

**MINUTES of the Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council held  
on Monday 15 March 2021 at 7.00pm**

**DUE TO THE ON-GOING COVID 19 PUBLIC HEALTH CRISIS THIS WAS A  
VIRTUAL MEETING, WITH MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC BEING ABLE TO  
ACCESS THE MEETING VIA THE PUBLISHED ZOOM INVITATION OR VIA  
YOUTUBE**

**Present:** Councillors Richard Wood (Council & Committee Chair), John Glover (Council Vice Chair), Alan Baines, (Committee Vice-Chair), Gregory Coombes, David Pafford and Mary Pile

**Also Present:** Wiltshire Councillor Phil Alford (Melksham Without North)

**Members of public present:** 12

**Officers:** Teresa Strange (Clerk) and Lorraine McRandle (Parish Officer)

**363/20 Welcome, Announcements & Housekeeping**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and informed the meeting a planning application for 150 dwellings off of Woodrow Road had been submitted to Wiltshire Council and would be discussed at the next Planning meeting on 12 April.

The Clerk stated the meeting was being live streamed via YouTube and would be available until the day after the minutes were approved.

**364/20 To receive Apologies and approval of reasons given**

It was noted Councillors Coombes and Chivers were not in attendance and no apologies had been received.

Note: Councillor Coombes arrived later in the meeting (at 7.03pm).

**365/20 Declarations of Interest**

**a) To receive Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**b) To consider for approval any Dispensation Requests received  
by the Clerk and not previously considered**

None.

**c) To note standing Dispensations relating to planning applications**

To note the Council have a dispensation lodged with Wiltshire Council dealing with Section 106 agreements relating to planning applications within the parish.

**366/20**

**Invited Guests: Dan Angell, TFA; James Millard, Blue Fox Planning and Stuart Choak, Calibro Re: Public consultation regarding land north at Beanacre (north of Dunch Lane)**

Dan Angell, TFA; James Millard, Blue Fox Planning, Stuart Choak, Calibro attended the meeting to update Members on public engagement regarding this site. Callum Warren, TFA and Oliver Burton-Taylor, Director Charterhouse were also in attendance as observers.

Dan Angell started the presentation with a timeline of work to date, the results of the public consultation and feedback on issues raised and explained around 1400 leaflets had been delivered to households, publicising the consultation, with information also provided via the local press and social media platforms, with 45 people responding to the consultation.

James Millard went on to provide a summary of the feedback received, which covered various aspects as follows:

- **Access & Traffic**
  - Do not want Dunch Lane to be a rat run
  - Access to the A350 would make the road even busier
  - Only one access point
  - Could anything be done about the speed of traffic going through Beanacre?
  
- **Ecology & Biodiversity**
  - Biodiversity will be lost and woodland reduced
  - Loss of green buffer between Melksham and Beanacre
  
- **Design & Layout**
  - The need for a sensitively designed development with energy efficient homes, addressing the climate change agenda.

- Sensitive layout of suitable density with consideration given to minimising the disruption caused by noise from the A350 and railway line
- **Facilities**
  - Lack of facilities locally, such as dentists, doctors, leisure, primary school and cinema
- **Flood Risk & Drainage**
  - Surrounding fields currently have standing water, particularly on the lower part of the site.
  - There is a lack of mains drainage in Beanacre
- **Heritage**
  - The need for a sensitive approach to the layout of the proposed development to minimise impact on those heritage assets within the vicinity of the site.

James went on to explain how the design would be shaped following some of the feedback received and be submitted to Wiltshire Council initially in outline form and subject to more detailed plans at a later stage, if outline approval is granted.

Several comments had been received regarding the woodland area to the North of the site, which provides an important area of biodiversity and ecology, as well as providing screening from Beanacre and heritage sites to the North, therefore it was proposed to make amendments to the scheme and draw back the built-up area away from the woodland, providing an opportunity to enhance this feature of the site.

Stuart Choak went through highway feedback received and explained engagement had, and was taking place, with Wiltshire Council on proposals for the site from a highway point of view.

Discussions had taken place regarding Dunch Lane, to understand the nature of problems and the impact the scheme would have and how some concerns could be mitigated.

