

BETLEY, BALTERLEY & WRINEHILL PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 6th April 2016

104/16 PRESENT:

Cllrs Robert Bettley-Smith, Richard Head, Mark Morris, Jo Thomas, Ian Walton and Chris Watkin (from min.109).

105/16 IN ATTENDANCE:

Borough Cllr Frankish.
Three members of the public.
Gwyn Griffiths (Clerk).

106/16 Apologies for absence had been received from Cllrs Berrisford (family), Daly (family), Ecclestone (work), Hales (work), Speed (health) and Townsend (other commitment).

107/16 Members considered the declaration of interests in agenda items.

Cllr Walton declared a prejudicial interest in planning application 16/00185 (Buddleigh) as he had objected to the original application at this site. All members declared a personal interest in planning application 16/00183 (Haywards Barn) through acquaintance with the applicant.

108/16 The Chairman outlined the procedure for public participation and the meeting was then adjourned.

109/16 Three members of the public were present, and all were interested in planning application 16/00185.

The first member of the public reviewed the process by which the situation had developed at Buddleigh. A Certificate of Lawful Development (CLD) had been issued solely for receptions on the field subject to a maximum of 28 days of activity per annum. This had been interpreted as permitting seven such events as the set-up to take-down normally extended across four days. The application now referred to nine events per annum, and claimed that this had been agreed by the Borough Council. He was very unhappy with any increase given the level of non-compliance with existing conditions.

[Cllr Watkin joined the meeting at this point]

A planning contravention notice had been issued in 2013 and a further warning in 2015. He felt there was no meaningful enforcement, and a failure to respect process.

There were specific local concerns regarding noise. This had been reported to Environmental Health and specific requirements had not been met.

The current application was to permit ceremonies within the domestic curtilage, which was a separate planning unit to the site authorised by the CLD. A licence to perform ceremonies had been obtained from the County Council, and two ceremonies had taken place in 2013. It was understood that informal advice had been given that “one or two” ceremonies would be considered permissible but the Planning Authority seemed unwilling to take action on its warnings.

The application amounted to development within the Green Belt. As such it required “very special circumstances” to justify permission. He expressed the view that it was time to put a stop to the further intensification of use of the site, involving a spread to the domestic curtilage and extra events. All three existing permissions had been breached.

A councillor asked what was the nature of the specific inconvenience to nearby residents. The member of the public replied that there were two principal concerns:

Noise - from the reception area, there was an adverse impact on nearby residential properties with loud music, singing etc.

Visual impact - the site was in the Green Belt and a rural location. Although the ceremony itself might not be noisy the arrival of large numbers of guests, vehicles, marquee etc. had a significant impact.

110/16 Members considered the following planning application:

16/00185/COU Use of part of existing barn building (games room) to provide up to 9 wedding ceremonies per annum and the use of existing residential curtilage to provide up to 9 wedding ceremonies per annum for Mr A Alexander.

RESOLVED that the Parish Council objects to the application on the following grounds:

A) the development constitutes a change of use within the Green Belt without the necessary very special circumstances;

B) there are serious issues of noise affecting the residential amenity of nearby residents with current seven events which would, by definition, be increased by nine events;

C) the Council is concerned that there have been several breaches of the conditions attached to existing consents.

If the Local Planning Authority is minded to approve they must satisfy themselves that the noise issue is fully addressed and that any breaches of conditions are strictly enforced.

111/16 The Clerk advised members that he had received planning application 16/00183 Division of property into two residential dwellings, Haywards Barn, New Road, Wrinehill. The application had been received after the advertised closing date for observations and four weeks after it had been recorded as being sent to the Parish Council. He had queried this with the Borough Council who could offer no explanation other than possible postal delays. In the light of the timescale members were asked how they wished to deal with the application.

RESOLVED that the application be considered at this meeting.

112/16 The Clerk advised members that no urgent business had been dealt with since the last meeting of the Council.

113/16 Members considered the following planning application:

16/00238/FUL Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of replacement dwelling (resubmission of 15/000269/FUL - revised design) for Mr R Ashford.

RESOLVED that the Parish Council has no objection, but the Local Planning Authority would need to satisfy itself that the design, form and scale is appropriate to the area.

114/16 Members considered the following planning application:

16/00183/FUL Division of existing dwelling to form two dwellings at Haywards Barn, New Road, Wrinehill for Mr Reah.

RESOLVED that the Parish Council strongly supports the application for the reinstatement of two dwellings as it believes that the division of a large dwelling into two smaller dwellings would be beneficial to the community and support social sustainability.