

# SWALLOWCLIFFE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Extraordinary Parish Council Meeting  
held in the Village Hall, Swallowcliffe  
on **Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> June 2025** at 7:00 pm

Present:

- Cllr. Stephen Banas (Chairman, portfolio holder for highways matters)
- Cllr. Amanda Brockway (Vice chair, portfolio holder for planning/footpaths/rights of way/rep to Wiltshire Council's South West Area Board)
- Cllr. Nick Osborne (Village Hall treasurer, portfolio holder for finance)
- Cllr. Nigel Cooke (Portfolio holder for village asset maintenance, emergency planning)
- Cllr Sarah Taylor (Parish steward coordinator)

In Attendance:

- Minute taker: Matthew Phillips
- 27 members of the public

## Formal Meeting Agenda

### 24. Apologies for Absence:

- None received. All councillors were present.

### 25. Declarations of Pecuniary or Other Interests:

- Members were reminded of their obligation to declare any interests in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 and the Council's Code of Conduct. No declarations of interest were made.

### 26. Dispensations to Participate:

- To receive and resolve on any applications for dispensations made to the Parish Clerk.

Parish Clerk not present - none made.

### 27. New Planning Application – Poles Farm:

To receive the application. To resolve on the Parish Council's response to Wiltshire Council.

Application No:	PL/2025/03953
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Proposal:	Change of use of land from agriculture to residential (Use Class C3), the demolition of existing barns (one of which is retrospective) and the erection of a residential dwelling, a detached car port and store, and a bin store, and associated works.
Site Address:	Poles Farm, Swallowcliffe, Salisbury, SP3 5NK

Cllr Stephen Banas (Chairman) outlined the plan of the meeting; that would take input from the audience, then have only a parish council discussion on how to respond to the application to Wiltshire Council.

Cllr Stephen Banas described how Cllr Nabil Najjar would handle any 'calling in'.

## Opened the floor to the public

A member of the public asked if there were any representatives from the developer, and one person made themselves known.

A member of the public read out the last refusal judgment. They believed this application showed very little change from the previous application in terms of why it was refused. There were 92 previous objections, and these concerns still apply. A map showing that the new property is on backland, not infill, was distributed.

A member of the public submitted a printout of her representation. Their point was that the highways 'no objection' and assertion that traffic increase would be minimal were based on inaccurate information. They requested that Highways visit the site to gain a better understanding of the dangers.

A member of the public made a representation on behalf of another member of the public that the application must fulfil three sequential requirements and it fails on all 3: it is a backland development and not between properties, it does not meet housing needs, and it is out of proportion. It does not, therefore, conform to core policy 2 and should be refused.

A member of the public made a representation on behalf of another member of the public. Their point was that Poles Farm should remain agricultural land and could be rehabilitated for wildflowers or vegetable plots.

A member of the public stated that the application does not meet the settlement's housing needs. Additionally, the drainage plans are not on the developer's land. They ask that the drainage plans be revisited because no outflow stream is available. In addition, Dark Sky guidelines would be compromised by the additional light spill.

A member of the public pointed out that illumination from even one light being on in the house would cause light to be emitted from the whole north-facing frontage. They believe that because of the trees and house orientation, the lights would need to be on all the time; the result would be one wall of light facing the other houses.

A member of the public shared his opinion that the scheme is badly thought out and not wanted by the village.

A member of the public reiterated that their experience also demonstrates that the lights would need to be on all the time and would be illuminating the houses opposite. The architect's layout plans are incorrect with elevation relative to Pond Close and need to be remeasured.

A member of the public stated that not one of the properties to be affected by light pollution is/was one of the consultees. They reiterated that there is no access to the stream for drainage on Ponds Close land, as evidenced by Ordnance Survey. They cited that they had written evidence from the former landowner that Poles Farm has no claim to the stream.

End of public comments

## Formal part of the meeting

Cllr Stephen Banas (Chairman) thanked the public for their views and invited Cllr. Amanda Brockway to speak.

Cllr. Amanda Brockway pointed out the improvements of the new plan over the previous plan. In these respects, the application is more thoughtful than the previous application, but she took the concerns of residents seriously.

She pointed out that thoughts such as 'better than previous' or 'better than nothing at all' are not reasons for approval. She stated that we must uphold the planning policies. Otherwise, it would set a dangerous precedent. The Parish Council can only object based on fact and policy. Whilst not a material planning concern, sewage discharge would need Environment Agency acceptance.

Cllr Amanda Brockway further elaborated that the new proposal conflicts with established policies aimed at protecting the character and environment of the village. She highlighted that the development contravenes Core Policies 57, 51, and 58, which address design quality, landscape protection, and heritage conservation, respectively. Additionally, the proposal undermines the Dark Sky initiative, which seeks to limit light pollution in rural areas. The development is not infill and this makes it fundamentally unsuitable, as it does not align with sustainable planning principles. Each of these violations underscores why this plan is inappropriate and not in the best interest of the community. On the issue of infill alone, this proposal fails and should be refused. However, all relevant planning policies need to be defended.

Cllr Stephen Banas (Chairman) invited other councillors to speak.

Cllr Nick Osborne objects.

Cllr Sarah Taylor objects.

Cllr Nigel Cooke objects.

Cllr Stephen Banas (Chairman) objects.

Cllr Stephen Banas summarised the points of opposition.

All agreed that not being infill is the key point. This proposal is still not compliant with planning policies when compared to the original proposal's reasons for rejection from Wiltshire Council's planning office.

Cllr Stephen Banas (Chairman) proposed a motion to object along the lines of non-compliance with planning policy. Seconded: Cllr Amanda Brockway. Votes for 5, against 0.

In response to a question from the public, Cllr Stephen Banas (Chairman) confirmed Cllr Nabil Najjar would need to know that the community widely objects to the application to be able to 'call in' the planning application. (To be considered at a Wiltshire Council planning committee meeting).

Cllr Nick Osborne proposed a motion to request that the planning application be 'called in' by Cllr Nabil Najjar. Seconded: Cllr Amanda Brockway. Votes for 5, against 0.

Cllr Stephen Banas (Chairman) agreed to request a site visit by the planning committee.

## Meeting closed at 19:48