

MINUTES of the Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council held on Monday 17th August 2015 at Crown Chambers, Melksham at 8.15 p.m.

Present: Cllrs. Richard Wood (Council Chair), Alan Baines, Gregory Coombes, Rolf Brindle, Mike Sankey and Paul Carter.

Apologies: John Glover (Council Vice-Chair) and Steve Petty.

Housekeeping: Cllr. Wood welcomed all to the meeting and explained the evacuation procedures in the event of a fire.

184/15 **Declarations of Interest:** There were no declarations of interest.

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

185/15 **Public Participation:** There were 11 members of the public in attendance to give their views on 15/06732/FUL – 63, Shaw Hill and 14/11295/REM – amended plans, former George Ward School, Shurnhold.

i) 15/06732/FUL – 63, Shaw Hill: There were 9 members of the public who wished to make representation against this application. They expressed concerns over the width of the private access lane and its ability to take not only construction traffic, but also the additional vehicles created by 3 new dwellings, stating that the entrance next to Beltane Place was dangerous and that there had already been accidents. There were concerns over conflicts regarding which vehicle had precedence when emerging from the private lane and Beltane Place onto the A365 and queries over future road safety if home owners erected high fences obscuring vision for motorists. A resident stated that when Beltane Place was constructed, a condition of the planning application was that double yellow lines and hatching were put on the A365 to prevent vehicles from parking and obstructing the view of vehicles emerging onto the A365, but this had not been done.

They reported that under a previous application for this site (13/05142/FUL) a condition had been imposed that the private lane be widened prior to commencement of any development and they considered that this had not been addressed. A resident reported that they had suggested to the applicant that the boundary wall of the application site was removed to widen the private lane at a narrow point before the second entrance to the site. They sought support from the Council, that should this application be successful, that a condition was imposed that the widening and resurfacing of the private lane up to the second entrance was completed prior to construction.

A resident considered that the number of car parking spaces indicated on the planning application was misleading and that the design of the proposed dwellings was not in keeping with the current properties.

The Applicant responded that the parking provision on the application was in response to Wiltshire Council Highways' recommendations. He stated that at the point of emergence onto the A365 that the speed limit was 30mph and that there was no highways issue. He reported that the widening of the first part of the private lane had been carried out and that this was done to make it safer for vehicles which

can now pass each other and motorists no longer need to reverse onto the A365. He assured residents that the whole private lane, with permission of the other residents, would be resurfaced once construction traffic had stopped and that legal documents would be drawn up with regard to the private lane maintenance, including the new part.

ii) 14/11295/REM - AMENDED PLANS: Former George Ward School, Shurnhold: Michelle Tattershall, Chair of CAWS (Community Action Whitley Shaw) reported that one of CAWS' objectives this year was to get a cycle path and wider footway from the Dunch Lane area to Shaw Primary School as the current footway is inadequate. CAWS would like to put forward as part of the planning process a proposal to widen the foot way and create a cycle path from Dunch Lane and the new development to Shaw Primary School. CAWS consider that even if this section of road was made 30mph, the footway is still far too narrow and it is extremely dangerous for the current children using it to access the school. This issue will only exacerbate when the children generated by this new development also attend the school.

The council reconvened.

186/15 **Planning Applications:** The Council considered the following applications and made the following comments, bringing forward agenda item 4b:

a) 15/06732/FUL – 63, Shaw Hill, Shaw, Wiltshire. SN12 8EX

Alteration of existing dwelling to create 2 detached dwellings, plus the erection of 2 new detached dwellings and associated work. Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Hallet

Comments: *The Council does not object, but has concerns over the entrance to the lane from the A365 and would like to see a report from Wiltshire Council Highways with regard to its safety and suitability as residents raised this as a concern. Additionally, the council wishes to see a condition imposed to ensure that the road surface of the lane is made good once construction is complete.*

b) 15/06687/FUL – 9, St Athan Close, Bowerhill, Melksham. SN12 6RA

Two storey extension to side. Applicant: Mr. Gary Blackmore

Comments: *The Council have no objections.*

c) 15/06746/FUL – 1, Ashley Close, Top Lane, Whitley, Wiltshire. SN12 8RH

Extensions and alterations to roof and ground floor. Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. King

Comments: *The Council does not object, but considers that this proposal is out of scale with the current street scene.*

d) 15/06607/FUL – 95, Corsham Road, Whitley, Melksham. SN12 8QF

Erection of shed to corner of front garden. Applicant: Mr. Jamie Smith

Comments: *The Council have no objections.*

e) 15/06879/FUL – Half Way Farm, Beanacre Road, Melksham, Wiltshire.

Construction of a pond. Applicant: Farthing and Co.