Stuart explained regarding the one entrance to the site, which had been raised during the consultation, had been taken on board and in highways standard terms, one access would be acceptable to serve the scheme, however, discussions were taking place with Wiltshire Council at the possibility of integrating an emergency second access, potentially co-locating this with the existing pedestrian/cycle strategy and combining with internal road configuration, allowing emergency vehicles a choice of entrances to go through.

Regarding the speed of traffic through Beanacre, Stuart explained discussions were taking place between Wiltshire Council and specialist colleagues at the possibility of reducing the 40mph speed limit to 30mph and providing traffic calming, in order to help reduce the speed on the A350 adjacent to the site. However, were still awaiting feedback from Wiltshire on this. Stuart explained the scheme was not reliant on a change in the speed limit, but was responding to issues raised during public consultation.

James explained a report was currently being prepared, summarising the various responses to the consultation and how these will be considered in drawing up the final scheme and invited everyone, including members of the public present, to have a look at the plans and the various technical documents once they had been submitted.

Dan went on to explain more work needed to be done before submitting the plans, as the consultation was still open until later that evening, a few more responses may come in and would need to be reviewed before submitting plans in April and thanked everyone for allowing to present and invited any questions.

The Chair invited members of the public to speak to proposals.

Several residents of Beanacre were present and raised the following concerns:

- Impact on the history and heritage of Beanacre and how this will be managed sensitively. There are several listed buildings adjacent to the site, including Beanacre Manor and queried whether English Heritage have been consulted.
- Impact on the woodland to the North of the site and the need to keep a green gap between Melksham and Beanacre, to avoid coalescence between the two. The boundary between Melksham and Beanacre runs through the middle of this site.
- Speeding on the A350 and what can be done to reduce this.
- Lack of footpath to the North of the site connecting to existing footpaths to enable access to facilities in Beanacre, such as the play area.
- Confusion over coalescence and whether residents of Burnt Cottages on Beanacre Road, surrounded by this development would now be in Melksham.

James explained with regard to heritage of the area, a Heritage Impact Assessment was undertaken by independent consultants of the site and it's setting and identified those assets most likely to be adversely affected

by proposals and would be submitted as part of the planning application in due course.

James explained Heritage Consultants had assessed the heritage assets in the vicinity of the site, not just the actual structures, but their setting and identified those which would be most affected by the development and as part of the planning application, a Heritage Impact Assessment would be submitted.

James explained the level of impact this development would have on the heritage assets identified would be demonstrated within the application and felt confident based on the assessment that in terms of possible harm, this would be sufficiently low.

James confirmed that English Heritage, as a statutory consultee will be consulted on the application.

The Chair sought clarification on how much the plans would be scaled back from the Northern end.

James explained the layout would be pulled back to a sufficient extent, but not sure what the definitive line would be. The northern boundary will be reinforced as much as it can be, to emphasize separation between Melksham and Beanacre. Access to the site has been relocated further South, recognising Melksham and Beanacre were two distinct areas.

With regard to speeding, Stuart explained it was not the responsibility of developers to correct existing speeding issues, but to consider if development could result in an unacceptable safety impact on the highway network. They were currently looking at impact/personal injury figures for the last 5 years to ascertain any clustering along the network to look at any unacceptable impacts arising from the development.

The approach has been to look at minimising the increase in activity along the section of the A350 adjacent to the development by providing a high quality, above specification, traffic free route for pedestrians/cyclists through the heart of the scheme connecting out to the junction of Dunch Lane, integrating with the existing shared network, thereby moving people away from the A350.

The reduction in the speed limit would require legally changing and would include an element of traffic calming with discussions currently ongoing with Wiltshire Council on this.

Regarding the concern whether Burnt Cottages were in Beanacre or Melksham, the Chair explained, following the outcome of the recent Governance Review where a proposal had been put forward by Melksham

Town Council to merge both parishes, this had not been supported by Wiltshire Council and would not be considered again for some time.

Stuart explained the focus was to integrate to the South, as this was seen as the likely place residents of the site would gravitate towards, i.e., railway station, shops and other amenities accessible by foot and cycle and looking to make improvements along the A350, including the installation of improved bus stops, which would include the widening of the footway in these areas and the installation of pedestrian crossings. Stuart stated had not looked towards North because focus had been where the facilities are located.

