

**MINUTES of the Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council
held on Monday 11th August 2014 at Christie Miller Sports Centre**

Present: FULL COMMITTEE: Cllrs. Richard Wood (Chair), John Glover (Vice-chair), Alan Baines, Rolf Brindle, Gregory Coombes, Steve Petty , Mike Sankey, Paul Carter, Jan Chivers.

Cllr. Terry Chivers attended as an observer.

170/14 **Apologies:** There were no apologies.

171/14 **Declarations of Interest:** Cllrs. J. Chivers & T. Chivers declared an interest in the Golden Fleece application as they were regular customers. Cllrs. Wood and Petty declared an interest in the Berryfield Village Hall application. Cllr. Carter declared an interest in 112 Beanacre as he knew the person involved.

The Council agreed to suspend Standing Orders for a period of public participation

172/14 **Public Participation:**
Twenty four members of the public were in attendance to discuss the Outline planning application for 450 dwellings on Land East of Spa Road (W14/06938/OUT).

The Council re-convened.

173/14 **Planning Applications:** The Committee considered the following planning applications and made the following comments:

W14/06938/OUT Land East of Spa Road.

Outline application for up to 450 dwellings with associated access and engineering operations, land for the extension of medical facilities and extension to the Eastern Relief Road from Thyme Road to the Spa – Snowberry Lane. Applicant: Hallam Lane Management & Bloor Homes.

Resolved: *The Council fully supported all the comments made by the members of public present and will include those comments in their response on this application to Wiltshire Council.*

Comments: *The Council do not oppose this application but do have concerns and issues that need to be addressed:*

- a) *Noise attenuation on the access road. A bund and heavily planted vegetation needs to be provided to the South and East of the new road to screen the listed buildings in Spa Road. A resident of the listed Spa buildings explained that due to the listed nature of his property he was unable to have double glazed windows. In*

addition this resident already has issues with light pollution from the existing new development as his property is so tall the current planting scheme does not prevent this.

- b) The configuration of the roundabouts at the Spa Road end of the proposed road are not suitable. There should be two sets of light controlled crossings here for the children going to and from Melksham Oak Community School.*
- c) The new proposed road should be completed very early on in the development, no later than 50 houses into the development. All traffic, including construction traffic, should use this road. In addition the Council would like Wiltshire Council to impose a weight restriction and traffic calming at the beginning of Snowberry Lane to prevent the use of it by construction traffic and to encourage the future use of the new Eastern Relief road rather than continued use of Snowberry Lane. In addition, there are noise issues caused by the height of manhole covers on the existing road at Snowberry Lane and Councillors are keen to see that this error is not repeated on the new road.*
- d) If the development was accessed from the North there would be no need of 3 T – junctions onto the proposed new road, and the Council queries if this is to be the main access why these are not roundabouts as on the Snowberry Lane Distributor Road.*
- e) Residents have expressed serious concerns over the volume of traffic in the Melksham area in general and feel that this development is on the wrong side of Melksham and will exacerbate the already congested roads.*
- f) A new access for the Football and Rugby Club will be in place, which was agreed prior to this application, and this access could be utilised in order to reduce the number of accesses from the proposed Eastern Distributor Road.*
- g) The land currently identified for potential expansion of the Medical Centre should be ring fenced and used only for community benefit should the Medical Centre not develop its facilities further. This land should not be used for housing.*
- h) The wider infrastructure, such as medical facilities and schools, needs to be given careful consideration. School places, in particular at the Secondary School, are beginning to become limited. Where will all these new school children go in the future? The provision of temporary classrooms is not acceptable and not a solution.*
- i) There are concerns over reconciling these plans with those of the Rugby and Football club, in particular over the area that was designated as a skylark meadow. These plans would seem to indicate that there would be development over half of this allocated natural habitat land. In addition residents have concerns over the fact that they have seen bats and deer on the land for proposed development.*
- j) A resident commented that many people use the fields that the developers propose to develop for recreational purposes, such as dog walking, and proposed that the developers include a landscaped perimeter walk.*

W14/07040/FUL Unit 7/8 Enterprise Centre, Lysander Road, Bowerhill, SN12 6SP. Change of Use to allow display and sale of motor cars with associated alterations. Applicant: Mrs J Evans.

Comments: The Council have no objections as long as a condition is imposed that the boundary hedgerow remains intact (as concerns that this might be cut back or removed to give visibility of cars from Westinghouse Way).

W14/07112/FUL 10, Beanacre, Melksham, SN12 7PT

Two Storey Extension. Applicant: Miss P Neale

Comments: The Council have no objections.

W14/07170/FUL The Golden Fleece, Folly Lane, Shaw, SN12 8HB.

