

MINUTES of Melksham Without Planning Committee Meeting held on Monday 19th November 2012 at Crown Chambers, Melksham Market Place at 7.00 p.m.

Present: Cllr. Mike Mills (Chairman); Cllrs. Alan Baines; Rolf Brindle; Gregory Coombes; John Glover; Don Millard and Richard Wood.

Apologies: Cllr. Mike Sankey

302/12 Cllr Don Millard declared an interest in Planning Application W12/0190 as a friend of the applicant.

It was agreed to suspend Standing Orders to allow for a period of public participation

303/12 **Public Participation (1)**

W12 02026 Demolition of house and replacement with two detached dwellings.

Resident Mr Gibbons of 187A expressed several concerns about this planning application. He emphasised that he lived at 187A, not 187 as described by the application and he had lived there 43 years. (187 Woodrow Road was a large property further along the road towards Melksham.) He had examined the application and was shocked that two very high dwellings were proposed; 7 metres to ridge height, and that there was no reference to any bat or wildlife survey being done. He believed the derelict house contained bats in the roof and birds were nesting in the chimneys. With reference to documentation, he wished to make the following points:

Clause 5.4. His own property 187A Woodrow had a window in the side elevation and this was a primary window not a secondary window. All three windows were necessary for light. It was proposed to erect a building of 7 metres to ridge height directly outside his window

Clauses 6.1. and 6.2.: The scale of the proposed new dwellings needed to in keeping with the size and height of other dwellings in the location which were low cottages and bungalows.

Clause 11.1 He did not understand what was being stated in 11.1 or the last three lines of 11.2. which referred to an anomaly re the settlement boundary.

Clause 11.6 The site was unkempt and run down because the owner had made no attempt to keep the ground clear of weeds since March. Prior to that he and other neighbours used to rotivate the ground for the previous tenant. He had reported to highways that shrubs etc were overgrowing the footway

His final concern related to scale s shown on the plans. The only drawings were shown as 1:200 and it was impossible to work out exactly where the house were proposed in relation to the front kerb and boundary, so he was unsure of the true impact on his own dwelling. He had spoken to the Planning Officer, who had agreed it was unclear exactly where the proposed dwellings would be on the site from the drawings that had been supplied. He had therefore requested that the application be put on hold until this important detail was clear. If they were built as shown it appeared his bungalow would be completely overshadowed and he would look out look directly on to a blank wall.

Mr Winterbourne of Woodrow Road confirmed he fully supported everything Mr. Gibbons had said. With reference to Clause 12 the boundaries needed to be clearly defined. The boundary line as shown touched his property, and he was concerned to ensure that when he had an oil delivery, the operative was still able to access his oil tank at the back of his property.

Cllr Baines asked if the current post and wire fence boundary was correct? If so it looked as though he would have 2 ft clearance to access his property

Cllr Millard queried if the fence belonged to Mr. Winterbourne?

Mr Winterbourne explained that the previous occupant had allowed him to remove the fence at the front to stop soil drifting. But then the fence was replaced where it was at present. His deeds said nothing about the boundary line. He had obtained drawings from the website.

Cllr Glover advised residents to make their views known directly to Wiltshire Council.

Cllr Coombes asked if Mr. Gibbons had discussed the documents with the Planning Officer the documents.

Mr Gibbons replied that the Planning Officer had brought the documents over. He explained that bats were flying around in the garden, and there was one possibly in the roof and that the house should have been pulled down years ago.

Cllr Coombes queried whether it was worthwhile to raise the issue of the bats

Mr. Gibbons emphasised the requirement to protect bats in Environmental law.

Cllr Wood shared Mr. Gibbon's concern about the bats. Planning conditions did require attention to bat roosts. Amelioration with two bungalows would be preferable.

The Chairman thanked residents for attending the Meeting and explaining their concerns.

The Council re-convened.