Councillor Wood expressed disappointment, as he understood at the pre app meeting there was a proposal for a footpath, northwards from the site connecting to Beanacre.

Dan explained the next steps would be for the team to get together and establish how to respond to points raised as part of the consultation, which could in improvements to the design and connectivity of the scheme.

The Chair invited the Wiltshire Councillor for Melksham Without North to speak to proposals for this site.

Councillor Alford asked if consideration had been given to access to schools, the nearest school would be Shaw School, however, there was no footpath along parts of Dunch Lane, with no scope to create any, given the narrowness of the lane. People would be tempted to use a private vehicle via Farmers roundabout/A365.

Stuart explained that they were currently working with Highways who have identified key issues they wished considered. Sustainability is considered in the round. They were currently assessing data and will start to identify stress points later and how to mitigate against these. Discussions were currently ongoing with Wiltshire Council regarding Dunch Lane.

The Chair thanked guests for attending the meeting and asked if Members were happy to move item 8 regarding a response to this application further up the agenda, which was agreed by Members.

**367/20 Proposed development Beanacre Road (opposite Subway) (Site 14 in the Local Plan Review documentation). To consider a response to the public consultation.**

Members made the following comments:

- Are the traffic calming measures along the A350 a reasonable solution, supported by Wiltshire Council, given the proposals could hinder traffic flow along the busy A350?
- Traffic exiting the site and turning right on the A350 towards town into heavy traffic, particularly at rush hour, has the potential to slow traffic down. Aware already of vehicles joining from other roads along the A350 via 'T' junctions, such as Westlands Lane, having difficulties joining the heavy stream of traffic, sometimes only being able to do this when vehicles stop to let them out. Would a better solution be the provision of a roundabout instead?
- It was understood traffic calming measures were not allowed on major roads.
- A commitment sought from developers for better connectivity to the train station from Beanacre Road.
- Concern at introducing another junction along this section of the A350, given the number of accidents (usually rear end shuts) which take place from traffic using existing junctions, such as Dunch Lane and Westlands Lane.
- Proposals for pull-in laybys for buses. It is understood these were no longer the preferred option of Wiltshire Council, as it was often difficult for vehicles to rejoin the flow of traffic, the preferred option being for vehicles to stop in a live traffic lane, to pick-up/drop off passengers.
- Lack of school places in the area. Melksham Oak secondary school is currently having an extension built; however, it is predicted this will be full by the 2023/24 academic year and potentially over-subscribed in following years, with this prediction not taking into account any new development taking place, between now and then.
- Coalescence between Melksham and Beanacre. Development should be restricted to South of the powerline to leave a gap between Melksham and Beanacre and the first properties in Beanacre (Burnt Cottages).
- Concerns on the impact on the heritage of the area.
- Concerns on the impact on the woodland to the North.
- Potential for noise pollution for new residents from the A350 and the railway line.

- How will concerns raised as part of the consultation be addressed?
- Unsustainability of the site, given the distance to both primary and secondary school provision and the lack of school places generally. The nearest school, Shaw Primary is already over-subscribed with no room to extend.

The Chair asked Members if they were happy to invite the guests to speak to the concerns raised, which Members agreed.

With regard to traffic issues raised, Stuart explained the applicant was currently discussing with Wiltshire Council the potential of reducing the speed limit from 40mph to 30mph on the A350 adjacent to this site. Any traffic calming would not include speed humps, but be more subtle in nature creating an efficient flow of traffic at 30mph rather than at 40mph.

During discussions with Wiltshire Council the potential for a roundabout was discussed, however, Wiltshire want to protect the free flow of traffic on the A350, therefore the right turn lane was following discussions with Wiltshire Council.

With regard to access to the railway station, Stuart explained the site could not provide an all-encompassing solution, given the level of work required, but understand Wiltshire Council were working on an access scheme and maybe there could be some discussion regarding a proportional contribution towards this.

With regard to the noise/air quality impact, James explained a Noise Impact Assessment had already been undertaken and identified the A350 and railway line, all which fell below the threshold.

Regarding trains sounding their horns, close to this site, they were liaising with Noise Consultants on this and how to factor into a Noise Assessment.

Regarding air quality, during discussions with Wiltshire Council an Air Quality report was not requested with regard to potential impact of this site.