Single Storey Rear Extension. Applicant: Mr John Casey, The Golden Fleece

Comments: The Council have no objections and welcome this application.

W14/05938/DEM Shurnhold Offices, Shurnhold, Melksham, SN12 8GQ.

Demolition of former school/office and outbuildings.

Applicant: Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd

Comments: The Council considers that with all the potential new development taking place in and around Melksham and the strain that this will put on infrastructure such as medical facilities and schools that the demolition of buildings that have been refurbished recently to a cost in excess of £1million is short sighted. Some of these buildings should be retained for community use.

W14/07250/FUL Sandridge Park House, Sandridge Common, Melksham, SN12 7QU.

Proposed Single Storey Extension. Applicant: Mr and Mrs E Solari

Comments: The Council have no objections.

W14/05698/FUL Land North of, 16 Berryfield Park, Melksham, Wiltshire. SN12 6ED

Proposed new dwelling. Applicant: Mr. David Gibbon (**Revised drawings**)

Comments: The Council OBJECTS to this application and wishes to re-iterate the comments previously made on the 15th July as the revised drawings have not addressed the previous concerns raised. As this proposed dwelling would lie within the path of the proposed canal route it should therefore be subject to the same planning criteria as W14/05206/OUT (Permanent village hall to replace existing portacabin), namely “The proposed replacement building would be located directly on the safeguarded route of the Wilts and Berks canal as highlighted on the Core Strategy policies map”. In addition the Council have concerns over the lack of detail in the highways report submitted 08.07.14 by Wiltshire Council Highways as the road is due to be closed off if the Wilts and Berks canal application goes through. The report submitted by Highways does not recognise the canal application and its implication to this development if the road is closed, in that when the road is permanently blocked

then the only access to this site would be up a one way lane against the current direction of flow. There is also currently no other driveways along this lane so this development would set a precedent.

- 174/14 **Planning Decisions:** The Council noted the following planning decisions:
- a) **W13/06053/VAR 112, Beanacre, Melksham, SN12 7PZ.** Retrospective application for garden walls and fences to the rear – permission REFUSED. Cllr. T Chivers reported that an appeal had been made against this application and that no enforcement would be taken until the appeal time had elapsed.

The Clerk reported that the neighbouring Right of Way belonging to 112b Beanacre was still blocked, and this was being followed up by Paul Millard the Rights of Way Officer. It also looked like a new access was being built onto the A350 from 113 Beanacre, and this had been reported to Planning Enforcement.

- b) **W14/05482/FUL 5, Skylark Road, Melksham, SN12 7FP.** Single storey rear sun lounge extension – permission APPROVED with conditions.
- c) **W14/05720/PNCOU Barn & Store, Upper Beanacre Farmyard, Beanacre.** Change of use of agricultural building to a dwelling house – prior approval REFUSED
- d) **W14/04589/FUL Bowerhill Pre-school, Bowerhill School, Halifax Road.** Provide a single storey modular building for Pre-school – permission APPROVED with conditions. It was noted that this was a temporary building for 15 years only.
- e) **W14/05241/PNCOU Oakley Farm, Lower Woodrow, Forest, SN12 7RB.** Prior Notification for a change of use of agricultural building to dwelling house. The Council noted that an appeal had been made against the refusal decision. The Clerk reported that the refusal had been made as the dwelling was isolated, would not be connected with agriculture and would set a precedent for the four poultry sheds. **Recommendation:** *The Council submit their previous comments to the Planning Inspector.*

- 175/14 **Planning Enforcement – S106 contribution to East of Melksham**
- The Council had received a 2nd Alteration to the S106 agreement and had serious concerns over why the Parish Council had not been consulted on these amendments and also why they had never been consulted or even received a copy of the 1st Alteration. The initial S106 agreement had stated that after 301 houses had been built that the football pitches, MUGA and older children play area would be built, but the community were still waiting for these facilities.
- Recommendation:** *The Council request a copy of the 1st alteration amendment document and express their concerns to Wiltshire Council over the lack of*

consultation as well as delay in the commencement of works for the community facilities.

176/14 **Wiltshire Core Strategy Update – July 2014**

The Council noted an update from the Planning Inspector on Wiltshire Council's Core Strategy Consultation. Consultation has taken place on the latest proposed modifications and reported back to the Inspector in June, who had further queries relating to how housing needs are assessed, the inclusion of housing already identified in Swindon being part of the 42,000 minimum housing need for Wiltshire and other queries.

177/14 **Joint Neighbourhood Plan:**

The Clerk reported that the Town Council had accepted the Parish Council's resolution to proceed with the funding split agreed and in principle were happy to set at date for a Steering Group meeting.

