**KENNET VALLEY PARISH COUNCIL**

**PLANNING MEETING: 4- 2020/21**

Minutes of the Planning Meeting held remotely by Zoom on Wednesday 20th January 2021 at 7pm.

**Present**: Cllr D Woolley (Planning Chairman), Cllr A Baring, Cllr L Davies, Cllr A Miller, Cllr J Turner, Cllr J Drew, Cllr M Bates, Cllr M Dissanayake & Cllr C Rogers.

**Apologies**: None.

**In attendance**: Sophie Roberts (Clerk)

1. **MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETINGS**: The minutes of the last meeting were approved and will be signed as a true record at the next available opportunity.
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**: Martin Bates declared an interest in item 5 due to living directly opposite the dwelling under discussion.
3. **MATTERS ARISING**:

A letter has been written to Wiltshire Council expressing our concerns that they are failing in their duty to notify neighbouring properties of planning applications and also a failure to display the green notices. A general response has been received from Mike Wilmott at Wiltshire Council. It was agreed no further response would be necessary.

1. **CORRESPONDENCE:**

Three revised objections have been placed on the Wiltshire Council website regarding planning application 20/09519/FUL.

Several emails have been received from the owner of land known as ‘Tumbledown’ on the Dene requesting an Easement. This item will be dealt with at the EGM on 20th January at 7.30pm.

1. **APPLICATION**:

**20/09519/FUL** – **Two storey side/rear extension and demolition of garage. 66, West Overton, SN8 4ER**

Cllr C Rogers presented the plans and provided some detail. The house is a semi-detatched ex workers cottage once part of the Meux Estate and designed by Charles Ponting, who had been a local architect living in Lockeridge. The houses were built as a pair around 1880 with a matching pair on the opposite side of the road. It was noted the houses had significant architectural merit.

The application has been revised after several objections and the Council were asked to consider the application again. It was noted the applicant has addressed some of the concerns and there are significant design improvements but the extension is still large, it would still affect the privacy of the neighbour and the application would result in the loss of parking in an area of the village which already has significant parking concerns.

The Council discussed the proposal in some detail taking into consideration the views of the neighbours and the parking issues. Although, once again the Council were sympathetic to the applicant’s need for more space, they agreed to object to the application.

***While the applicant has gone some way to meeting the objections to the original scheme, the revised proposals are still unacceptable on the grounds of loss of privacy to the neighbours, on aesthetic grounds, and because of the loss of parking.***

1. **PLANNING PROCEDURE:**

The Council considered the current Parish Council Planning Procedure which neccessitated the need for a designated village representative for each of the three villages. There was a requirement for two councillors from two different villages to carry out a site visit (one of whom had to be from the village where the application is to be considered). The Council noted the disproportionate number of applications in Lockeridge and also the varying availbility and numbers of councillors in each village which made the current requirements quite onerous. It was agreed to aleviate these issues by removing the requirement for village representatives and allow site visits to be carried out by two councillors from any of the three villages. The Clerk will revise the current Parish Council Planning Procedure to reflect these changes for formal approval at either the next Parish Council meeting or Planning Committee meeting, whichever is the soonest. **Action Clerk**

The meeting closed at 7.32 pm.
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