The Clerk reminded Members that NHS in response to another recent planning application in Melksham had commented they had no capacity within GP services in the town. In addition, a local public transport campaigner/supporter had provided ideas on improving access to the railway station; utilizing access via the Spencers Sports & Social Club rather than Foundry Close.

The Clerk informed the meeting she was aware of concerns raised by the Chairman of the Beanacre Community group regarding flooding in



Westlands Lane (A350 end) with several properties lower than the pavement level often flooding internally, from water coming off nearby fields, despite attenuation/dew ponds to the south of the lane. There were concerns of the impact of the development further south, on the capacity of the attenuation.

Due to the deadline to respond to this consultation, the Planning Committee had received delegated powers from Full Council on 1 March 2021, therefore, it was:

**Resolved:** The Parish Council make the following response to the public consultation:

- Unsustainability of the site due to:
  - Lack of a primary school places. There is a lack of primary school places in Melksham. It is understood, Shaw School, which is the closest to this site, is oversubscribed and unable to expand.
  - Lack of secondary school places. Whilst Melksham Oak (the only secondary school in Melksham) is currently being extended, it is understood, even with the extension the school will be full by the 2023/24 academic year and potentially over-subscribed in following years.
  - Accessibility. Lack of adequate footpaths along parts of Dunch Lane to walk to Shaw Primary School (if places were available). Also, a lack of adequate footpaths to both the South towards the town, but particularly to the North of the site along the A350 to Beanacre, to provide safe access to facilities, such as the play area adjacent to St Barnabas Church.
  - The reliance of residents on the private vehicle to access facilities, such as educational provision, with Melksham Oak and primary schools being some distance away from the site, railway station and health services to name a few.
  - Access to the railway station from this site is difficult and would require negotiating a busy road infrastructure to access.
  - Road Safety. Access to the site is via the very busy A350 which is a major trunk road to the South Coast. Aware of several rear end shunts taking place in the vicinity of this site, due to vehicles stopping to enable vehicles to join traffic from side roads.
  - Impact on the Highway. Whilst it was noted traffic calming proposals were being considered on the A350 to enable safer egress/access to the site, Members felt a roundabout would provide safer access/egress and at the same time keep traffic flowing along the A350.
  - Proposals for the development include bus pull-in laybys, these are no longer the preferred option, as it is often difficult for vehicles to rejoin the flow of traffic. The preferred option is for

vehicles to stop in a live traffic lane, to pick-up/drop off passengers.

- Coalescence between Beanacre and Melksham. To avoid this any development needs to be South of the powerlines to protect the history and heritage of Beanacre.
- Noise Impact on residents of the development. The site is between the busy A350 to the West and the railway line to the East. It was noted all trains are required to sound their horns to warn people who may be using the farmers track or public Right of Way, which crosses the line in this area.
- Impact on already overstretched GP services within the town. Aware the NHS, in commenting on another application in Melksham Without in February, stating there is no capacity within the GP services in town.
- The impact on the ecology of the area, particularly the woodland to the North of the site. It is understood bats and Great Crested Newts have been spotted in the area.
- The impact on the heritage of Beanacre and the proximity to several listed buildings, such as Beanacre Old Manor (Grade I) and New Manor (Grade II).
- There is no mains drainage in Beanacre, Wessex Water are undertaking investigative trials in April as part of their business case planning.
- Impact this development will have on flooding. Some properties in Westlands Lane, Beanacre (A350 end) are lower than pavement level and often flood internally from water coming off nearby fields, despite attenuation/dew ponds. There is concern of the impact of the proposed development to these fields with attenuation to the north of the development.
- Surface water drainage, any drainage provided for the site cannot go Westwards towards South Brook, as this currently often overflows, causing flooding in Shurnhold.

Welcome proposals for footpath to the North to connect to Public Right of Way (MELW92) to Shurnhold Fields (mini country park/public open space jointly owned and managed by Melksham Without Parish Council and Melksham Town Council).

