



Minutes of a meeting of the Planning, Environment & Transport Committee held virtually on Zoom on Thursday 22 April 2021 at 7pm

Councillors present:

Richard Bambury (Chairman) Jenny Budgetell
Bill Douglas Nick Murry
John Scragg (Vice-Chairman)

Officers present: Matt Kirby, Director of Community Services
Andy Conroy, Planning Officer
Heather Rae, Democratic Services Manager
Michael Weeks, Democratic and Civic Officer
Jake Bailey, Aboricultural Officer

Public present: 2 members of the public were present

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There was 1 verbal question question from a member of the public which is appended to these minutes at **APPENDIX A**. The responses to this question were not part of the meeting but are appended to these minutes at **APPENDIX B**.

140. APOLOGIES

There were apologies for absence from Councillors Raj Gill, Michael Merry, Mary Norton, Andy Phillips, Nina Phillips and Chris Ruck.

141. NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTION

No notification of substitution was received.

142. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

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

143. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 April 2021 were proposed by Councillor John Scragg and seconded by Councillor Jenny Budgetell. 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.

144. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

- (i) As the last committee of the municipal year, all Councillors and Officers involved with the Planning, Environment and Transport Committee were thanked for their contribution and involvement over the past year.
- (ii) The IT system used by Wiltshire Council for its planning applications has recently changed and it is hoped that post the elections, training will be arranged for the new PET committee Councillors on how to view the system efficiently.

145. 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'.

146. STREET NAMING BLOOR HOMES DEVELOPMENT, PHASE 4, LAND AT HUNTERS MOON, EASTON LANE

Councillor Bill Douglas highlighted that on previous street naming requests the ward councillor has had first opportunity to put forward names, and in the absence of the ward councillor this agenda item should be moved to the next meeting if there was no pressing deadline.

RESOLVED that

This item be relooked at on the agenda when the ward councillor will be present.

147. CHIPPENHAM COMMUNITY AREA TRANSPORT GROUP (CATG): HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT/METRO COUNT REQUESTS

RESOLVED that the following comments be forwarded to Wiltshire Council for consideration by the Community Area Transport Group:

- CTC Ref 025 - Narrow chicane on footpath, Queens Crescent
 - The Town Council supports this request in principle. However, this 'in principal' acceptance is made subject to a formal recommendation being made by Wiltshire Council and a fully costed report being submitted and is

subject to further debate and decision at a future PET Committee meeting.

- CTC Ref 026- Parking Issues, Brunel Court
 - The Town Council requests that Wiltshire Council investigate who owns the land, and following this is subject to a further debate and decision at a future PET committee meeting.
- CTC Ref 027 - Road Safety Issues, Stanley Lane
 - The Town Council requests a further assessment, that not only centres on Abbeyfield School but the area as a whole, to include the entrance to Stanley park to assess on safety measures can be put into place.
- CTC Ref 028 - Speeding on A4, between bridge centre roundabout and Rowden Arms
 - The Town Council objects to this request, and that this concern regarding speeding should be assessed by Wiltshire Police.

148. URGENT ACTION BETWEEN MEETINGS

Councillors noted the following Urgent Action Form containing a PET decision that was made under delegated authority by the Chief Executive in accordance with Standing Order 11.4 (copy in minute book):

- i) Support of a Temporary Pavement Licence Application for the Prince of Wales Micropub, 8 Station Hill, SN15 1FG

149. PROPOSED TEMPORARY STREET CLOSURES/TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The following were noted:

- i) Temporary closure of the A4 (part) from its junction with the B4528 for a distance of approx. 84m in an easterly direction on 6 May 2021 between the hours of 19:00 and 00:00 for one night to enable Wiltshire Council to carry out carriageway reactive patching and associated maintenance works.
- ii) Temporary closure of the B4069 (part) Sutton Benger from Frampton Farm for approx. 150m in an easterly direction from 10 - 24 May 2021 to enable Wessex Water to carry out installation of a new sewer main and associated apparatus.

150. ITEMS FOR COMMUNICATION

There were no items for communication.

151. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will take place on Thursday 3 June 2021.