Councillors discussed that with the three proposed large housing developments being currently considered the Melksham area's housing allocation for the next 10 years could well be settled by these applications, leaving little scope for a Neighbourhood Plan to dictate future housing allocations. **Recommendation:** *The Council contact the Town Council to arrange a Joint Neighbourhood Plan steering committee meeting for September.*

178/14 **Settlement Boundary Review:** Cllrs. Glover & Carter had attended an information session and reported that Wiltshire Council was in the process of reviewing and, where appropriate, redefining extant 'settlement boundaries'. The culmination of the work undertaken to date has led to the preparation of a draft methodology for undertaking the review process; and a series of maps that detail initial proposals for revised settlement boundaries. To inform the preparation of the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations DPD, Wiltshire Council was undertaking an informal consultation with Parish and Town Councils whose area includes settlements with existing boundary lines.

The informal consultation will run for an 8-week period, commencing on Monday 28 July and closing on Monday 22 September 2014 with any changes coming into effect in December 2015. **Recommendation:** *The Council submit the following comments in response to the Consultation questions:*

- 1) **Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?** *Yes. The Parish Council agree that draft settlement boundaries should follow clearly defined physical features, such as, walls, fences, hedgerows, roads and water courses in order to define the built area of the settlement.*

The Parish Council however do not agree that curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement, including large residential gardens, should be excluded from this criteria as part of a property will be defined as urban and the remainder of a property will be defined as open countryside; this would prevent residents building a large shed in their rear garden. The boundary does not follow a physical feature.

The boundaries only identify areas of land already developed, the Parish Council feel that they should include areas planned for development, as well as areas that are considered appropriate for future development.

2) Do you consider that the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion? *No, there are many inconsistencies with the principle outlined above in Question 1 as many of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries shown do not follow physical features.*

3) Are there any areas of the proposed draft Settlement Boundaries that should be modified?

Yes.

Melksham & Bowerhill:

H11, I11 & I12: The Spa

The Council feel this should remain OUTSIDE of the Settlement Boundary as it did in the West Wiltshire Local Plan 1st Alteration 2004. As per point 1, the Council does not feel that properties should be split, with the dwelling inside the boundary and the garden outside the boundary as this does not follow a physical feature.

B13, C13, D11, D12, D13, D14, E11, E12: Berryfield

The Council feel that Berryfield should not be considered as a small village and be included in this Settlement Boundary Review. Berryfield is bigger than North Bradley for example, which is being considered under this review. There is a lot of development planned for Berryfield with the Melksham Link canal project and associated development, as well as a planning application for 160 dwellings which has been lodged with Wiltshire Council this week.

D11, E11, E11,E12: Mobile Home Park, Berryfield

The boundary used to follow a clear physical feature here, the A350, but there is a now a 'finger' drawn encompassing the Mobile Home Park, this does not follow a clear physical feature.

3B: Shurnhold offices/George Ward school site

The boundary has been moved to NOT include this site which now has outlying planning consent and an application for demolition; why would the boundary move now to not include a site that has planning consent?

7C: Sewage sites

The Parish Council do not understand why the Melksham Treatment Works has not been included within the settlement boundary of the Town when the adjacent Countrywide and Asda sites are included. The Sewage Works could not be considered as undeveloped countryside.

B3 & C3: Dunch Lane & G6

As per point 1, the Council does not feel that properties should be split, with the dwelling inside the boundary and the garden outside the boundary as this does not follow a physical feature.

D 13, 14, 15, 16 – K13, 14, 15, 16: Bowerhill Industrial and Residential areas

The Council has concerns that the Village of Bowerhill does not have a delineation between the Industrial and Residential areas.

Shaw & Whitley:

No comments

4) Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes, what is your anticipated timetable for this work? *Yes, in the next 18 months.*

5) Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review? *No*

179/14 **Wiltshire Council Kerbside Garden Waste Consultation:**

It was noted that the Planning Committee had delegated powers to submit comments on this consultation as the deadline was on the 1st September, before the Full Council next met. (*See Min. 168/14*)

The Council considered the three proposals in the consultation:

- 1) A three month suspension of the garden waste service with no collections in December, January and February.
- 2) A five month suspension of the garden waste service with no collections in November, December, January, February and March.
- 3) To introduce a chargeable kerbside garden waste collection service for those who opt to pay for this.

Resolved: *The Council write to the head of Waste Collection rather than fill out the prescriptive questionnaire stating that they would like to see the service remain unchanged as it has helped to reduce the dumping of waste in the countryside.*

However, of the options available they would prefer option 1, with the addition that the grey bin can be used for garden waste in those three months.

Meeting closed at 9.25pm

Chairman, 8th September, 2014