



Minutes of a meeting of the Planning, Environment & Transport Committee held virtually on Zoom on Thursday 11 March 2021 at 7pm

Councillors present:

Richard Bambury (Chairman)	Jenny Budgell
Nick Murry	Mary Norton
Nina Phillips	Chris Ruck
John Scragg (Vice-Chairman)	

Also Present: Councillor Clare Cape

Officers present: Matt Kirby, Director of Community Services
Andy Conroy, Planning Officer
Ann Chard, Administrative Services Officer - Planning
Michael Weeks, Democratic & Civic Officer

Public present: Four members of the public were present

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

A copy of comments/questions asked is appended to these minutes at APPENDIX A.

The response to these questions were not part of the meeting but is appended to these minutes at APPENDIX B.

116. APOLOGIES

There were apologies for absence from Councillors Raj Gill, Michael Merry and Andy Phillips.

117. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTION

No notification of substitution was received.

118. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

No declaration of interest as defined by the latest approved Code of Conduct in the current approved Standing Orders was received.

119. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 February 2021, which had been updated to include responses to public questions asked, were proposed by Councillor Chris Ruck and seconded by Councillor Jenny Budgell. It was agreed that the minutes were a correct record.

RESOLVED that the minutes were approved as a correct record and will be signed by the Chairman at a later date.

120. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman thanked Councillors and members of the public for their input into the consultations for Future Chippenham and the Local Plan Review.

121. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED

- (i) That the attached list of observations on planning applications be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
- (ii) That no planning applications be 'called-in'.

122. 1. THE COUNTY OF WILTSHIRE (VARIOUS ROADS, CHIPPENHAM, CHIPPENHAM WITHOUT, CORSHAM, LANGLEY BURRELL AND KINGTON LANGLEY) (40MPH SPEED LIMIT) ORDER 2021
2. THE COUNTY OF WILTSHIRE (A350, KINGTON LANGLEY AND LANGLEY BURRELL) (50MPH SPEED LIMIT) ORDER 2021
3. THE COUNTY OF WILTSHIRE (C163 EASTON LANE, CORSHAM) (50MPH SPEED LIMIT) ORDER 2021
4. THE COUNTY OF WILTSHIRE (A350, CHIPPENHAM, CHIPPENHAM WITHOUT, CORSHAM AND LACOCK) (DERESTRICTED ROADS) ORDER 2021

Councillors considered the above proposed Traffic Regulation Orders (copy in minute book).

RESOLVED that Wiltshire Council be informed that the Town Council considers the 40mph speed limit for the feeder roads off the A350 to be excessive and recommends a 30mph speed limit be introduced on these roads.

123. URGENT ACTION BETWEEN MEETINGS

Councillors noted the following Urgent Action Forms containing PET decisions that were made under delegated authority by the Chief Executive in accordance with Standing Order 11.4 (copies in minute book):

- Support Letter of Corsham Railway Station
- Support WALPA letter to the Secretary of State

The Chairman had emailed members of the PET Committee regarding the proposed letters, which had enabled him to advise the Chief Executive, and he thanked them for their responses. He stressed that the PET Committee must be given the opportunity to see any letters being sent out in its name.

124. FRIENDS OF CHIPPENHAM STATION (FoCS)

Councillors received a presentation from Councillor John Scragg, the Town Council's representative on the above, following his attendance at a meeting held on 11 February 2021. Luke Farley from Great Western had attended the meeting and had since provided the slides which Councillor Scragg presented. There was encouraging news about the north side of the Station. Approval for the lift had been given some time ago and funding had now been secured. There was now an improved design for the staircase which meant the exit from the lift into the car park will not now take pedestrians directly into the entrance/exit of the car park which would have been dangerous. Instead this exit leads onto a footpath and a pedestrian crossing has been added. A footpath alongside the tracks has also been amended to make it safer. Network Rail hope to install the third lift before work begins on improvements to the north side and hope that all work will be completed by the end of 2021. Councillor Nick Murry added that the task group had wanted more parking on the north side of the Station and less parking on the south side, which had not happened. The inclusion of cycle parking at the front of the Station was welcomed but there were other improvements which had not been included, such as cycle ramps up the side of the footbridge, and electric charging points, particularly for taxis, despite the ducting being installed.