The meeting concluded at 8.16pm

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:

DRAFT

PLANNING APPLICATIONS - 22 April 2021

Application No.	Address/Description	Ward
21/02156/FUL	Sycamore House, 16 Hardenhuish Lane SN14 6HN Erection of a detached garage No Ward Councillors present: - No objection subject to the garage being tied to the host dwelling.	CP & Redlands
21/02270/FUL	37 Lowden SN15 2BJ Porch Extension, Vehicle Parking Area & Dropped Kerb Cllr John Scragg consulted: - Objection The row of houses, of which the dwelling in question is the end property, are set at a lower ground level than the highway, with front gardens and low boundary treatment between. The proposed replacement of front garden and boundary railings/wall with raised concrete hardstanding for parking would appear as a dominant feature in the streetscene along this section of Lowden and would have a detrimental impact on visual amenity. It may also set a precedent for approval of other such raised parking areas along this row, which would erode the character of the area and streetscene. The proposal would be contrary to CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the National Design Guide and the NPPF. The Town Council would defer to WC Highways to determine whether the proposal would have any impact on highway or pedestrian safety due to reversing in/out of the proposed spaces, in the vicinity of parked cars along Lowden.	Lowden & Rowden
21/02298/FUL	Sheldon School, Hardenhuish Lane SN14 6HJ Removal of two (2no.) brick dugouts and 1.2m fencing and installation of a new modular spectator stand with replacement 1.2m spectator fencing Cllr Jenny Budgell consulted: - No objection	Hardenhuish
21/02312/FUL	2 York Close SN14 0QB Front ground floor extension to increase living room and create porch with first floor front extension to increase existing bedroom forming en-suite space. Rear single storey extension No Ward Councillor present: - Objection There is no objection to the proposed extensions to the property. However, the proposed siting of a timber shed within the front garden would appear as a	Queens & Sheldon

	dominant and incongruous feature in the streetscene by virtue of its siting forward of the building line, its scale and materials. It would be harmful to the visual amenity of the surrounding area, and its character, and contrary to CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, the National Design Guide and the NPPF. If this element of the application were to be removed the scheme could be supported.	
21/02321/ADV	Aldi Stores Limited, Methuen Park SN14 0UL Two internally illuminated wall hanging signs mounted to the face of the building (sign A); One non-illuminated building entrance sign (sign B); One non-illuminated opening times panel and image sign (sign C); One internally illuminated freestanding 6m high double faced double pole boundary sign (sign D); One internally illuminated freestanding 6m high double faced triple post mounted sign (sign E) No Ward Councillor present: - No Objection The Town Council would prefer to see the height of the totem signs reduced slightly to 5m-5.5m to make them appear less dominant features and of a more human scale (the totem sign at Aldi Hathaway Retail Park is 5m in height).	CP & Derriads
21/02423/FUL	53 Kings Avenue SN14 0UJ Proposed two storey extension No Ward Councillor present: -No Objection	CP & Derriads
21/02548/ADV	Tesco Express, 5 Hathaway Retail Park, Foundry Lane SN15 1JB Proposal to install to 8 x fascia signs, 2 x projecting signs, 11 x graphics Cllr Nick Murry consulted: -No Objection	Monkton
PL/2021/03014	14 The Butts SN15 3JT Reduce 1 Cherry Tree to Provide a 2 Metre Clearance from Utility Cables, Reduce to Provide a Clearance of 2 Metres Above Footpath and Remove Branches Overhanging Road; Reduce 2 Cherry Trees by 2 Metre to Provide Clearance from Utility Cables Cllr Bill Douglas consulted: -No objection. The proposed works are sympathetic in nature and the Town Council does not object to these works being carried out to avoid conflict with overhead infrastructure and to maintain an appropriate crown clearance above the adjacent pedestrian walkway.	Hardens & England
PL/2021/03280	16 St Margarets Gardens SN15 2BU Fell 1 Beech Tree	Lowden & Rowden

