of Barn A. A new entry was not dismissed. The surface water would drain into the field to the east of the development. There would be a “soakaway”. As much as possible of the surrounding land of the development would be of a permeable surface.

It was noted that Bartlett's lane, to the east is subject to flooding. Christopher Wheatley-Hubbard replied that the water would be captured.

There were many queries/opinions voiced by the Parishioners such as Where would the gate for the green lane be sited and where was parking for units 1 & 2. The response was that this is not yet specified but would preserve the privacy of the north part of the lane.

Why are the units 1,2,3,4 and 5 so close. Response; these are existing buildings and have to be retained.

Will the units be freehold. Response; they will be “lets”.

It was commented that the proposed development resembled a “miniature village”. Response; it is an artist's impression, but the plans almost identically fit the footprint. Unit 6 will be an aesthetically pleasing infill.

CWH continued by saying that the “green lane” will stay as it is, that it was felt that “smaller is better” and larger houses would not necessarily be quieter and units 3 & 4 were bungalows which are currently in demand. There would be limited traffic in the village since the access would be on the top road. All the plans are based on information received from his Agents and Planning Advisors.

A parishioner pointed out that the application is in line with the informal Parish Plan of 2012 but that a pre-application had not been sent. That the County Council should call the application in or that amendments should be made.

The Vice Chairman noted that there were 3 options for the Parish Council: no comment; object or agree, but with conditions. Because no comments had been posted on the Wiltshire Council site for the application it suggested that there is no objection. The finer details must be carefully monitored.

A parishioner noted that there could be a 4th option – to try to ensure the proper consideration of the issue but that this might open the door for further developments such as that of the Dove Inn, which is a totally different type of application. The aim should be not to lose the nature of Corton.

A parishioner noted that if the units were for young families where is storage for bikes etc.

Christopher Wheatley-Hubbard responded. Units 3 & 4 would probably suit the elderly and that requests have been made for rentals with no outside space. The “car barn” is garages and storage space. The development is to be a “mixed set-up” for tenants who will be selected.

A parishioner asked who would maintain the area. Christopher Wheatley-Hubbard responded that it would be similar to the 4 houses on the other side of the road – the tenants do the maintenance.

A parishioner suggested that a new footpath could be created across the field to the east of the development to the top road. The response was that this matter is not relevant to this application. Christopher Wheatley-Hubbard went on to point out that there was a duty of care and that “working units” or “holiday lets” were inappropriate for the village.

A parishioner pointed out that emergency access might be needed from the internal road.

A parishioner asked whether the car parking area would be visible from the road - hopefully not.

A parishioner asked whether they could vote “en bloc” - a show of hands gave 2 against.

The Vice Chairman noted that if this proceeds “with conditions” the applicant could withdraw and then re-apply. Failing this, the application needs to be called in for any changes to be incorporated in the final decision.

A parishioner said they supported the application in principle.

Cllr Newbury pointed out that applicants can modify plans but the planning officers, having been pro commercial or holiday lets would probably refuse the application for conversion of the existing buildings. If it were called in, the Planning Committee could ask for changes to achieve the best results. The matter of the due date for consultation and decision being just over a week ahead is for the planning officers. If it is called in this date does not apply.

Open Forum closed at 19.10

4. PARISH COUNCILLORS MEETING

21/40 The Councillors considered the content of the Meeting and concluded that the actual plans for the Application were somewhat vague and unclear and whilst many Parishioners appear to be in favour of development of the buildings for re-use as dwellings The Parish Council considers the plans should be modified. This should take into account, amongst other matters: the privacy issues of neighbours; the loss of amenity; the viability/safety of the planned access onto the road; infrastructure services; surface, grey and foul water management; access to the courtyard; greening of the courtyard and surrounding area; controlled closure of the green lane to vehicles.

In view of these preliminary concerns the Councillors agreed, unanimously, that this Application should be called in.

Meeting closed 19.45