304/12

W12 02026 John Stainer, 188 Woodrow Road. Proposed demolition of existing unsound detached house and its replacement with two detached dwellings. It was agreed to advance this planning application on the Agenda

Comments: a) The proposed dwellings are far too large and out of keeping with the existing dwellings. The Parish Council feel that bungalows would be far more appropriate on this site.

b) The two proposed dwellings are set too far forward, giving the impression that there is an established building line. However there is no building line in this part of the road and it would be better to build bungalows and set them set right back in line with the rear of the existing bungalow. In their present position, the two dwellings seriously compromise the light amenity of the next door bungalow; no. 187A Woodrow Road.

c) *The Parish Council request more accurate and detailed plans to scale, to show exactly where on the site, the two houses are to be built, as residents cannot tell from the plans submitted to date exactly how far they are from current boundaries.*

d) *The existing unsound house is a habitat for bats as well as other wildlife. Please could a bat survey be carried out and a protective condition applied as necessary.*

e) *Please note Mr Gibbons' house is 187A, not 187 as mentioned on this plan*

As residents wished to speak again it was agreed to suspend Standing Orders to allow a second period of public participation

305/12 **Public Participation (2)**

Mr Gibbons stated he had no objection to development on the site, but that it must be done sympathetically, with two bungalows on one side, and the row of cottages on the other side.

Cllr Coombes enquired if the meeting with the Planning officer was useful.

Mr. Gibbons replied she had not commented one way or other.

The Chair explained that the Planning Officer can only collect information and can not make a comment.

The Chair thanked the residents once again, and informed them they were welcome to stay on for the remainder of the meeting.

The Council re-convened.

306/12 **Other Planning Applications**

W12/01907 TW Landscapes, Unit 10 Indus Acre Industrial Estate for Land South West of 429 Redstocks. Proposed change of use from agriculture to a mixed use for agriculture and for storage of fencing materials required for use in association with Landscaping business.

Comments:- *The Council has no objection to this application in principal, but requests that the access and egress of the site is constructed of the right materials to ensure that road safety is not compromised through mud being transported on to the road from the site. (See attached concerns from residents)*

W12/ 01940 Mr & Mrs Blower, Grassmead, 113 Beanacre, SN12 9PZ Proposed demolition of existing detached garage and workshop and new two storey side extension with single storey rear extension.

Comments:- *No objection to this application but please note the compass direction marked on the plan is incorrect by 90 degrees*

W12/02014 Wiltshire School of Gymnastics, Bowerhill Proposed extension to Wiltshire School of Gymnastics to create new Gymnastics Hall, equipment store, office and meeting room for Coaches.

Comments: *This planning application has not yet been received by the Parish Council However the Council has been made aware that the site plan has missed off one building that is adjacent to the proposed extension; the ATC building and the ATC has not been consulted. The ATC building already has buildings on its other sides, and is concerned that if this extension is constructed in its present proposed position, the windows at that*

end of ATC building will be blocked and lose light. They also use the car park for parades and have nowhere else to go. (NB The postal address for 2385 (Melksham) Sqn Air Training Corps is as follows; 33 Lancaster Road, Bowerhill, Melksham, SN12 6SS)

*Generally the Parish Council **STRONGLY OBJECTS** that the proposed extension appears to take away much-needed parking spaces. As you know there is already a severe shortage of parking on Bowerhill and this would only aggravate an already serious problem*

The Council are concerned that not all the neighbouring properties have been correctly notified. The ATC building will lose light completely from two windows and will no longer be able to use the car park for their parade practice.

We look forward to receiving the full set of plans in due course, and will submit final comments when these have been received. (No plans yet received -22nd November)

There were no objections to the following planning applications:-

W/12/01950 Mr B Larkin, for Home Farm Shaw Hill, Shaw, SN12 8EW Application to replace extant planning permission 07/02586 to erect a mess room with drying facilities and a wash down area.

W12/01964 Certificate of Lawfulness for existing use of land as a domestic garden for Kays Cottage, 489 Semington Road. SN12 6DR

W12/02055 Mr Stephen Weeks, 27 Winston Road, Melksham SN12 6EG Proposed side and rear extensions with new hipped roof to existing flat roofed kitchen.

W12/02075 Mr D. Scott, 4 Locking Close, Bowerhill, SN12 6XR
Proposed single storey rear extension, rear porch and alterations to front porch.