Councillor Scragg also reported that FoCS are planning a celebration for the founding of Chippenham Station. This will take place on 31 May 2021 when the Station will have been open for 180 years. A representative of FoCS confirmed that this exhibition would be in virtual form and they were liaising with the Museum on the exhibition which would be linked up to several websites. The FoCS Facebook page will contain regular updates.

125. PROPOSED TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES/TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The following were noted:

- Recommencement of temporary closure of the A420 Marshfield Road (part) from its junction with St Paul Street to its junction with the A420 Ivy Lane from 23 - 27 March 2021.
- Temporary closure of New Road (part) from its junction with Station Hill to its junction with The Bridge and The Bridge from its junction with New Road to its junction with Bath Road from 29 - 31 March 2021.

- Temporary closure of the A420 New Road (part) from its junction with the A420 Marshfield Road to its junction with Union Road and the A420 Marshfield Road (part) from its junction with the A420 New Road to its junction with St Paul Street from 13 - 14 April 2021 (Phase 1). Temporary closure of the A420 Marshfield Road (part) from its junction with Ivy Lane to its junction with St Paul Street from 15 - 19 April 2021 (Phase 2).
- Urgent Closure of the A4 Bath Road (part) from the Pheasant Inn for c84m in an easterly direction on 12 March between the hours of 19:00 and 00:00.

126. ITEMS FOR COMMUNICATION

There were no items for communication. Councillor Nick Murry requested that the Planning Officer send members of the PET Committee details of how to respond to the current Government consultation on revisions to the NPPF and the introduction of a National Model Design Code, as the deadline for comments of 27 March 2021 fell before the next PET Committee meeting.

127. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place on Thursday 1 April 2021.

The meeting concluded at 8.15pm

These minutes are subject to confirmation at the next meeting
Signed on behalf of the Committee as a true record of the meeting

Chairman:

Date:

PLANNING APPLICATIONS -11 March 2021

Application No.	Address/Description	Ward
<u>21/00030/FUL</u>	3 Ashfield Road SN15 1QQ Single storey partial extension to rear of property, aligning existing external walls. Cllr Jenny Budgell consulted: - No objection.	Hardenhuish
<u>21/00502/FUL</u>	48 Park Lane SN15 1LN Single storey ground floor rear extension. Cllr Jenny Budgell consulted: - Object The proposal would likely result in loss of light and outlook to the rear habitable room windows and rear garden of the neighbouring property. A site visit needs to be undertaken to thoroughly assess the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the neighbour. The proposed extension by virtue of its length, flat roof design and roof overhang (which in any case may contravene use of the right of way) would not be consistent with the architecture of the Conservation Area, and amended plans should be submitted which resolve these issues. An amended scheme is likely to be supported, but as it stands the proposed would currently be contrary to CP57 and CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the Chippenham Conservation Area Management Plan SPG, the National Design Guide and the NPPF.	Hardenhuish
<u>21/00748/FUL</u>	8 Villiers Close SN15 3SQ Proposed Front Porch. Cllr Nick Murry consulted: - No objection.	Monkton
<u>21/00795/REM</u>	Land at North Chippenham, Hill Corner Road West of A350 Development comprising the erection of 22 dwellings and associated landscaping and infrastructure at Land at North Chippenham (Parcel P1E). Cllr Jenny Budgell consulted: - No objection. The proposed development appears in general conformity with the outline consent. However, the standard of generic, volume-housebuilder schemes such as this continues to be poor when it comes to addressing climate and ecological emergencies, and the transition to a low carbon future. As such, the	Hardenhuish (& Langley Burrell)

