

MINUTES of the Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council held on Monday 9th March 2015 at Crown Chambers, Melksham at 7.00 p.m.

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

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

- 422/14 **Declarations of Interest:** Cllr Brindle declared an interest in application 15/01801/FUL, 455, Bowerhill Lane as the applicants were known to him.
- 423/14 **Public Participation:** There were no members of the public present.
- 424/14 **Planning Applications:** Melksham Without Parish Council considered the following applications and made the following comments:
- a) **15/01487/FUL – 36, Hornchurch Road, Bowerhill. SN12 6QE**
Side extension. Applicant: Mrs. D. Seus
Comments: The Council have no objections as long as there is no loss of parking space.
 - b) **15/01776/TPO – Chestnut House, 53D Beanacre, Melksham, Wiltshire. SN12 7PY** T1 Sycamore section fell to ground level and replanting with native species. T2 Horse Chestnut pollard by 50%. Applicant: Mr. Tubbs
Comments: The Council have no objections.
 - c) **15/01144/FUL – 1, Kenley Close, Bowerhill, Melksham, Wiltshire. SN12 6QE.** Rear conservatory. Applicant: Mr. Mordkhai.
Comments: The Council have no objections.
 - d) **15/01881/FUL – Largard House, First Lane, Whitley. SN12 8RL**
Install two conservation type roof windows to kitchen extension.
Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. A Book.
Comments: The Council have no objections.
 - e) **15/01801/FUL – 455, Bowerhill Lane, Bowerhill, Melksham. SN12 6RA**
Demolition of existing detached dwelling house and erection of new detached dwelling house with integral garage. Applicant: Mr. & Mrs. Robinson.
Comments: The Council have no objections.
- 425/14 **Non-material amendment to Planning Permission W/12/02298/FUL Herman Miller Ltd:** Land Off Portal Road, Bowerhill, Melksham: Erection of a manufacturing and storage facility with ancillary offices and plant and associated infrastructure including a new vehicular access from Portal Road, HGV parking, car parking and motorcycle and cycle parking, and landscaping and associated works, and extension of the existing Portal Road to connect to the roundabout with Westinghouse Way, demolition of the existing pavilion and erection of a replacement pavilion off Westinghouse Way and associated works.
The Council noted the following changes sought through the non-material amendment application:

- **Changes to the docks and level access doors on the north elevation:** The location of two of the docks and one of the level access doors on the north elevation has been amended.
- **Changes to the Pavilion cladding:** External material of the Pavilion has changed from 'grey facing brickwork' to grey facing blockwork'.
- **Inclusion of 1.5m bund:** Retention of soil disturbed due to the erection of the development.

The Council discussed the proposed changes to the Pavilion and had concerns that the replacement Pavilion should be like for like and that the proposed changes could have a negative impact with regard to potential graffiti damage, the thermal properties of the building and future maintenance and weatherproofing issues. It was noted that this blockwork had already been built.

Recommended: The Council query with the developer what effect these changes in materials will have on the thermal properties of the new Pavilion and any future maintenance of the building.

426/14

Planning Decisions & Enforcement Notices:

14/12162/PNCOU: Holding No. 45/176/0231 Land off Shaw Hill: conversion of agricultural building to provide 2 new dwellings. The Council noted that this application had been refused.

427/14

Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Development Plan Document – Identification of Potential Housing Sites

a) Stakeholder Engagement:

i) Report from Wiltshire Council Briefing Session held 23/02/15: Cllr Petty had attended this briefing session and reported back to the Council, he felt that the key points were:

- Site DPDs would carry greater weight than a Neighbourhood Plan in the Core Strategy.
- Melksham had been identified as needing another 611 dwellings to fulfil the 5 year supply. Trowbridge is unlikely to be able to fulfil its remit of 1,649 dwellings and as such surrounding parishes will be expected to accommodate any shortfall.

ii) Wiltshire Council Briefing Presentation 23/02/15: The Council noted the power point presentation from this briefing.

b) Housing Supply Paper & MWPC Review of SHLAA sites April 2014: The Clerk explained that this briefing paper was to note, but it did explain the methodology behind site selections. Cllr Brindle queried windfall sites, stating that for small villages that have an allocation of less than 50 all of these could be windfall, however within the town allocations there is no provision for windfall sites and these could provide some of the required allocation. The Committee noted and later referred to the Review of SHLAA sites conducted in April 2014.

c) Response to Wiltshire Council Draft Site Selection Methodology: The Council considered the Informal Consultation (closing date of Tuesday 31st March 2015) and gave its responses to their questions:

Recommended: The Council made the following responses to the Consultation:

1. **Do you agree with the approach to identifying the potential 'Areas of Search' where new housing sites could be identified?** Cllr Glover queried why Melksham Area had to find 611 houses, where as the Devizes Area only had to find 210.

There were concerns over why some of the Market Towns were listed and others such as Devizes and Bradford-on-Avon were not, that the classifications were not consistent and as such the Council did not agree to the approach. The Council wished to seek clarification from Wiltshire Council over whether these anomalies were due to each town's progress in their Neighbourhood Plans, and if so why this was not reflected in the DPD.