Comments: *The Council have no objections.*

- f) **15/07067/ADV – Former George Ward School, Shurnhold, Melksham.** 1 x single stack advertisement board and 2 x flag poles. Applicant: Persimmon Homes (Wessex)

Comments: *The Council have no objections, however they are disappointed that this planning application was received on 3rd August 2015 after the advertisement board and flag poles had been erected.*

- g) **14/11295/REM – AMENDED PLANS Former George Ward School, Shurnhold, Melksham.** Reserved Matters application pursuant to outline permission W/11/02312/FUL for the erection of 270 dwellings relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Applicant: Persimmon Homes (Wessex)

Comments: *The Council **OBJECTS** and wishes to re-iterate its previous comments made on the 20th May 2015 and to raise additional concerns and observations:*

1. The Parish Council wishes to see as much of the existing hedgerows retained as possible and on the 20th May it strongly objected to the incorporation of hedgerows into the gardens of the houses which it showed in the south west corner of the development on the amended plans dated 12th May. It objected as in other recent developments in the Parish residents removed hedgerows immediately on occupation. Whilst the revised plans (*dwg no. 858-PL01-03* 17th July) appear to show some of the hedgerow on the south west no longer in the boundary of the development, the plans do show hedgerows to be garden boundaries in the north east of the development. Whilst annotation on *dwg no. PERW 19598 10C* states that “Existing hedgerow to be retained” the Council wishes to see these hedgerows to be outside of residential garden boundaries. Provision should be made to replace any hedges where possible. There have also been a lot of trees planted on the George Ward site, many dedicated in the memory of former pupils and these too should be protected where possible. Additionally the Council queries an annotation on *dwg no. PERW 19598 10C*, where it states “filling in gap in existing hedgerow”. The council are unaware of any gap in this particular stretch of hedgerow.

2. The Parish Council feel it is totally unacceptable for any vehicles to have access onto Dunch Lane and the amended plans (12th May 2015) show 3 houses (with 6 parking spaces/accesses) having direct access onto Dunch Lane. There is no footway on this section of Dunch Lane. The access would require the removal of the existing hedgerow in this area. The latest revised plans (17th July 2015) not only fail to address this issue, but actually add a further two parking spaces/access onto Dunch Lane, *Plot 62 on dwg no. 858-PL01-2 rev D*. The Council strongly objects to this.

3. The document “Revised Landscape Masterplan” (12th May 2015), has an annotation “Proposed supplementary shrub and tree planting to boundary, filling in the gap within the existing hedgerow and **maintaining the rural character of Dunch Lane**”. The Council commented on 20th May that the addition of 3 storey houses on the corner of Dunch Lane would severely impact on the rural character of Dunch Lane. It welcomes the reduction in height of the houses now planned in

the revision of 17th July, however, one of these lower height dwellings on the south west corner of Dunch Lane shows two parking spaces and access onto Dunch Lane, *Plot 62 on dwg no. 858-PL01-2 rev D*. This is now in addition to the 3 accesses/6 parking spaces onto Dunch Lane, *Plots 63, 64 & 65 on dwg no. 858-PL01-2 rev D*, which the Council previously objected to. The Council strongly objects to these accesses as they feel that this will severely impact on the rural character of Dunch Lane that should be preserved.

4. The Parish Council feel that it is unacceptable that residents from 261 houses will be opening out onto the A365 (Bath Road) with no “**No Right Turn**” turn in place and commented as such on 20th May 2015. The latest revisions on *dwg no, P700/16 Rev B (Visibility Splays)* show two islands in the middle of the highway opposite the main site entrance, but does not address the issues with entering and exiting the site off the very busy and often congested A365. As previously requested, the council wish to see either “No Right Turn” imposed on this new junction or a third lane to enable traffic to pass those waiting to turn in or out of the development. There were also concerns raised by the Council on 20th May with regard to access to the coach park via Dunch Lane, which has no pavement. Again, these latest plans have not addressed these concerns.

5. The Parish Council expect to see dropped kerbs at the main entrance, and that the current eastern entrance of the site is made good (please note that there is a current Area Board issue raised about the provision of dropped kerbs along the Bath Road from Whitley into Melksham Town (ISSUE 3843: “A pair of dropped kerbs to be installed at the bottom of Middle Lane to enable residents from Whitley to get into the town centre via the footways. At present residents cannot cross Middle lane. This is the only dropped kerb required that prevents them getting into town. The other crossing without dropped kerbs is **the old service entrance to George ward School** which will be addressed by the development of the site for housing; as presumably will be the narrow footway from Dunch Lane to the George ward site which may be too narrow for a mobility scooter.”). Both the Parish Council and Community Action Whitley Shaw (CAWS), who represent the views of the residents of both the villages, wish to see dropped kerbs in the layby/old service entrance on the A365.