	<p>Town Council requests that the following further details and/or amended plans are submitted to improve the design, sustainability and quality of the development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings/structures should be wildlife friendly and include hedgehog tunnels in fences, tree planting in rear gardens, bird/bat boxes, and swift bricks at a ratio of 1 brick per dwelling • Electric vehicle charging infrastructure should be incorporated for each dwelling (where EV wall sockets are not provided sufficient cabling/power should be provided within garages to allow EV charging) • All new housing development in Chippenham should demonstrate it is of a sustainable construction (equivalent to the former Level 4 Code for Sustainable Homes) and incorporate low carbon energy features (such features may include passive ventilation, building orientation to take advantage of natural light and heat, high performance insulation, green/brown roofs, water recycling, solar panels, energy efficient/renewable energy heating systems). Further details should be submitted up front with this application. • Plot 13 should have a wall, rather than fence, where it faces on to the public realm (open space) • The footpath through the open space should be included for adoption. 	
<u>21/00807/FUL</u>	<p>33 Orchard Road SN14 OBE Two storey side extension with single storey rear extension. No Ward Councillors present: - No objection.</p>	Queens & Sheldon
<u>21/00995/FUL</u>	<p>45 Park Avenue SN14 OHB Proposed two storey side extension, facade / internal alterations, rooflight insertion and all associated works. Cllr Nina Phillips consulted: - No objection.</p>	CP & Redlands
<u>21/01000/FUL</u>	<p>2 Market Place SN15 3HE Installation of one new CCTV camera. No Ward Councillors present: - No objection.</p>	Hardens & England
<u>21/01010/FUL</u>	<p>15 Orchard Crescent SN14 OBG Proposed ground floor garage conversion, floor plan redesign and all associated works. Cllr Mary Norton consulted:</p>	Queens & Sheldon

	- No objection.	
<u>21/01015/VAR</u>	11 Thomas Mead SN15 3YS Variation of Condition 4 of 19/09088/FUL (Resubmission of lapsed planning permission N/09/00845/FUL with amendments for a proposed first floor extension over the attached garage) to alter requirement for obscured glazing. No Ward Councillors present: - No objection.	Hardens & England
<u>21/01096/FUL</u>	Ivy Park House Rowden Hill SN15 2AF Addition of single-storey two car garage; small side extension; replacement of existing conservatory; modification of window and door openings to suit new layout. Cllrs Jenny Budgell & John Scragg consulted: - No objection.	Lowden & Rowden
<u>21/01110/REM</u>	Land at North Chippenham Hill Corner Road West of A350 SN15 1UG Reserved matters application for the development of the Local Centre comprising of 15 Apartments (C3), 230sqm (gross) of retail space (A1) Landscaping and Associated Infrastructure Works. Cllr Jenny Budgell consulted: - Object The Design & Access Statement submitted for the outline consent (N/12/00560/OUT) cited the local centre as comprising "mixed use local centre with A1/D1/D2" uses. It went on to explain "There is also potential for residential on the upper floors above these other uses". The Officer Report also cited this as being "0.12ha to accommodate a local centre - potentially comprising a retail unit, doctor/dental surgery and/or community facility." The approved parameters plan showed two buildings to be accommodated on this local centre site. What is sadly (but predictably) now being proposed would, by no stretch of the imagination be, "a vibrant community centre", as quoted by the Applicant in this submission. The proposal cannot be taken as any serious interpretation of a local centre in accordance with the provisions of the above paragraph i.e. one shop is supposed to serve 750 houses and result in a sustainable development where people do not have to travel by car to access basic facilities such as shops and services. This is essentially a housing-led development, with the addition of a corner shop.	Hardenhuish

