

**Minutes of the Council (Planning) Meeting held remotely on
Wednesday 15 July 2020**

Present Councillor S Abbott (Chairman)
Councillors P Anstey, L Bray, A Brown, A Crockford, R Hopkinson,
N Farmer, S Moysey, G Sanders, M Wakeman and A White

In Attendance Mrs K Gilby (Planning and Events Officer)
D Martin (Chief Executive)
Councillor P Whalley (Wiltshire Councillor)

PL 01/20 Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors C Fuller and R Le Var.

PL 02/20 Public Question Time and Petitions

Councillor P Whalley spoke in relation to the Reserved Matters application 20/04367/REM - Peacock Grove – Erection of 29 dwellings following the demolition of six existing dwellings and associated works pursuant to outline planning permission 15/11544/OUT. He outlined the history of the site and asked that the Town Council recommend refusal of the application on the grounds that the submitted documents contain many errors and inconsistencies and in places insufficient information to fully assess the proposals impact, that the drainage strategy is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework and that the drainage outlet is proposed to be sited on land not controlled by the applicant. He informed the Town Council that he had called-in the application.

One member of the public spoke in relation to the Reserved Matters application 20/04367/REM - Peacock Grove – Erection of 29 dwellings following the demolition of six existing dwellings and associated works pursuant to outline planning permission 15/11544/OUT. She detailed many inaccuracies contained within the application including:

1. The ground stability assessment states that no work should take place within 3m of the southern slope, however, the drainage strategy includes swales in this location without clarification that this will not destabilise the slope running down to the Brook.
2. The acoustic assessment refers to the wrong application number and includes the wrong housing layout. It also out of date and does not reflect the increase in noise experience since the vegetation was stripped from the railway embankments.

3. The Design Compliance document still references indicative information and draws its architectural references from the town centre.

4. In addition to the Councils Tree Officers comments, the Arboricultural Impact Assessment states that there will be no shading of the proposed properties from the existing trees and no subsequent risk of pruning, but it submits no evidence to support this statement. Considering the height and proximity of a number of the trees, it is possible that at least five houses will be adversely affected by existing trees.

5. The easements for the proposed infrastructure and the foul pumping station have not been identified and could make most of the proposed landscaping scheme impossible to implement as well as requiring further trees to be removed.

6. Many of the trees proposed in the landscaping scheme appear to be within or on the edge of the swale, surely this would not be feasible and would undermine the long-term integrity of the swale.

7. The second-floor plans for nine of the dwellings are missing. Thus, four-bedroom houses are labelled as three-bedroom houses with substandard gardens and poor parking provision.

8. The plans show 13 of the units will be 2½ storeys, but the text only refers to nine. The text also refers to some single storey dwellings, but there are none.

She also expressed a number of concerns about the detailed design of the scheme:

1. 45% of the proposed dwellings are 2½ storeys and 10m tall. All of the proposed dwellings are over 9m in height. This is over twice as tall as the existing bungalow and 2.5m taller than the two storey houses on Brook Drive.

2. The proposed housing layout within the site is cluttered and excessively hard.

3. The density appears to be twice that of the neighbouring suburban development.

4. The parking allocation is substandard in places, this is balanced by overprovision in others, but the core of the site is under provided for, which will result in conflict and excessive on street parking.

5. The proposed gardens are often smaller than the footprint of the proposed dwellings and/or awkwardly shaped, limiting the amenities of future residents.

6. The positioning of a foul pumping station as a central feature within the proposed layout situated within the small amount of Public Open Space

7. The easement for the pumping station has clearly not been taken into account during the creation of the landscaping proposals.

8. The proposed access bridge from Brook Drive will be lined with metal railings (like those found on the edge of a dual carriageway).

9. The proposals for addressing the noise pollution originating from the railway line would appear to be to create soundproof boxes where occupants will be unable to open their windows, and occupants will have no protection from the noise within their rear gardens. This will further limit the amenities of future occupants.

10. There is no significant landscaping/planting proposed within the site and what has been identified is unlikely to be implemented due to the layout of the drainage and other infrastructure.

11. This is an elevated prominent site and will be more exposed once the landscaping proposals have been implemented.

She asked that the Town Council recommend refusal of the application.

PL 03/20 Declarations of Interest

Councillor G Sanders declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 20/04367/REM - Peacock Grove – Erection of 29 dwellings following the demolition of six existing dwellings and associated works pursuant to outline planning permission 15/11544/OUT as she has been dealing with the application in a work capacity. She remained in the meeting during the discussion and decision on the item.

Councillor G Sanders declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 20/04617/FUL107 Tellcroft Close – Proposed insertion of Velux windows to existing roof structure as an acquaintance of the applicant. She remained in the meeting during the discussion and decision on the item.

PL 04/20 Applications

BOX PARISH

20/04313/FUL Land at the Barn, Bradford Road – Erection of two pairs of semi-detached dwellings and double garage for existing dwelling.

Resolved: to recommend refusal on the grounds that the proposed access is unsuitable, the removal of trees not in the applicant's ownership is unacceptable and that the proposal would represent overdevelopment of the site.