Attention is drawn to various policies within the emerging Melksham Neighbourhood Plan, which is currently with the Examiner:

### **‘Policy 3: Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management**

All new development must include appropriate measures to align modern drainage systems with natural water processes to mitigate any flood risk. Development proposals will be supported where they:

- i. are located where the risk of flooding (from all sources) is lowest;
- ii. demonstrate how surface water and associated run-off can be drawn into the ground in a sustainable way for surface treatments in residential, commercial and public parking areas;
- iii. demonstrate, where applicable, that existing land drainage and ditches are safeguarded to ensure that any sustainable surface water outfalls are not lost;
- iv. utilise re-use of rainwater wherever possible but where discharged, should be done as high up the drainage hierarchy as possible by aligning modern drainage systems with natural water processes;
- v. demonstrate efficient water usage of no more than 110 litres per person per day for new residential development and all new non-residential development of 1000 square metres gross floor area or more should meet the BREEAM 'excellent' standards for water consumption.

All major development proposals must include provision of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) as part of the Natural Flood Management approach and wider Green Infrastructure network delivering multiple benefits, such as improving water quality and water quantity, recreation and biodiversity.

Major development proposals (full and outline) should also demonstrate that the SuDS comply with CIRIA Guidance, and demonstrate that an adequate area has been reserved for storage volumes without requiring inaccessible slopes.'

### **Policy 11: Sustainable Transport and active Travel:**

'All developments must be planned in line with the Sustainable Transport Hierarchy. Applications for major development must demonstrate through an effective travel plan how sustainable transport modes in the Plan area are maximised and that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all people.

As a key element in our sustainable transport network, further improvements to the accessibility and quality of the links between the wider town and Melksham Railway Station will be strongly supported. Improvements to the quality of the public realm around the station, will also be strongly supported.'

Attention is also drawn to proposals to amend various aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) including Chapter 14: Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change, flooding and coastal Proposed Change currently under consultation

'New paragraphs 160 and 161 have been amended to clarify that the policy applies to all sources of flood risk.

New para 160c) has been amended to clarify that plans should manage any residual flood risk by using opportunities provided by new development and improvements in green and other infrastructure to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding (making as much use as possible of natural flood management techniques as part of an integrated approach to flood risk management).'

If this application were to go ahead the Parish Council would ask that:

- To improve the pavement/footway in both the North and South direction along the Beanacre Road to provide better connectivity to facilities.
- For a contribution towards a potential local bus service.\*
- To fund the community facilities at St Barnabas Church and adjoining land – the play area, the school room (the de facto community centre), and the community field.
- As Beanacre itself is not on mains drainage, to make provision for a connection.
- To fund a pedestrian link to the Railway station off of Foundry Close, to enable residents from the new development to walk to the station.
- To ensure that school and NHS contribution requests are included (that Wiltshire Council and the NHS commit to this in the s106)

\*At a previous meeting it had been asked to provide funding towards the Metro bus, if funding from other Section 106 contributions were to end shortly. On contacting Phil Grocock, Bus Network Manager at Wiltshire Council, it was clarified the Metro bus was currently funded via Section 106 contributions from the East of Melksham development and felt it would be difficult to get Section 106 funding for the Metro bus, as the main A350 is well served by the X34 every half an hour.

Whilst not raised at the meeting, but in responding to developers at pre app stage/public consultation stage the Parish Council regularly ask the following:

- Circular pedestrian routes are included around the site.
- The Parish Council to enter into negotiations over the possibility of taking over management and ownership of any proposed LEAPs (Local Equipped Area of Play) (if situated

within the parish boundary of this site which straddles both Town and Melksham Without parishes).

- Equipment be installed for teenagers
- The provision of benches and bins where there are circular pedestrian routes and public open space.
- Shared spaces which are easily identifiable.
- There are practical art contributions and the Parish Council are involved in public art discussions.
- The development is tenant blind.
- Any bus shelters provided are suitable in providing Real Time Information (RTI) i.e., access to an electricity supply, WiFi connectivity and appropriate height.
- The road layout is such that there are no dead ends in order that residents and refuse lorries do not need to reverse out of roads.

It was noted Melksham Town Council had also considered a response to the public consultation, as well as considered various community gains, if this application were to go ahead.

Councillor Wood thanked representatives for the application for attending the meeting at which point they left the meeting.

