

Tisbury Parish Council - Minutes of Interim Meeting
Tuesday 19th August 2014 in the Elizabeth Hall, Tisbury at 7pm

**Draft until
signed**

14.08.13	<p>Present: P.Cnllrs P. Duffy (Chairman), D. Carroll (Vice-Chairman), J. Berkley-Matthews, Mrs J. Amos, Mrs P. Chave, Miss F. Corp, A. Griffin, Ms J. Ings, Mrs A. West, D. Wood - 10.</p> <p>Also in attendance: C. Darby (St Modwen); WCnllr T. Deane - until 8:15pm; up to 6 WTP.Cnllrs <i>(G. Flower, Mrs I. Lacey, Mrs T. Austreng, R. Platts, R. Little and N. Noyle)</i>; up to 3 applicants/architects (14.07447 & 14.06751); up to 4 residents; Mrs S. Harry (RFO/Clerk).</p> <p>Apologies received and accepted: none.</p>
14.08.14	<p><u>Dispensations:</u></p> <p>a. declarations of disclosable pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests already declared in the Register of Interests: 14/06751/ful - Clock House - Mrs J. Amos, P. Duffy 14/07226/ful - Lenmoor - Mrs J. Amos</p> <p>b. declarations of disclosable pecuniary and non-pecuniary interests not previously declared in the Register of Interests: 14/07447/ful - Cleeve Hill - P. Duffy, A. Griffin, Mrs J. Amos, Ms J. Ings</p>
14.08.15	<p><u>Public Participation and Presentations:</u> Questions and/or statements</p> <p>a. The applicant for Cleeve Hill spoke in favour of the proposals.</p> <p>b. A neighbour of Cleeve Hill spoke against the proposal on the grounds of lack of privacy, the use of dormer windows and various inaccuracies in the Design and Access statement.</p> <p>c. Another neighbour of Cleeve Hill spoke against the proposal on the grounds of lack of privacy, but also the position of the proposed house within the plot, i.e. the corner; this would enable further building in the future.</p> <p>d. A third neighbour of Cleeve Hill indicated that while not objecting to a bungalow, the proposed property, with dormer windows, would lead to a loss of views. A further statement was made concerning one of the two gulleys under the 3 Arch Bridge being blocked and not effectively cleaned in recent times.</p>
PLANNING MATTERS - resolutions required	
14.08.16	<p>Consideration of Planning Applications: [Chairman not voting unless casting vote required]</p> <p>14/06851/ful - Ivy Cottage, Court St, Tisbury, SP3 6LN - 2 storey rear extension - whilst noting the loss of a smaller property in Tisbury, P.Cnllrs resolved to support this application. Proposed DC / seconded JBM / 6 in favour with 1 against and 2 abstentions</p> <p>14/07226/ful - Land to rear of Lenmoor, Park Road, Tisbury, SP3 6LF - erection of 1x3 bedroom P.Cnllrs resolved to offer no objection to the plans. Proposed Mrs PamC / seconded AG / 8 in favour with 1 abstention (Mrs JA)</p> <p>14/07447/ful - Cleeve Hill, Vicarage Road, Tisbury, SP3 6HZ - proposed new dwelling P.Cnllrs agreed, following a short discussion, to postpone a decision until the September full meeting to allow a site visit to take place. [P.Cnllr DC takes over chairmanship]</p>

	<p>14/06751/ful - Clock House, The Avenue, Tisbury, SP3 6JG - raising height of boundary wall and alterations to access including new gates</p> <p>Following the indecisive votes taken at the previous meeting, P.Cnllrs agreed that this application would be re-considered.</p> <p>P.Cnllrs subsequently resolved that whilst not having any objection to the alterations to the access including new gates, to object to the raising of the boundary wall height.</p> <p>Proposed Mrs PamC / seconded JBM / 5 in favour with 2 against and 2 abstentions (Mrs JA / PD)</p>	
14.08.17	<p>[P.Cnllr PD takes over chairmanship]</p> <p>Station Road/Parmiter site - Colin Darby (CD) from St Modwen was introduced and invited to give feedback from the comments made at the NHP session on 5th July and also give an insight into the ideas that St Modwen may have regarding the site.</p> <p><i>[note that TPC had invited West Tisbury councillors for this item in particular, as the site forms part of the boundary of the two parishes.</i></p> <p><i>The Chairman has made it clear that Parish Councillors, from either council, would definitely not be forming or discussing any firm opinions about the future of the site, but would inform St Modwen about current or past difficulties for example, with land contamination or the aspiration for a second platform at the railway station.</i></p> <p><i>It has been made clear that any discussion arising from sharing information would not in any way pre-determine the parish councils' responses to any future planning application.]</i></p> <p>CD gave a brief background of the involvement of St Modwen with the site, current occupants and highlighted the primary difficulties, these being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The split nature of the site, being c.6 acres of flat land with the remainder being a steep embankment. b. Lack of potential commercial tenants due to the surrounding road infrastructure. c. As yet unquantified land contamination. d. The potential for a second platform at the rail station. e. The presence of the footpath crossing the railway line and giving pedestrian access between the two sides. f. The current planning designation of light industrial and the potential for a mixed use site to include both employment and housing elements. <p>There were however some more positive factors, including the close proximity of the railway station and High Street shops.</p> <p>A more general discussion then followed with the opportunity for WTP.Cnllrs and MoPs to also engage in the session. The main points being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The opportunity for St Modwen to benefit from the ongoing NHP process. b. Timescales and phasing of any development would be influenced by the long and narrow nature of the site; in particular, access would need to be improved in the first instance and an earliest start date would be 12/18 months with a 3-4 years finish. c. The necessity for a safe crossing of the railway line, either above or below and acknowledging the difficulties with either approach. d. The potential for temporary parking on site, bearing in mind that there would need to be a reasonable return for any investment made. e. The desire of potential residents to live on a site that was not 'pretty'. f. The desire from some people for a purely residential development did not find majority approval amongst those present; the need for employment opportunities being thought more desirable for the longer term sustainability of 	