CORSHAM PICKWICK WARD

20/05498/TCA Corsham Court, High Street - See Schedule of Works.

Resolved: that no objection be raised. The Town Council would ask that consideration be given to replacing any felled trees with other indigenous species.

CORSHAM TOWN WARD

20/04367/REM Peacock Grove – Erection of 29 dwellings following the demolition of six existing dwellings and associated works pursuant to outline planning permission 15/11544/OUT.

Corsham Town Council has always objected to development on this site on the grounds that:

- i) it is unnecessary;
- ii) the site is outside the settlement boundary;
- iii) would exacerbate existing flooding problems;
- iv) unacceptable loss of privacy for existing dwellings;
- v) environmental and ecological harm;
- vi) overdevelopment;
- vii) unsustainable impact on local infrastructure including schools and health service provision;
- viii) detriment to the landscape character;
- ix) it is contrary to both the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the Corsham Neighbourhood Plan.

Resolved: to unanimously recommend refusal of the application on the grounds that the proposal is contrary to:

- i) The National Planning Policy Framework February 2019 with regards to design quality as outlined in paragraphs 127 and 130.*
- ii) The Wiltshire Core Strategy - The information submitted has failed to demonstrate that the requirements of Core Policies 50 and 51 have been met in terms of seeking opportunities to enhance biodiversity and to preserve and enhance landscape character. Also, Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy as the proposal does not represent good quality design.*
- iii) The Corsham Neighbourhood Plan Policy CNP ED1 as it does not take account of the principles and guidance in the Corsham Batscape Strategy and Corsham Design Guide, Policy CNP E1 as it does not demonstrate how the proposal will contribute to the delivery of the Corsham Batscape Strategy, Policy CNP E2 part c) – the application fails to demonstrate that the proposal will reduce flood risk and ensure that*

the design and location of new development is resilient to the effects of flooding, and d), e) and f) as the proposal does not demonstrate low carbon sustainable design, the promotion of the efficient use of natural resources, the re-use and recycling of resources and the production and consumption of renewable energy and grey water re-use. Policy CNP E4 as the application results in the loss of green infrastructure without the provision of suitable replacement green infrastructure, Policy CNP HW1 as the proposal does not protect, improve and extend Corsham's green infrastructure network, CNP HW2 as there is no indication of how the proposal will provide or contribute to healthcare facilities on or off-site, CNP HW6 as there are no details of how the proposal would include public art, Policy CNP HE1 as the application does not achieve high quality design that respects the scale, character and historic built fabric of existing and surrounding buildings or respect the established building plot arrangements, widths and architectural rhythm of the street scene including front gardens, railings, walls and hedges, nor does it take account of the key views to ensure that development within these views respects the key features of the views.

iv) *The Corsham Design Guide as detailed below:*

The Reserved Matters application states that it is in keeping with the locality but has a much higher density and is not of a complementary design. The height of the proposed dwellings especially the 2½ storey dwellings is not in keeping with the location and is contrary to the Corsham Design Guide.

The site is outside a defined Character Area and so the general design guidance in section 3.2 applies – Of relevance are (P48-49):

The building density of proposed residential areas should respect its context and setting within the town and surroundings.

All new development should be of an appropriate scale and reflect the existing settlement pattern.

Developments should be designed to allow for car parking on properties (driveways/attached

garages/car ports and under-crofts) to discourage on-street parking.

Building style must be appropriate to the context.

Design of new buildings should draw from Corsham Design Guide to ensure a natural harmony with existing buildings in Corsham.

Building height should take reference from existing buildings found in the local character area; any development should not exceed the scale, height and mass of adjacent, existing buildings unless proposed as a 'key' building.

Where possible the overall height should be respectful of the existing, local and adjacent buildings.

The roof design, shape, pitch, eaves, form and material of all development should be appropriate to its location and visibility within Corsham, as well as its contribution to the roofscape of the surrounding area.

The site abuts Character Area 19 of the Corsham Design Guide and as such should also be in keeping with this character area '...the Broadmead and Brook Drive developments there is an equal number of 2-storey and 1 to 1½ storey buildings'. In terms of materials '...the main building material here is buff coloured re-constituted Bath Stone...' '...roofs are mostly gabled with relatively shallow pitches of 30 degrees...' '... tiles with mostly brown concrete pantiles...'

Specific Design Guidance for this area includes:

Retain existing areas of greenspace, including The Batters and adjacent areas.

Retain a medium building density in the area.

For any new housing, parking facilities should be provided on the property to not add more parking pressure. Wiltshire Council's Parking Standards – Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026 – Car Parking Strategy P27 states at 7.5 '...the council has decided not to include garages as part of the allocated parking provision except where there are overriding design considerations.' Therefore, this

proposal does not meet the parking standards (by 13 parking spaces to dwellings).

'...infill development within Broadmead and Brook Drive retain mix of bungalows and 2-storey, either detached or semi-detached..' – this proposal contains a short terrace and flats and all of the proposed dwellings are over nine metres in height which is over twice the height of the existing bungalow and two and a half metres taller than the two-storey houses on Brook Drive.

In terms of materials 'Favour dressed local limestone or reconstituted limestone, ...' - most of the dwellings in this proposal are rendered.