	<p>The residential apartments on the ground floor need to be omitted and all of the ground floor given over to Use Classes E and F, and for there to be two or three local centre units. This would also free up parking space on the frontage for patrons/customers only. Residential parking should not be located on the frontage, rather at the rear of the building. The proposed building, being set so far back from the Spine Road and adjacent block of flats, would have poor legibility in the streetscene and dilute what should be a 'landmark'. It would be hidden behind the adjacent block when approaching the site by car from the west.</p> <p>Within the frontage parking area there is no demarcation of a pedestrian route (i.e. raised surface or change of materials) direct from the Spine Road to the retail unit entrance doors. This would likely result in conflict between vehicles and pedestrians.</p> <p>There is no cycle parking for those visiting the retail store - this should be provided in line with the provision recommended in Table 11-1 of LTN 1/20.</p> <p>The site would benefit from a crossing on the spine road to benefit school children who need to access the new school.</p> <p>The proposal also provides a poor standard of amenity for future residential occupiers. The apartments appear not to benefit from any communal amenity space and none have balconies. The COVID-19 pandemic has demonstrated the importance of having access to outdoor amenity space. Access to the apartments via the rear, and with no natural surveillance from the public realm, would be poor. There should be a public facing front entrance.</p> <p>The proposal would not provide an adequate local centre to serve 750 households, and would be contrary to the provisions of the outline consent, CP3 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the NPPF. In addition, the proposal would provide poor living conditions for future occupiers, contrary to CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the National Design Guide and the NPPF.</p>	
<u>21/01153/FUL</u>	Land at Dyers Close SN15 3LG Demolition of existing garages; erection of detached	Hardens & England

	<p>bungalow with associated garage/parking and landscaped curtilage area; and public turning space. No Ward Councillors present:</p> <p>- Object Given the Applicant's confirmation that the garages are not used by local residents for parking, the principle of a dwelling here is acceptable and has been well designed given the site constraints. However, the Town Council concurs with Highway comments and would wish for the Applicant to a) demonstrate an appropriate turning head at the end of the cul-de-sac, b) an amendment to the parking space in front of the garage to allow a minimum of 5.5m in order to open the garage door, and c) ensure the access remains to the driveway of no. 13 (which is not shown on any existing plans). At present the proposal would be contrary to CP61 and CP62 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the NPPF.</p>	
<p><u>21/01268/TCA</u></p>	<p>The Hawthorns, Flat 1 Hawthorn Road SN15 1FH 10% Crown Reduction to Juniper (T1), Fell 1 Rowan (T2), 20% Lower Crown Reduction to Blue Cedar (T3). Cllr Nick Murry consulted:</p> <p>- Object Note: T1 is a Holm oak (<i>Quercus ilex</i>), T2 is a cultivar of broad leaved lime (<i>Tilia platyphyllos</i> 'rubra' / 'streetwise') and T3 is an Atlas cedar (<i>Cedrus atlantica</i>).</p> <p>The main reason for objection to this application is the proposed felling of T2, which the Town Council believe is unjustified given the condition of the tree. The decay pocket referred to in the application is not extensive and the edges are occluding. There is sufficient sound wood in the outer wall of the trunk for the tree to be within acceptable tolerances. The decay pocket is also localised around an old branch stub, rather than the central stem, and the likelihood of failure of the stem is not considered high. The crown is healthy and provides moderate amenity to the area.</p> <p>The Town Council does not object to the proposed 20% reduction of the lower limbs of T3, which equate to approximately 1m reduction in branch length.</p> <p>The applicant might reconsider the proposed 10% crown reduction of T1, which only equates to reductions of between 0.2m (north crown) and 0.65m (east crown), an operation that would require the</p>	<p>Monkton</p>