307/12

Planning Correspondence

1. East Melksham Development – Forest and Sandridge School: The Chairman reported that Glenn Godwin of Pegasus Planning had asked for a Meeting on Tuesday 13th November with representatives from Wiltshire Council, Forest and Sandridge School and the Salisbury Diocese to present plans for funding of the new school on the development East of Melksham. A proposal had been put forward to build 15 homes on the existing school site to raise a £2 million shortfall needed to fund a new 2 class entry school. Cllr. Millard questioned why he had not been informed about the meeting. The Chair explained that it had been arranged at very short notice. Pegasus Planning intended to carry out public consultation to ascertain local views. Cllr Millard suggested the site should be marketed properly to give others a chance to buy it. He asked if the old part of the school was listed. Since development had started on the East of Melksham site, the developers had been trying to increase the number of houses. Surely more money should be made available for the new school? Cllr Wood reported that the Forest & Sandridge School now had 200 children, far above the original limit. It was logical if a new school was being built to go for a 2 class entry school. However the existing school was 2 entry and so there was a funding short fall. Cllr Mills informed that it was planned to meet the short-fall from the development of private housing. There were no plans for social housing on the old school site. Cllr Brindle expressed concern that a proposal to make up the shortfall by building 15 new homes in the countryside was being made now. The school had been deteriorating for at least 10 years and temporary mobiles had been in use

for a long time. There surely were funds somewhere to cover for a replacement school when the existing one was worn out. He did not support the idea of redeveloping the existing site to pay for the new school. Cllr Glover emphasised that replacement Diocesan schools were not funded by Wiltshire Council and it was unlikely the Dioceses would have put the money aside.

It was agreed to suspend Standing Orders again to enable Cllr. Nicol, the Council's representative on Forest and School Governors, to speak

308/12

Public Participation 2

Forest and Sandridge School replacement:

Cllr. Nicol reported the existing school was owned by Salisbury Diocese, not Wiltshire Council. It had been condemned and was in a very poor condition. Some Section 106 Agreement money would go towards the new school. Wiltshire Council did not maintain or repair buildings adequately.

The Council re-convened

Planning Correspondence cont

2. Wilts and Berks Canal – Neighbourhood Planning: The Planning Committee noted a letter from the Wiltshire Council Canal Officer Ken Oliver to ask for confirmation that the Council had a working group to consider Neighbourhood Planning. The Canal Partnership wished to meet with the Council to consider how canal plans could become part of a Neighbourhood Plan

3. Joint Town and Parish Neighbourhood Plan Group: The Clerk reported that the Group had met on Thursday 15th November when draft Terms of Reference for the Steering Group had been reviewed. The Terms had now been sent to Wiltshire Council for further comment. Copies of Minutes of the last two Steering Group meetings had been received from the Town Council.

3. Old George Ward School site – planning renewal: A copy letter sent to Wiltshire Council Monitoring Officer by Mr Chivers was received. This complained about the way in which a planning decision had been made on the above site. The letter alleged that the Conservative Group was holding group meetings before planning committee meetings and this contravened Wiltshire Council's Code of Conduct. The Council noted that the Planning Committee had rejected this application and that this decision had been overturned on appeal.

4. Outstanding S 106 Agreement- renegotiations: The Council noted that the Government was consulting on a proposal for all S. 106 Agreements prior to April 2010 to be re-negotiated. This was to avoid development being stalled because developers believed agreements were too demanding in a changed economic climate. The Committee expressed concern that this could lead to more development taking place without benefit to the local community. It was noted the CIL would be an extra tax on development.
Resolved: *The Council object unless safeguards were put in place to ensure local communities benefited from new development.*

5. W12 00150 Whaddon Grove House, Retrospective change of use of bedrooms to bed and breakfast letting rooms – Appeal It was noted that the Council had made no objections to the application and so would not be submitting comments on the Appeal.

6. Planning Appeals – Technical Reforms: A NALC Paper was received to inform that the Government had announced measures to speed up Appeals and make them more transparent. NALC supported the proposals but emphasised that local councils should still have the same right of Appeal as developers. The Committee supported this view.

7. Solar Farm at Broughton Gifford: The Committee noted a report from Jodie Hoare to inform that the Public Exhibition at Broughton had been well supported and several residents from Shaw had attended as well. This was noted.

8. Community Infrastructure Levy: Email received to inform online consultation had closed but local councils could still submit comments in writing until Wednesday 5th December. Councillors again asked how the Levy would be distributed to communities, and whether funds would go to Area Boards.

Resolved: The Council write again to Wiltshire Council to request an answer to their queries.

9. Consultation of Modifications & Government Guidance relating to Manager Aggregate Supply. It was noted this consultation would continue until Thursday 27th November.

10. Proposed MUGA for Bowerhill: The Planning Committee noted an email from Glenn Godwin of Pegasus Planning to confirm his client Persimmon had agreed to make a £32,500 donation to the new MUGA at Hornchurch Road. This news was welcomed.

Meeting closed at 8.15 p.m.

Chairman, 10th December 2012