	<p>Cllr John Scragg consulted: -No Objection</p> <p>A previous application (20/10197/TPO) was submitted to undertake a 15% crown reduction to this tree (amongst other proposed works on trees on the same property), to which the Town Council raised no objection subject to conditions and Wiltshire Council approved with conditions.</p> <p>This subsequent application has submitted photographic evidence of the extent of the wounding on T1 (T2 in the previous application) and the presence of a fungal fruiting body. No site inspection was undertaken by the Town Council but it is likely the fungal body is of <i>Pleurotus ostreatus</i> (Oyster fungus), capable of causing white rot of the heartwood on extensive wound sites. The presence of this fungus suggests that the condition of this tree will continue decline and will eventually fail; due to the limited crown size, crown reduction options are limited on this tree and given its proximity to a habitable dwelling and busy road the Town Council does not object to its removal.</p> <p>The Town Council would express a preference for the retention of a 'monolith' (removing the crown and leaving a standing stem in place as a balanced structure) of an appropriate height for ecological value, and a replacement tree of a similar native species.</p>	
PL/2021/03379	<p>11 Marshfield Road SN15 1JX Fell 1 Holly (T1) and Removal of 1 Stem from Multi-stemmed Holly (T2)</p> <p>Cllr Jenny Budgell consulted: -No Objection</p> <p>Whilst T1 likely does not have sufficient amenity value to justify a TPO, it nevertheless has value in the immediate area. No context for removal was provided in the application (the Town Council acknowledges this is not required for a Notification of Proposed Tree Works Within a Conservation Area), however the Town Council would express a preference for T1 to be crown reduced rather than removed if possible.</p> <p>The Town Council does not object to the proposed works for T2.</p>	Hardenhuish
PL/2021/03390	<p>87 Marshfield Road SN15 1JR Fell 1 Eucalyptus Tree</p> <p>Cllr John Scragg consulted:</p>	Lowden & Rowden

	<p>-Objection The Town Council acknowledges that this tree has a large canopy and due to the south facing aspect of the house, the tree may cast significant shade on the house during much of the day. However, whilst this tree likely does not qualify for TPO status, it is of a significant size which can be seen in the surrounding area from selective viewpoints. Shading will also likely become more of an asset as global temperatures increase due to climate change and the need for urban cooling increases.</p> <p>The Town Council would express a preference for the tree to be crown reduced or even pollarded rather than felled, which would both remove deadwood and reduce shading.</p>	
PL/2021/03391	<p>88 Marshfield ROAD SN15 1JR Fell 1 Ash Tree Cllr John Scragg consulted: -Objection The Town Council was unable to inspect this tree due to access being required, however if the tree does not pose any significant hazards that would require it to be felled, it would be preferable for the tree to be crown reduced or even pollarded. This would both remove deadwood and reduce shading, and retain many of the benefits associated with trees in urban areas.</p>	Lowden & Rowden
PL/2021/03540	<p>116 Queens Crescent SN14 0NR Fell 1 Beech Tree No Ward Councillor present: -No Objection The Town Council refers to the comprehensive Arboricultural report submitted with this application which identify a significant hazard. Whilst the report recommends management options to reduce (but not remove) the risk and retain the tree as well as recommending removal, the tree owner has requested permission to remove the tree and the Town Council recognises that the amenity value of the tree may be disproportionate to the cost of retention/ potential for damage or harm, given that removal of the tree is inevitable as it will eventually surpass acceptable safety thresholds.</p> <p>As the fault is at 6m, the Town Council would express a preference for leaving a monolith of up to 6m (subject to safety considerations) for ecological value.</p>	Queens & Sheldon

PL/2021/03614	<p>1 Station Square, Cocklebury Road SN15 3NT Fell 6 Leylandii Cllr Nick Murry consulted: -No Objection The Town Council understands that this proposal relates to the agreed re-development of the site. Retention of these trees would be unpractical given their proximity to the existing building and disproportionate to the value/ condition/ longevity of the trees. 1:1 replacement with natives would be preferable.</p>	Monkton
PL/2021/03685	<p>1A Burlands Road SN15 3DF Demolition of garaging and replacement with one two storey one bedroom dwelling Cllr Bill Douglas consulted: -No Objection The proposed re-design would improve upon the design of the consented scheme. However, the integral garage would take up the majority of the ground floor. It would be preferable to remove this element entirely and free up some additional internal habitable space at ground floor. Given a 1-bed dwelling is proposed, together with the site's sustainable location on the edge of the town centre, on-plot parking is not deemed necessary.</p>	Hardens & England
Amended Plan		
20/06500/FUL	<p>17 Station Hill SN15 1EQ Conversion and extension of existing building for the creation of 13 flats and removal of existing Sui Generis use Cllr Nick Murry consulted: -No Objection The scheme has been re-designed for a third time to try to address concerns raised by the Town Council and Wiltshire Council Officers. The new-build rear section now substitutes a flat roof for a pitched roof. The scale, massing and materials of this rear section is improved, and it should not appear visible from the street, or cause harm to the significance of Chippenham Conservation Area.</p> <p>Whilst the Design and Access Statement refers to a Daylight Assessment, this Assessment is not publically available to view. Notwithstanding, it is understood that there have been minor modifications to the layout to improve daylight to habitable rooms (there were concerns with regard to first and second floor windows in the side elevation in particular). Therefore if the</p>	Monkton