	pruning of numerous small branches which may prove impractical using good Arboricultural practice. T1 has an asymmetric crown and a crown reshape, given in metre reductions, may be more appropriate.	
<u>21/01313/FUL</u>	13 Dover Street SN14 0EE Ground floor rear extension. Cllr John Scragg consulted: - No objection.	Lowden & Rowden
<u>21/01400/FUL</u>	8 Hayward Close SN15 3FA Extension and alterations to existing dwelling. Cllr Richard Bambury consulted: - No objection.	Pewsham
<u>21/01403/FUL</u>	75 London Road SN15 3AL Part demolition of existing single storey rear extension and construction of two storey rear extension. No Ward Councillors present: - No objection.	Hardens & England
<u>21/01453/TCA</u>	Lowden Manor House Lowden Hill SN15 2BX Repollard 6 Poplars to Previous Pruning Points (G1), Fell 1 Lawsons Cypress (T2). Cllr Nick Murry consulted: - No objection. Routine maintenance proposed for G1. T2 is leaning ~15° over the access road and the Town Council would not consider this tree eligible for a TPO.	Monkton
<u>21/01463/FUL</u>	Phase 5 Land at Hunters Moon Full Planning Application for residential development, associated parking, public open space, landscaping, access, drainage works and associated infrastructure. Cllr Chris Ruck consulted: - No objection. The proposed development appears in general conformity with the masterplan for the site, and an additional windfall of 95 houses would reduce pressure for the future release of greenfield land on the town's fringes under the Local Plan Review. However, the standard of generic, volume-housebuilder schemes such as this continues to be poor when it comes to addressing climate and ecological emergencies, and the transition to a low carbon future. As such the Town Council requests that the following further details and/or amended plans are submitted to improve the design, sustainability and quality of the development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buildings/structures should be wildlife friendly and include hedgehog tunnels in fences, tree planting in 	CP & Derriads

	<p>rear gardens, bird/bat boxes, and swift bricks at a ratio of 1 brick per dwelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric vehicle charging infrastructure should be incorporated for each dwelling (where EV wall sockets are not provided sufficient cabling/power should be provided within garages to allow EV charging) • All new housing development in Chippenham should demonstrate it is of a sustainable construction (equivalent to the former Level 4 Code for Sustainable Homes) and incorporate low carbon energy features (such features may include passive ventilation, building orientation to take advantage of natural light and heat, high performance insulation, green/brown roofs, water recycling, solar panels, energy efficient/renewable energy heating systems). Further details should be submitted up front with this application. • There are some areas of the scheme which have an excessive expanse of car parking to frontages - this needs to be broken up further with soft landscaping. • Where houses do not have garages, sheds need to be provided for secure cycle storage. • A long term management plan needs to be submitted for the area of woodland by the railway line, to ensure it is beneficially managed for biodiversity and possible public access. 	
<u>21/01465/REM</u>	<p>Phase 4A Land at Hunters Moon Reserved Matters for 4 homes forming Phase 4A of Hunters Moon. Consent is sought for all outstanding matters relating to this area, comprising Layout, Scale, Appearance, Materials and Landscaping. Cllr Chris Ruck consulted: - No objection.</p>	CP & Derriads
<u>21/01539/TPO</u>	<p>10 Saxby Road SN15 1UB 30% Crown Reduction to 1 Oak Tree and 1 Yew Tree (T48 & T49 on TPO). Cllr Nick Murry consulted: - Object The Town Council does not object to the pruning of the oak tree in principle, as the tree has previously been reduced and there is deadwood in the peripheral crown over the road. However, the Town Council would request that the specification is clarified, preferably in metre reductions, as 30% would appear quite harsh and</p>	Monkton

	<p>beyond the previous pruning points. The oak is mature and prominent in the landscape, and premature excessive pruning may result in further decay of the tree. The council would support a reduction of approximately 20% i.e. back to previous pruning points (approximately 2m height reduction/ 1.5m radial branch spread reduction).</p> <p>The Town council does not object to the proposed pruning of the yew tree.</p>	
<u>21/01559/ADV</u>	<p>Tesco Metro 1, Emery Gate SN15 3JP Proposal to install to 3x Fascia signs & 1 x projecting sign. No Ward Councillors present: - No objection.</p>	Hardens & England
<u>21/01622/FUL</u>	<p>Bath Road Service Station Bath Road SN15 2AR Proposed Demolition of existing shop building and roll over car wash to be replaced with new shop building a 1No. Jet wash bay and screening. Relocated Tanker below ground Fill position and New forecourt drainage containment. Cllrs Jenny Budgell & John Scragg consulted: - Object The principle of refurbishment of the petrol station and larger kiosk is supported. However, there are concerns with regard to the impact the proposal could have on the amenity of those adjoining residential occupiers which share a boundary with the site - in terms of a) noise from the jet wash - a noise impact assessment should be submitted to demonstrate whether this might be an issue or not, and b) potential loss of outlook and light to rear windows and rear gardens from the enlarged kiosk, which would be sited much closer to residential properties.</p> <p>In addition, 10 customer car parking spaces would appear excessive for the site, and it is not clear whether the enlarged customer car parking area would result in the removal of existing boundary trees and shrubs on the site which should be retained.</p> <p>Finally, we concur with the comments of the Chippenham Cycle Network Development Group (please review their detailed comments) that there needs to be: a) secure cycle parking provided close to the retail kiosk entrance; b) shared use signage to indicate the presence of a cycleway (to signpost the cycle route that runs north-south through the eastern end of the</p>	Lowden & Rowden