2. **In particular, we would be interested in whether you agree that we do not look for sites in areas of search that require less than approximately 50 dwellings to be provided over the remainder of the Plan period to 2026?** This makes an impact on the remainder of the Melksham Community Area as 51 dwellings were required. As such the Council do not agree as sites of 30 or 40 dwellings would accumulate and fulfill some of the requirement.
3. **Whether the Plan should identify sites for growth within all, some or none of the Large Villages identified in Table 1 or if not, what mechanism should be used to identify sites in these settlements?** All large villages in Table 1 should have sites identified.
4. **Are there any other factors that should be used to inform the identification of Areas of Search or the level of growth to be provided?** The Council has no comment.
5. **Do you agree with the methodology for identifying housing sites?** The Council do not agree with the methodology as in stage 3 it should include prevention of coalescence with adjacent communities as per Core Strategy Policy, this has been born out by recent planning application decisions already made on sites 266, 267 & 648.
6. **Are there any other factors that should be considered in the methodology that have not been taken into account?** Core Strategy policy to prevent coalescence.
7. **Do you agree with the options for development? If so, please state which options and why?**

The Council do **not** support either Refined Option 1 or 2 (Melksham and Bowerhill) as they do not support all the sites.

The Council would prefer to see an Option 3 consisting of the following sites.

Suggested Option 3 Melksham and Bowerhill

Site 648	This site has been previously identified and supported and was subject to a recent planning application (W/14/07526/OUT)
Site 265	This site has been previously identified and supported by the Parish Council and is currently subject to two planning applications (W/14/06938/OUT & W/14/10461/OUT)
Site 3103	This site has previously been identified and supported; the Parish Council considers this site as the next most suitable site for development in the Parish, and the logical next expansion of the East of Melksham development. It is accessible from the main road and close to amenities. The Council have consistently stated this position over a number of years.

The above sites would be the priority sites for the Council, it would also support, but not as high a priority as sites 648, 265 and 3103, Sites 3105a & 3105b in association with the Melksham Link canal development

8. Is there any option you don't support? If so, please state which option and why?

The Council do **not** support either Refined Option 1 or 2 (Melksham and Bowerhill) as they do not support all the sites, and therefore have put forward their own suggested Option 3 under question 7.

Refined Option 1 Melksham and Bowerhill

The Council do not agree with option 1 as they do not support all the sites.

- | | |
|-------------|--|
| Site 728 | This site is not supported as this land forms part of the rural buffer. |
| Sites 3105a | This site has been previously identified and supported. |
| Sites 3105d | This site is not supported due to coalescence. |
| Site 3105b | No opposition to this site. |
| Site 648 | This site has been previously identified and supported and was subject to a recent planning application (W/14/07526/OUT) |
| Site 3249 | This site is not suitable as it is an intrusion into an area that has listed buildings and would impinge on the setting. The Parish Council wish to see this as a conservation area. |
| Site 186 | This site is not supported as the Parish Council would prefer to see this stay as commercial land as per its current use. |

Refined Option 2 Melksham and Bowerhill

The Council do not agree with option 2 as they do not support all the sites.

- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Sites 267, 266 | These sites are not supported due to coalescence and an application for these two sites has been recently recommended for refusal (W/14/04846/OUT) |
| Site 265 | This site has been previously identified and supported by the Parish Council and is currently subject to two planning applications (W/14/06938/OUT & W/14/10461/OUT) |
| Site 3103 | This site has previously been identified and supported; the Parish Council considers this site as the next most suitable site for development in the Parish, and the logical next expansion of the East of Melksham development. It is accessible from the main road and close to amenities. The Council have consistently stated this position over a number of years. |
| Site 1025 | The Council does not support this site as it will create coalescence. The north part of this land should remain the rural buffer and any development of the south should be industrial/commercial as the land already backs onto the existing industrial area. |
| Site 186 | This site is not supported as the Parish Council would prefer to see this stay as commercial land as per its current use. |

9. Are there any other specific sites that we should be considering and if so what are they?

Yes. The Council believes there is scope for additional land for housing north of the A3102 but not beyond New Road (east of Site 3103, West of New Road) up to the new roundabout feeding the new Eastern Distributor Road.

The Council is concerned about the lack of industrial sites, and although this consultation is concerned with Housing Sites it would like to stress that land adjacent to the Bowerhill Industrial Estate should be secured for further Industrial use and not allocated for housing otherwise the Melksham area will become unsustainable for travel to work times if industrial development is not able to grow at Bowerhill Industrial Estate. The land to the east of Site 699 up to the A350 should be prevented from becoming an allocated housing site and be earmarked for industrial development

Cllr Coombes left the meeting at 8.40pm

428/14 **Planning Correspondence:** The Council noted correspondence from Duncan Hames MP with regard to large planning applications in and around the Parish.

429/14 **Planning Policy:** The Council noted the track changes that the Clerk had made to the Planning Policy to reflect changes in statutory documents, but further amendments and additions were required.

Recommended: *The members of the Planning Committee to individually look at the policy, feedback any additions or amendments for the Clerk to include in the Policy for consideration at a future meeting.*

Meeting closed at 9.05pm

Chairman, 23rd March 2015