**368/20**

### **Public Participation**

Councillor Phil Alford (Melksham Without North) wished to speak to several planning applications in his ward:

- **Construction of a solar farm and battery storage facility. Land North of Melksham Substation, Beanacre (Planning Application No: 20/06840) (Revised Plans)**

Councillor Alford explained he had previously 'Called in' this application due to its size and scale and proposed to keep the 'Call in', as the size and scale had not changed and was still visible from parts of Beanacre, such as Westlands Lane and The Laurels.

- **39 Eden Grove, Whitley. Proposed Three New Dwellings & Landscaping (Planning Application No: 21/01791)**

Councillor Alford explained he welcomed the change in orientation of these dwellings from the previous scheme, with an access now proposed off Eden Grove, however, raised a concern at the proximity of the third dwelling to a bungalow in Brookfield Rise, some 10m away, given its relative height compared to the bungalow and the impact this would have on the amenity of its residents.

Several residents of Beanacre wished to speak to proposals for a solar farm in Beanacre and raised the following concerns:

- Impact and damage this development would have on not just the ecology of the site, but also the wider Beanacre area, which has a huge diversity of ecology, including Great Crested Newts and felt the ecology of the area needed to be sustained as an important asset to the area.
- Impact this application would have on the area, but noted it was difficult for the 'lay person' to provide a comprehensive response given the amount and complexity of plans provided and explained if 3D drawings were available, it would provide a clearer picture of how this application would impact the area.

The need to protect Beanacre as an ancient settlement free from such developments.

- Impact the solar farm would have on flooding in the area.

**369/20**

**To consider the following Planning Applications:**

**20/06840/FUL:** Land North of Melksham Substation, Near Melksham. Construction of a solar farm and battery storage facility together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure. Applicants Pegasus Group

Although there had been changes to the original plans and panels removed from higher ground to the North East of Daniel's Wood, Councillors raised the following concerns:

- The visual impact of panels adjacent to Westlands Lane. Whilst some panels were on lower ground between the lane and the railway line, and shielded to a degree, they were still visible from the lane.
- The visual impact from panels adjacent to Westlands Lane on the Grade II Listed farmhouse opposite the site.
- Impact on flooding in the area. Whilst it was noted some changes had been made to drainage proposals, following comments from Wiltshire Council's Drainage Team. There was a concern that some run off from the site would find its way through the culvert and into the water course around The Laurels and other parts of Westlands Lane. The Laurels in particular has several properties which suffer

from flooding already. There is little scope for water to flow in either direction, due to the nature of the land in the area, which does not drain sufficiently.

- Is there a need for another solar farm, given the number of sites already in the area?

It was noted both the Core Strategy and the emerging Melksham Neighbourhood Plan supported renewable energy.

It was noted in responding to the application via the Wiltshire Council response form “No Objection” had been ticked and whether “Support Subject to conditions” should have been the response, in order that Wiltshire Council take note of the comments/conditions raised.

Discussion ensued on whether the Council should use the Forms provided by Wiltshire Council or send an email, as it was felt the options available on the form limited a fuller response.

The Clerk explained in sending the Parish Council’s comments, not only was the form sent, but an extract from the minutes was also sent to add context and included on Wiltshire Council’s website, along with the form.

The Clerk also pointed out ‘No objection’ was the response made to the application with various comments and the minutes of the meeting had subsequently been approved.

The Clerk stated the Planning Officer in their report often included all the comments raised by the Council, not just what response box was ticked.

It was suggested for clarity in future, an email be sent to Wiltshire Council, rather than completing the response form provided.

The Clerk noted Councillor Alford had ‘called in’ the application and asked if any Members wished to attend the meeting when this application would be considered at Wiltshire Council.

Unfortunately, no Members came forward, However, Councillor Alford stated he was still

intending to 'Call in' the application and attend the relevant committee when the application would be considered.

Following clarification from the Chair on the extent of panels, Members wished to see removed from the site in order to make it satisfactory in terms of impact on the area, the following comments were made:

**Comments:** No objection, subject to the panels to the South of Daniel's Wood being removed.

In addition, the Clerk annotated a drawing to show which panels to be requested to be removed, which members agreed.