	<p>site), and c) a strip of land set aside on the site frontage which would allow for the future development of a 3m-wide shared use path across the front of the site along Bath Road, from the puffin crossing in the east, to Brunel Court in the west. This would appear to have minimal impact on the internal site design, but would be genuinely transformational to the town's cycle network, with all the health, climate and mobility benefits this brings.</p> <p>If further details could be provided/the scheme amended as requested above, the Town Council would be happy to withdraw its objection.</p>	
<p><u>21/01636/OUT</u></p>	<p>Land off the B4069 East of Barrow Farm Langley Burrell, Chippenham</p> <p>Residential development (up to 250 dwellings), a local centre (comprising commercial business and service uses (Use Class E), drinking establishment and hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) with a GIA limit of 675 sq m of which no more than 200 sq m (GIA) shall be used for retail (Class E(a)) drinking establishment and hot food takeaway (Sui Generis)), associated works and infrastructure, ancillary facilities, open space, landscaping with vehicular access from the B4069</p> <p>- Object</p> <p>In view of Wiltshire Council's lack of 5 year housing land supply the timing of this proposal, on a site where housing development has recently been refused by the Planning Inspectorate, is opportunistic and circumnavigates the democratic, plan-led system. The Town Council is therefore strongly opposed to any development of this site in principle, and considers that the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal, under the application of the 'tilted balance', for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The site is not allocated for future housing development in the Local Plan, nor within the current Local Plan Review. The rigorous assessment of suitable sites undertaken in order to allocate housing land in the Chippenham Site Allocations DPD found this site to be unsuitable for allocation. 2) There is not a significant shortfall in housing supply in Wiltshire (only 4.56 years shortfall). Wiltshire Council's Councillors Briefing Note No. 20- 	<p>(Langley Burrell)</p>

37 confirms "it is not considered to be a significant shortfall in supply" and "The extent of the shortfall will be a material consideration when determining planning applications, and this can be weighed into the balancing exercise undertaken when officers and/or committee determine planning applications." It goes on to explain: "Cases where adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits can, and should, still be refused...". It goes on to explain: "The views of the local community, particularly those of town and parish councils will be important in considering potential benefits and impacts of proposals when planning applications are determined."

- 3) Wiltshire Council is meeting 149% of the Housing Delivery Test, indicating that delivery is not currently an issue.
Housing allocations in the Chippenham Site Allocations DPD are all now approved, Rowden Park is being built out, and there is no reason to believe that there will be a shortfall in housing supply over the Plan period. Hence, there is no demand for, or benefits of approving additional housing above and beyond existing allocations in the Chippenham area for this Plan period.
- 4) Significant harm to the character and visual qualities of the area
The Council notes the Planning Inspectorate's dismissal of the appeal of Planning Application 14/10433/OUT for residential development on this site in 2016. It concurs with the substantive grounds for dismissal, in that the development would have caused significant harm to the character and visual qualities of the area, and conflicted with Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy CP51. This still remains the case with the current proposal.
- 5) Significant harm to heritage assets and their setting
The EIA submitted with the application confirms there would be significant harm to the setting of the Grade II Listed Barrow Farmhouse and Barrow Cottage. The Council's also notes the Inspector's comments in the dismissal of Planning Application 14/10433/OUT on substantive grounds that it would