'Favour pitched roofs to match existing.' – the pitch of the roofs of this proposal is much higher.

The Design Compliance Statement which forms part of the proposal uses design references which are not predominantly from the immediate surroundings and 2 of the 7 are from new developments. There is no reference to the Corsham Design Guide. Nine of the dwellings will be constructed of reconstituted stone with the remaining 17 being finished with render.

The roofs of the garages are to be of a different material to that of the houses which is not in keeping with the locality.

v) *The Corsham Batscape Strategy as follows:*

Part of the site is within a Strategic Flyway and the woodland and scrub and grass area are identified as foraging habitats for rare species of bats associated with the Bath and Bradford on Avon 'Special Area of Conservation'

The Corsham Batscape strategy recommends 10m for the bat commuting corridor and then 15m minimum standoff from development to buffer bat commuting corridor (P27 Corsham Batscape Strategy) this proposal would not seem to achieve this.

The detailed design of the scheme is also felt to be lacking in the following areas:

House types A and B show windows in the roofs but no floor plans for the top levels (11 dwellings) – if these floors are not to be used as living space the windows should be removed.

Insufficient detail on the bridge plans and inappropriate railings.

The style of the proposed dwellings is not in keeping especially plot 29 which is to be set amongst existing dwellings on Brook Drive.

Condition 19 of the Appeal Decision requires that the dwellings shall achieve a level of energy performance at or equivalent to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable homes – The Town Council would like reassurance that this condition has been met.

The Town Council has concerns:

that noise will affect the amenity of the outside space particularly for those dwellings closest to the railway line. P20 of the Design Compliance statement shows 'potential for noise attenuation fence subject to detail design' but there does not seem to be another reference to it or any detailed plans.

regarding surface water being discharged into the Byde Mill Brook despite the proposed mitigation measures as this area is known to flood.

regarding the positioning of the foul water pumping station next to the informal play space.

regarding the location of the drainage outfall as it appears to be on privately owned land.

that the elevated nature of the site and the resulting amplified impact on the adjoining properties has not been fully considered and reflected in the design of the dwellings proposed.

The Town Council would also support the concerns of Wiltshire Council's Arboricultural Officer, Drainage

Engineer and Senior Highway Development Control Engineer.

20/04539/FUL 28 Glebe Way – Demolish existing conservatory and construction of new single-storey rear extension. New two-storey extension over garage.

Resolved: that no objection be raised subject to the proposals meeting Wiltshire Council's Parking Standards.

20/04617/FUL 107 Tellcroft Close – Proposed insertion of Velux windows to existing roof structure.

Resolved: that no objection be raised.

20/04754/TCA 6 Pound Pill – Remove lower lateral limb from Willow (T1) and reduce lateral limb of Ash over driveway by up to 3 metres (T2).

Resolved: that no objection be raised.

20/05489/TCA The Rookery, Lacock Road – Fell two Ash trees and 20% reduction to one Beech Tree.

Resolved: that no objection be raised. The Town Council would ask that consideration be given to replacing any felled trees with other indigenous species.

20/05077/FUL 18 Alexander Terrace – Single-storey rear extension.

Resolved: that no objection be raised.

CORSHAM WEST WARD

20/04470/FUL 1 Goblins Pit Close – Single-storey rear extension.

Resolved: that no objection be raised.

PL 05/20 Amended/Additional Plans

There were none for this meeting.

PL 06/20 Decisions

(1) Approvals

CORSHAM TOWN WARD

20/02127/FUL Leaffield Stoneyard, Potley Lane – Change of Use from B2 to D2 to enable occupation by Chippenham Moonraker Gymnastics with associated internal alterations.

20/03633/FUL 89 Pickwick Road – Single-storey rear extension, detached car-port and new driveway.

(2) Refusals

There were none for this meeting.

(3) Withdrawn

There were none for this meeting.

(4) Void

There were none for this meeting.

PL 07/20 Pre-application Consultation on the proposed upgrade to the existing telecommunications mast at Valley Road, Corsham

As part of MBNL’s continued network improvement programme, the company stated that there is a specific requirement for a new mast at the footway of Corsham Valley Road to ensure that the latest high quality 2G, 3G and 4G service provision continues to be provided in the Corsham area. The proposed new column would also ensure that new 5G coverage can also be provided at this location. This ensures that coverage and capacity requirements are maintained. The proposed new mast has been sited and designed in order to provide 5G coverage and to support the existing mobile network. At present it is paramount that digital connectivity is supported and maintained throughout the country. In particular the current massive shift in user demand from city centres and places of work to residential areas and suburbs requires an improvement in coverage and capacity throughout the whole network. MBNL stated that the current proposal therefore provides such additional capacity to the network whilst still promoting the improved 5G technology.

Resolved: The Town Council is pleased to have been given the opportunity to engage in the pre-application consultation but does not wish to submit any comments at this time.

The meeting commenced at 7.30pm and closed at 8.16pm. There were three members of the public present at the start of the meeting and none at the close.

CHAIRMAN

DATE

Councillors’ decisions on planning applications are based on the information available to them at the time of the meeting.