<p>(8:15pm)</p>	<p>the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. There would be a potential for influencing the delivery of increased housing units through the NHP, but the plan would not be able to stop increasing numbers if allocation was made in the Core Strategy. h. There was general agreement that any residential units built should be 1 or 2 bedrooms with small gardens and suitable for young or old. i. Everyone agreed that there would be an impact from the building of Tisbury Campus, as this may encourage more young people into the village that would require either housing or sustainable transport. j. 2 points were made regarding the site; firstly, that the extent of land contamination was not currently quantifiable due to the covering of concrete that allowed only small bore samples, and secondly that the 6 acres available for development was not sufficient for a viable 'Elderly Care Complex'. k. It was noted that of the 6 acres available, in a mixed development, c.3 to 3½ would be allocated to housing, c.2 for employment, c.½ for the railway station and c.¼ for the current user on site. l. Various other points were made, including alternative uses not previously mentioned of the SK8 Park or a delivery point for residents, landscaping as a condition. <p>The item concluded with the Chairman thanking CD for attending and providing a valuable insight into the site issues as a whole.</p> <p>Before moving onto the following agenda item, P.Cnllrs re-iterated a number of points for clarification of thought:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The St Modwen site was included within the draft housing boundary changes currently being circulated by WC. ii. Making industrial units available does not necessarily bring employment to the village. iii. P.Cnllrs should be pressing for the maximum feasible employment area within any mixed development in the village. It was noted that at the APM in May, Jane Scott had mentioned the possibility of commercial Porton Down 'spin-offs' being tempted by the St Modwen site in Tisbury due to the location of the railway station and suggested that this idea be pursued. 	<p>Clerk</p>
<p>14.08.18</p> <p>amendment</p>	<p>Feedback on Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document consultation - informal consultation with parish and town councils; runs until September 22nd 2014.</p> <p>P.Cnllrs, having studied the draft revised housing boundary in the consultation document, felt that the selection criteria used had led to the potential for larger scale developments in those settlements with better facilities, rather than a distribution amongst the area as a whole leading to smaller well integrated plots.</p> <p>The following factors were considered to be crucial in any change to the current housing boundary in Tisbury:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Utility and transport infrastructure - in the case of Tisbury for example, increased demand on services and infrastructure that are already stretched would require significant capital expenditure to ensure minimum negative impact on current residents. b. Resistance to change on currently allocated employment sites. 	

	<p>c. Developments on the edges of a village, leading to 'bolt-on' housing with little integration into the existing community.</p> <p>d. Smaller villages should not be excluded from infill development; one or two houses in each village has less impact on all communities than a larger 'bolt-on'.</p>	
MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED and/or RESOLVED		
14.08.19	<p>Draft guidelines for pre-application planning applications P.Cnllrs discussed the options available for some time before resolving to have a 6-month trial based on the guidelines circulated with the agenda. Proposed DC / seconded MrsPamC / unanimous</p>	
MATTERS FOR NOTING		
14.08.20	Community First Volunteer Awards - no nominations were received.	
14.08.21	<p>Date of next meetings Full meeting - Tuesday 2nd September 2014 Plus further meetings as advised.</p>	
14.08.22	Exclusion of the Public and Press (if necessary) - that under the Public Bodies (Admission to meetings) Act 1960 (as extended by s.100 of the LGA 1972), the public and accredited representatives of newspapers be excluded from the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the LGA 1972- none.	

Notes:

Planning applications are routinely available for public inspection on-line at www.wiltshire.gov.uk, at the Elizabeth Hall 30 minutes immediately prior to a meeting or at other times by contacting the clerk