

BARTON ON THE HEATH PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY GENERAL PARISH COUNCIL MEETING

HELD VIA ZOOM ON TUESDAY 15th DECEMBER AT 18.30.

Present: **Councillors:**

Chairman: Mr J. Coker

Vice-Chairman: Mr B. Radford

Mrs J. Piney Brigadier J. Rickett Mrs G. Cathie

Clerk to the Parish Council: Mrs Julia Gotrel

Public:

Mr J. Hayman-Joyce Mr. & Mrs A. Jones Mr. & Mrs G. Jones

Mr J. Mathias Mr C. Seymour-Smith Mrs P. Mead

Mr J. Castle Mr S. Lofthouse Mr. C. Maynell Mrs. H. Seymour-Smith

Ms. H. Moreland Ms. E. Eisenberg

Apologies: The Honorable Treasurer to the Parish Council: Mrs. M MacPherson

- 1. Declaration of Disclosable Pecuniary Interest:** No pecuniary interest.
2. The Chairman has received comments from the Village regarding the planning applications set out below. Therefore this Extraordinary General Meeting has been called to discuss these applications.
- 3. The Planning Applications:**
 - A. 20/03109/FUL: The Brown House: Demolition of existing 70's garage and entrance lobby. Erection of rear extension and side car porch. :**

The Chairman asked Mr Chris. Seymour-Smith to present his planning application for The Brown House in detail.

With the aid of screen sharing, Chris was able to talk through the plans from all aspects, including the materials to be used, the aim to be as sustainable as possible and the intension of returning the house to more of a Cotswold cottage in keeping with other similar neighbouring properties and extensions.

The Chairman asked the Parish Council for any questions.

The Chairman asked if the dining room doors would be folding and powder coated. Mr Seymour-Smith confirmed that that would be the case.

Mr Rickett asked where the solar panels would be fitted. It was confirmed that they would be on the rear roof of the property.

The public was asked for their questions. Ms Hollie Moreland summarized the objection that she had already lodged with SDC. She commented that although she appreciated the need for improvement to a family home, she questioned the extension's size. It contradicted the `cottage 'feeling' Mr Seymour-Smith wanted to achieve. Hollie pointed out that the plans shown did not include the newly approved shed, which, in her view, would create over development of the site. Mr Mathias asked about the windows to the front as being described as crittall style windows, what would the finish be? Mr Seymour-Smith confirmed that they would be painted a colour similar to neighbouring buildings.

Regarding the perceived over development of the plot, the Chairman commented that the final decision would be that of SDC and the Conservation Officer. He then asked for the support, in principle, from the P.C for the application.

Mr Rickett strongly supported this application, and Ms Moreland endorsed the application for work to the front of the property but objected to developing the sizeable modern extension to the rear. She reconfirmed that she had lodged her objections on the SDC website.

All the members of the P.C. supported the application. Therefore the Clerk was asked to submit a reply of NO OBJECTION to the application by 17/12/2020.

B. 20/03246/FUL: Rainbow Farm: Change of use of paddock to residential use.

Ms Eisenberg shared her screen to enable explanation of application; she thanked the Village for their patience during the restoration works carried out thus far on the farm and explained the reason for the change of use as an extension of the private garden. The land had originally been divided up for the neighbouring properties in a haphazard way. The change of use would reinstate the garden and create a more precise definition of agricultural land [shown on the plans]. The garden and adjoining pasture had a steep slope, and it was intended to use the large amount of earth from the pool to level out the garden space, it would be fully grassed with no buildings or proposed buildings be erected in the future.

The Chairman thanked Ms Eisenberg for her detailed presentation and asked the P.C for any questions regarding the proposal. Mr Rickett asked what the land's intended use would be once made as a garden; Ms Eisenberg's response was to provide a 'children's play area.

The Chairman then asked the public for any questions. Mr Simon Lofthouse responded that he could see the attraction of increasing the land use options and the improved value it might bring to the property. But he objected to the proposal as felt that paddock land should remain as agricultural, and not change for the reason of local character. He himself had bought land adjoining Campden Farm to protect the view and would stay for agricultural use.

The Chairman clarified that there was no problem with the regrading the land but to be resown as pasture land.

Mr. Lofthouse confirmed that the land should remain as a paddock, and understood that the spoil should be used, rather than carted away, but this was not a good enough reason for a change of use.

Ms Eisenberg confirmed that this was not a development but a change of use, which does not facilitate any development plans as not structural, she confirmed again that this proposal was not to develop.

Mr. Hayman-Joyce asked if the land was to be left as grassland, why apply for a change of use?

Ms Eisenberg responded that her architect had advised her that the spoil could not be used for levelling unless planning permission was sought. Mr Hayman-Joyce hi-lighted that the 'children's play area would join a conservation area which backs onto his land. He also pointed out that although 'you 'can't see 'it' does not mean 'you 'can't hear 'it'. He felt that the change of use would threaten and impact on the local landscape and future countryside.

He concluded that it was the principle of conversion of agricultural land to domestic curtilage he objected to.

A continued heated debate ensued with the Chairman endeavouring to give all those who wanted to voice an opinion an opportunity to do so.

Mrs Tracey Jones commented that the photographs in the documents that formed part of the application pack did not fairly represent the view from the top of the hill leading to Little Compton. She felt that the garden's extension was an intrusion into the unspoilt area of the AONB and could not support the application.

Mr Glenn Jones also raised a point about the uses to which the land would be put. Ms Eisenberg commented that she would be happy for SDC to apply any reasonable restrictions to its use.

Questions were raised about why an application had to be made when there was no objection from anyone to the spreading of the spoil and the field's levelling.

Ms Eisenburg told the meeting that her advisors had made it clear that an application was required.

The Chairman then asked the P.C. to consider the comments made and form an opinion.

Before that could proceed, a brief discussion was held between the Chairman and Mr Mathias about how the P.C. may or may not respond to planning applications and the Chairman promised a full debate at the next meeting.

Mr Mathias then questioned Ms Piney about her land.

She responded that part of her garden had been agricultural land but had become domestic curtilage by the effluxion of time, (10 years), so no application had needed to be made.

The Chairman asked again for a view from the P.C.

Juley Piney was for the application

Gillian Cathie abstained

Johnny Rickett objected

Brian Radford was undecided.

Further debate was had. Mr Johnny Rickett strongly expressed that as the neighbours had objected to the change of use, the P.C. should uphold their views and object to the application.

The Chairman asked for another vote. The Chairman proposed the motion that the P.C. object to the application. The motion was approved with two votes for, one against and one abstention.

The Chairman agreed to instruct the Clerk accordingly.

4. AOB

As time was moving on the Chairman briefly stated that there would be an update on the Broadband project at the next meeting.

The meeting was closed at 20.30.