**21/01111/REM:**

Phase 2B of Land east of Spa Road, Melksham. Reserved Matters for 50 homes forming part of Phases 4A & 5A of outline planning permission 17/09248/VAR. Consent is sought for all outstanding matters relating to this area, comprising Scale, Layout, External Appearance, Landscaping, Internal Access Arrangements and the Mix and Type of Housing. Applicants BDW South West

**Comments:** No objection as it stands, but ask that consideration be given to the provision of a roundabout (in line with the rest of the current relief road/Eastern Way), on the exit to this development to provide safer egress for vehicles, onto the new road proposed off Eastern Way to Spa Road, which will be used as a relief road from Sandridge Road to access the A365/A350.

**21/01122/FUL:**

17 The Beeches, Shaw. Proposed single storey rear extension. Applicant Mr Melvin.

**Comments:** No Objection.

**21/01535/FUL:**

23-24 Land To Rear Of, Beanacre, Beanacre. Proposed New Dwelling & Detached Garage. Applicant Nick Keen

At the meeting, several plans that members viewed earlier in the day, were no longer visible on the Wiltshire Council website. As several members had viewed them earlier, and bearing in mind the deadline for comments, they were happy



to comment as follows:

**Comments:** If the property is set back from the lane and its position adjusted to satisfy comments raised by a neighbour, the Parish Council would have No Objection.

[21/01601](#)/FUL:

Shaw Country House, Bath Road, Shaw. Extensions to dwelling; front boundary wall and gates; carport and two storey detached building providing garaging for dwelling and service space to holiday lets and new two bed holiday unit. Applicants Mr & Mrs McCarthy

**Comments:** No Objection.

[21/01669](#)/FUL:

16A Shaw Hill, Shaw. Proposed replacement detached garage. Applicant Peter Rawlings

**Comments:** No Objection.

[21/01765](#)/FUL:

The Barn and Store At Upper Beanacre Farmyard, Beanacre. Replacement of barn & store with 2 chalet bungalows. Applicant Harry Keen

**Comments:** No Objection.

[21/02280](#)/FUL:

63 Shaw Hill, Shaw. Proposed single storey rear extension. Applicants Mr & Mrs Evans

**Comments:** No Objection.

[21/01819](#)/FUL:

Silver Birch, 68 F Shaw Hill, Shaw. Proposed single storey rear extension, porch & works to detached garage. Applicant Paul Berry

**Comments:** No Objection.

[21/01791](#)/FUL:

39 Eden Grove, Whitley. Proposed Three New Dwellings & Landscaping. Applicant Barrie Poolman

Both Councillor Coombes and Glover declared an interest in this applicant as they knew the applicant on a professional basis.

**Comments:** Support with a condition that sufficient bin storage is provided for the central unit as it has no rear access.

**370/20 Revised Plans** To comment on any revised plans received within the required timeframe (14 days).

None received.

**371/20 Planning Enforcement:**

**a) To note any new planning enforcement queries raised.**

With regard to trees on Pathfinder Way, the Clerk explained the Enforcement Officer had forwarded the Council's request to the Tree Officer for substantial trees to be planted, over and above the amount recently removed in order they may be able to speak to the developer. The Enforcement Officer had cautioned the developer only needed to replace trees with what had previously been agreed. The Clerk had responded saying Members had not been made aware that additional trees were to be removed and if they had they would have been able to make a response.

**b) To note response following issues raised relating to completion of items at Pathfinder Place before occupation as detailed in the s106 legal agreement.**

The Clerk explained she had not received a response to queries regarding the completion of items at Pathfinder Place before occupation, as detailed in the Section 106 Agreement, but would continue to chase.

**372/20 Planning Policy**

**a) Lack of 5 Year Land Supply**

**i) Wiltshire Area Localism and Planning Alliance (WALPA): To note latest actions taken by the group in seeking a change to legislation to protect those areas with a Neighbourhood Plan against a lack of 5-year land supply**

Various letters from WALPA to the Leader of Wiltshire Council, Robert Jenrick MP; the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities & Local Government; various MPs and opposition leaders seeking a change to legislation, to protect those areas with a Neighbourhood Plan against a lack of 5-year land supply had been circulated with the agenda pack.

The Clerk explained a response had been received from Michelle Donelan MP stating she was aware of the

concerns and would be speaking to Christopher Pincher, Minister for Housing, to which the Clerk had responded with how the lack of 5-year land supply had impacted the parish, in order to raise at the meeting with Christopher Pincher, as local context.