6. There is no footway on the first part of Dunch Lane and this development should provide one, along the front of proposed plots 62, 63,64 and 65. It is presumed that the primary school aged children generated from this development will attend Shaw Primary School. Both the Parish Council and CAWS would like to see improvements to the current footway from the George Ward School Site to the Primary School, this footpath is not adequate and there are serious concerns over the safety of this route not only for children attending the school, but also for families wishing to walk from Shaw and Whitley into the town centre. The additional children generated from this development will only exacerbate this situation. CAWS would like to see not only a footway but a cycle path in order that children can cycle to school to reduce the impact of even more cars parked on the Corsham Road in Shaw at school drop off and collection times, and would like to see some of the S106 community benefit spent on these

highways improvements. The Parish Council support the views of CAWS, but have concerns that there is not enough room on the Bath Road and Dunch Lane for a cycle path and the retention of hedgerows with the present design.

7. The Council feel that Public Open Space D is not usable as open space as it will contain an attenuation pond, with the surrounding area boggy too. Additionally they query Public Open Space B as this is a copse.

8. The Council wishes to seek clarification and details with regard to the proposed sports facilities. These are still shown on the revised plans (17th July 2015) with changing facilities, car park and coach park. The Council understands that all these facilities are to now be at the Melksham Campus and/or at the new Rugby and Football facilities currently under construction at Woolmore Farm, and queries the intention of the S106 community benefit spend. As previously mentioned the Council and CAWS wishes to see some of the community benefit to be spent improving the footways on both Dunch Lane and the Bath Road for the use of all local residents. Should the sports facilities remain part of this planning application then the Council would like clarification on who would take responsibility for the maintenance and upkeep of this facility. Additionally it has concerns over the access to the sports facilities by coaches. If the sports facilities are no longer to part of the plan, then the Parish Council would like clarification on what the community benefit that had been assigned for this area is now to be spent on.

187/15

Public Consultation held Wednesday 15th July – Land to the North of

Sandridge Common: Proposed residential development of up to 110 dwellings with associated infrastructure, open space, landscaping and vehicular access from Sandridge Common.

The Clerk, Cllr Glover and Cllr Baines attended this consultation and gave feedback.

Recommended: *The Council submit the following comments in response to the public consultation:*

1. Provision of footway along the entire frontage length of the A3102 is required.
2. The developers to respect in the detail of this site that the existing adjoining properties are bungalows.
3. Children from this development would attend the new Forest and Sandridge School and as such a pedestrian crossing would be needed across the A3102 and that this should be lined up with the current entrance to footpath MW22. The Parish Council recommends that S106 funding is used to provide this. Additionally there should be a barrier at the end of the footpath that exits onto A3102 to prevent children from running out.
4. There are no street lights from the Murco garage to the roundabout and any new housing would be on the left hand side of this section of the A3102. The Council wishes to see street lights from the 5 newly installed at Skylark Road up to the roundabout on Sandridge Common on the northern side.
5. Apart from the school there is a lack of any community building and a small hall would benefit all the residents living in the East of Melksham.

- 188/15 **Planning Appeals:** The Council considered the following:
15/03555/PNCOU Oakley Farm, Lower Woodrow, Forest. Prior notification for a change of use of Agricultural Building to Dwellinghouse (Resubmission). Appeal against refusal. **Recommended:** *The Council re-submit previous comments made to Wiltshire Council on 19th May, 2015, to the Planning Inspectorate.*
- 189/15 **Planning Decisions:** The Council noted an update on its own application:
15/05989/FUL Land to the West of new East of Melksham (Forest & Sandridge) School. 2m wide link footpath from Ingram Road to meet newly constructed footpath to rear of new school. **Permission APPROVED.**
The Clerk reported that a resident had complained that the new footway was not far enough away from their property, and planning enforcement had been asked to check this. Planning enforcement had also been asked to check the landscaping between the footway at the rear of the school and the houses as it was very poor. It was also noted that 5 of the 15 trees planted along the distributor road (at Rosemary Way) had died.
A resident reported that where the new footway meets Ingram road there is a “V” shaped concrete stile that could prevent pushchairs from accessing the path; this is not in the Parish but in the Town. **Recommended:** *The Council write to the Town Council and Wiltshire Council requesting that this is removed prior to the commencement of the new school term.*
- 190/15 **Premises Licence Variation for the Pear Tree Inn, Whitley.**
The Council noted that the Western Area Licensing Sub Committee approved the Licence Variation for the Pear Tree Inn, Whitley.
- 191/15 **Street Naming**
- a) **Former Forest & Sandridge School Site, Sandridge:** The Council considered a request from the developers of the former Sandridge School Site for a potential street name. The Council felt that it would be appropriate to name the street after the family that had given the land for the school and the money for the teachers when it was first constructed. **Recommended:** *The Council request that the street is named “Lopes Close”.*
 - b) **Retail Area on Land North of Cranesbill Road:** Suggestions from the previously agreed list of potential street names for the East of Melksham development had been submitted by the developers for the new retail area on Cranesbill Road for consideration by the Parish Council. **Recommended:** *The Council request that the Retail Area is named “Verbena Court”.*

Meeting closed at 9.25pm

Chairman, 14th September, 2015