	<p>have caused less than substantial harm to heritage assets and conflicted with Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy CP58. This still remains the case with the current proposal. The proposal would also be contrary to Policy HP4 of the Langley Burrell Neighbourhood Plan in that it would not preserve the setting of hamlets/isolated listed buildings at Barrow Farm. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to Policy HP3 of the Neighbourhood Plan as the site forms part of the historic Langley Common, a non-designated heritage asset that contributes to the character of Langley Burrell.</p> <p>6) Erosion of the character and community of Langley Burrell, as a rural village separated from urban Chippenham The Council notes the Inspector’s comments in the dismissal of Planning Application 14/10433/OUT on substantive grounds that it would have resulted in the erosion of the separation between Chippenham and Langley Burrell and harm to the local environment, with the latter “losing a significant part of its identity as a rural settlement, and that this would be harmful to the character of the village and the interests of the community”. This still remains the case with the current proposal. In addition, the proposal would be contrary to Policy LP1 of the Langley Burrell Neighbourhood Plan in that the proposal would: not retain, and would diminish, the physical separation between Langley Burrell and Chippenham; would not retain, and would detract from, the dominance of the natural features that provide the setting for buildings and hamlets, such as the woodlands of Bird’s Marsh; it would not retain the tranquility of the rural landscape in particular where public footpaths allow access for recreation; and it would diminish the significant views across open countryside to Birds Marsh Wood from the B4609.</p> <p>7) Poor permeability between the site and its surroundings There are no road linkages proposed into the adjacent North Chippenham development and therefore poor permeability between the site and its surroundings. Instead the development would rely on a single vehicular access on to the already busy B4069. The development would represent a</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>remote and isolated housing estate in the countryside, largely reliant on the car to access facilities in Chippenham.</p> <p>The proposed shared use paths within the development should be replaced with segregated cycleways, in line with LTN 1/20. Since this is a greenfield development, there are no constraints that would require falling back to shared use.</p> <p>The proposed residential cycle parking (one space per dwelling, proposed in the Travel Plan par 5.6) is insufficient: it should be one space per bedroom, as set out in LTN 1/20 table 11-1.</p> <p>The proposed local centre must have covered cycle parking, and easy access for cyclists to reach it from the adjacent cycleway (unclear from the masterplan whether this is the case).</p> <p>Connections from the site to the wider town cycle network must be provided, in a way that enables meaningful onward journeys that will enable even less-confident cyclists to cycle. The current plans have two major obstacles: dangerous main road crossings, plus a lack of off-road/quietway cycle provision between the development site and remainder of the town cycle network. We recommend that the Applicant liaises with Chippenham Cycle Network Development Group who would be happy to suggest detailed solutions to these problems, but which would reasonably require off-site contributions to be made.</p> <p>8) Lack of a community hub, or local centre, located at the heart of the development.</p> <p>The location of the “local centre”, at the edge of the development, would be unlikely to meet the shopping, leisure and community needs of the whole estate. It should be located at the centre of the development, as a focal point for the community, and within easy walking distance for all residents. This represents poor design and unsustainable development and would result in another soulless housing estate, and a missed opportunity to provide an identity or focal point for the development.</p> <p>9) No education facilities are proposed on the site, or S106 education contributions, putting pressure on already stretched educational facilities in Chippenham.</p>	
--	---	--