**b) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) & National Model Design Code consultation.** To consider a response.

The Clerk explained she had been made aware of the consultation on changes to the NPPF by WALPA, who felt, as it was the NPPF which changed the lack of 5-year land supply to only hold for two years, with a Neighbourhood Plan, it would be worth asking for changes in response to the consultation, even though there were no proposals to change this specific policy.

It was noted there were proposals to change various policies, including natural flood management, which Members welcomed.

**Recommendation:** To respond to the consultation, seeking changes to the NPPF policy on Neighbourhood Plans only holding for a 3-year land supply for 2 years, when there is a lack of 5-year land supply.

To welcome changes with regard to natural flood management and to include reference to changes in the NPPF regarding natural flood management in the response to the Beanacre Road public consultation.

**c) Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

**i) To note correspondence from Michelle Donelan MP and response from Wiltshire Council regarding Future Chippenham**

It was noted Michelle Donelan MP had written to Councillor Philip Whitehead, Leader of Wiltshire Council withdrawing her support, for Future Chippenham.

**ii) Following a statement by the Leader of Wiltshire Council that CIL in the Chippenham Area will be spent in the area. To seek a similar statement for the Melksham area from the Leader of Wiltshire Council.**

It was noted in responding to Michelle Donelan's letter, the Leader of Wiltshire Council had confirmed that all Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) generated from development in Chippenham would be invested back into the area and not elsewhere in the County.

The Clerk explained she had calculated the CIL generated from development in the parish council's area equated to £4.5m for Wiltshire Council's share (85%) and whether Members wished to ask where this was used in Melksham.

**Recommendation:** To write to the Leader of Wiltshire Council to seek clarification where Wiltshire Council have spent the £4.5m in the Melksham area and to seek confirmation in future, that CIL generated in the parish will be spent on projects on the 'Infrastructure List' for Melksham.

## **b) Melksham Neighbourhood Plan**

### **i) To note Notes of Neighbourhood Plan meetings held 11 February, 24 February and 3 March**

The Clerk informed the meeting the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March would be circulated in due course, as they had only just been completed earlier that day.

The Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group had undertaken quite a lot of work recently in responding to the Local Plan Review and to questions raised by the Examiner.

The Examiner had undertaken a visit to Melksham recently to clarify a few points in the plan and hoped to complete his draft report within the next 7 days.

It was noted that some Neighbourhood Plan Referendums were taking place on 6<sup>th</sup> May in conjunction with the local elections; with the next tranche planned for mid-June.

**373/20**

## **S106 Agreements and Developer meetings: (Standing Item)**

### **a) To note update on ongoing and new S106 Agreements**

#### **i) Public Art Update**

- Pathfinder Place

The Clerk explained the public art panel was currently with the manufacturer. Discussions were taking place with Highways regarding location.

- Bowood View

The art contract had now been signed.

- Sandridge Place

No update.

#### **b) To consider any new S106 queries**

The Clerk explained Colin Brown, Wiltshire Council had been in touch regarding the new Semington Road application to say he would be writing into the Section 106 Agreement that all monies go to the Parish Council.

The Clerk expressed caution, as the Council had no legal power regarding the specific procurement of public art. However, by the next Planning meeting on 12 April, Members would know who was standing for election and if 9 candidates had come forward would mean the Council would have an opportunity to considering adopting the General Power of Competence, given more powers to undertake council activities.

It was suggested at the next Planning meeting to consider what theme the street names for this site would follow and if agreed to follow the theme of the adjacent site i.e., canal engineers to contact Paul Lenaerts, Wilts & Berks Canal Trust on suitable names of canal engineers as soon as possible to draw up a list for consideration.

With regard to the Davey Play area, the Clerk explained the Wiltshire Council s106 Officer had gone through the RoSPA report to check everything picked up in the report had been completed.

With regard to the parish council noticeboard for this site, this had been ordered and would be delivered to the site office shortly. Councillor Baines was currently looking up background information to the RAF officer names for inclusion on the public art information board.

**c) To note any S106 decisions made under delegated powers**

None.

**d) To note any contact with developers**

None.

Meeting closed at 9.27pm

Signed .....  
By the Chair, 26 April 2021