	<p>Case Officer is satisfied that there would be adequate outlook and daylight from all habitable rooms for future occupiers the Town Council would not object on this basis.</p> <p>Given the above, and the fact that 100% on-site affordable housing would be provided, on balance, the Town Council would not object to the proposal providing that the following elements are dealt with by way of condition prior to commencement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elevation/floor plans which clarify the section of the existing building to be demolished/section to be retained. These MUST be provided prior to commencement of works on site to avoid any misinterpretation about which section of the non-designated heritage asset is to be retained • Noise Impact Assessment (if this cannot be provided up front) to ensure future occupiers are not adversely affected by railway noise/vibration. • Joinery details for windows on front elevation (these should be timber framed), and details of the front entrance door (the front door as shown does not fit in with the historic facade) 	
20/09381/FUL	<p>11 Downham Mead SN15 3LN Two storey side & rear extension Cllr Nick Murry consulted: -No Objection</p>	Monkton

At the invitation of the Chairman, a resident made the following comments.

Good evening councillors - I'm the resident that put forward the first of the highways improvement schemes you'll be considering this evening - the removal of the chicane on the footpath linking Avebury Road and Queens Crescent.

Just before I explain the reasons for putting this forward, I wanted to make clear this isn't a cycle scheme. I appreciate that when I'm speaking to you, individually and collectively, it's often about cycle network improvements, but not this one!

I've put this forward for improvement because the chicane excludes certain users from this path, including some of the most vulnerable in our community, due to the extremely narrow gap between the barriers - it's one of, if not the narrowest I've come across in the town.

Any barrier put in today needs to undergo an assessment under the Equality Act 2010, to ensure no one is excluded. This chicane has been there for longer than the Equality Act, so won't have been assessed in this way, but I'm certain it would fail an Equality Act assessment, and therefore be illegal if it was proposed for installation today.

I've shared some pictures showing me trying to get my son's single buggy through the chicane (p11 of your agenda pack) - it's just about possible if you physically lift it up part-way through and move it sideways. For someone in a wheelchair, this is unlikely to be possible, ditto for those using mobility scooters, or parents with double buggies.

It's thereby excluding a not insignificant number of people. The shortest paved alternative route is a detour of almost half a mile - also shown in your agenda pack.

For those who may raise the issue of mopeds, which may be why this was installed, I refer to the many other footpaths around the town that don't have chicanes preventing mopeds from using them, but where I've certainly never seen a moped illegally riding on the path. Moped use is often more a fear than something that actually happens. Moreover, modern guidance from the DfT is that where moped use is a problem, enforcement should be the way to address it, not barriers, for the very reason that they exclude people.

I trust you'll agree that we need to be doing all we can to ensure our public paths are accessible to all, and will therefore support the replacement of this chicane with something that doesn't exclude any legitimate path user.

Written responses to public questions asked at PET on 22 April 2021:

Thank you for your comments and question at the meeting of the Planning, Environment and Transport Committee on 22 April 2021. The Committee resolved to support in principle the highway improvement request (CTC Ref 025) regarding the narrow chicane between Avebury Road and Queens Crescent, and their comments will be forwarded to Wiltshire Council for consideration at the next CATG meeting. Wiltshire Council Engineers will carry out further investigation and options/costs on this proposal to be considered at the CATG meeting and this will inform a final decision at a future PET Committee meeting.

DRAFT