	10) There is no indication that housing design would incorporate sustainable construction/energy efficient measures to meet the pathway to carbon neutral housing, nor are electric vehicle charging points for each house provided.	
<u>21/01657/FUL</u>	21 Ridings Mead SN15 1PO Single storey rear extension, loft conversion & internal reconfiguration. Cllr Jenny Budgell consulted: - No objection.	Hardenhuish
<u>21/01667/FUL</u>	77 Marshfield Road SN15 1JR Two storey rear extension & roof terrace with self contained annex beneath (multigenerational living purpose). Cllrs Jenny Budgell & John Scragg consulted: - No objection.	Lowden & Rowden
<u>21/01702/TPO</u>	125 Queens Crescent SN14 0NW Reduce Lime Tree Back to Previous Pruning Points and Removal of New Growth from Lower Crown. Cllr Mary Norton consulted: - No objection. The Town Council does not object to the updated work specifications (i.e. 30% reduction and minor crown lift) as per additional information from agent, submitted with the application.	Queens & Sheldon
<u>21/01734/FUL</u>	6 Farleigh Close SN14 OPT Alterations and first floor extension to existing dwelling. Cllr Mary Norton consulted: - No objection.	Queens & Sheldon
<u>21/01753/TCA</u>	15 St Mary Street SN15 3JN 3 Metre Lateral Reduction and 3 Metre Vertical Reduction to 1 Yew (T1), 4 Metre Vertical Reduction to 2 Irish Yew (T2 & T3), Fell 1 Crab Apple (T4). No Ward Councillors present: - No objection. The Town Council does not object to the proposed tree work, however it is recommended that the agent clarifies with the case officer the crown reduction specifications; it is assumed that the 3 metre lateral reduction refers to a 3m reduction in crown diameter rather than radius, however if this is not the case then the proposed works would be considered excessive (A proposed 3m reduction to crown radius would seem unlikely given that a 3 metre vertical reduction is proposed and the existing crown radius is around 4-5m).	Hardens & England

Amended Plans		
<u>20/05495/FUL</u>	<p>Land at Ambulance Headquarters Malmesbury Road SN15 5LN New residential development following the demolition of existing buildings. To include: Public Open Space; Landscaping; Sustainable Urban Drainage and other Associated Infrastructure Works. Cllr Jenny Budgell consulted: - Object Whilst we do appreciate the amendments that have been made to improve the urban design and landscape aspects of the scheme (and would have no objections in this regard if Wiltshire Council Urban Design and Landscape Officers did not have any), one of the fundamental sticking points that remains (and that we believe is still wholly achievable) is the lack of a pedestrian/cycle link into the North Chippenham site. We would be grateful if the Applicant could provide evidence of the reasons given by the North Chippenham Consortium for not agreeing to this link or discussions it has had with this group (given the Applicant belongs to the North Chippenham Consortium). The second reason suggested for not agreeing to this link (on technical grounds because it would cross a small watercourse) does not appear to be beyond the technical capabilities of the UK's largest housebuilder.</p> <p>In addition, our previous concerns have not yet been addressed relating to sustainable building construction, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, wildlife friendly building design, trees in rear gardens, integrated bin storage, and details of cycle storage - therefore our objection unfortunately remains.</p>	Hardenhuish (& Langley Burrell)
<u>20/09370/FUL</u> & <u>20/10490/LBC</u>	<p>32 Frogwell SN14 0DQ Single storey extension to main house. Convert existing garage building to self-contained annexe. Cllr Chris Ruck consulted: - No further comments.</p>	CP & Derriads

Public Comments and Questions

- 1) At the invitation of the Chairman a resident addressed the Committee regarding planning application 21/01153/FUL (Land at Dyers Close) and requested they be permitted to share a plan on screen, which was agreed. They pointed out that the description referred to a bungalow but that the property had an upstairs. They also pointed out that the driveway of no. 13 had not been shown on the plans. They referred to the narrowness of the road and the lack of parking. Their partner is a blue badge holder and there would be nowhere for them to park, or indeed other visitors such as carers, should this proceed. They hoped the Committee would object to this application.
- 2) At the invitation of the Chairman a resident asked for confirmation that planning applications 21/00030/FUL and 21/000502/FUL were indeed within the ward of Hardenhuish.

The Chairman confirmed that a response would be provided to question 2 and this is also attached at **APPENDIX B** (not part of the meeting).

Not part of the meeting

Appendix B

Response to public question 2 raised at the PET Committee meeting held on 11 March 2021:

Wiltshire Council states on its website that planning applications [21/00030/FUL](#) and [21/000502/FUL](#) both fall within Hardenhuish ward and these applications can be viewed by clicking on the respective links.