

Northern Area Planning Committee

MINUTES OF THE NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 1 FEBRUARY 2023 AT COUNCIL CHAMBER - COUNCIL OFFICES, MONKTON PARK, CHIPPENHAM, SN15 1ER.

Present:

Cllr Tony Trotman (Chairman), Cllr Howard Greenman (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Chuck Berry, Cllr David Bowler, Cllr Steve Bucknell, Cllr Gavin Grant, Cllr Jacqui Lay, Cllr Dr Brian Mathew, Cllr Nic Puntis, Cllr Elizabeth Threlfall and Cllr Clare Cape (Substitute)

Also Present:

Cllr Bob Jones MBE, Cllr Liz Alstrom, Cllr Ross Henning, and Cllr Dr Nick Murry

1 **Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Martin Smith, who had arranged for Cllr Clare Cape to attend the meeting in his absence.

2 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Councillor Gavin Grant updated that positive discussions with Bloor Homes over a contentious application had continued with representatives and Malmesbury Town Council. There is the belief that Bloor Homes will be placing a single application for both elements of the site that would be likely to be seen by the committee and with the suggested form, it would be supported by Malmesbury Town Council.

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2022 were presented for consideration, and it was;

Resolved:

To approve and sign as a true and correct record of the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2022.

3 **Declarations of Interest**

The were no declarations of disclosable pecuniary interest.

4 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman informed those in attendance of the procedures in place if there was to be a fire alarm.

5 **Public Participation**

No questions had been received from councillors or members of the public.

The Chairman welcomed all present. He then explained the rules of public participation and the procedure to be followed at the meeting.

6 **Planning Appeals and Updates**

It was noted that the appeals report was missing an appeal. After which, Councillor Chuck Berry moved that the Committee note the contents of the appeals report included within the agenda. It was seconded by Councillor Elizabeth Threlfall.

Resolved:

To note the Planning Appeals Update Report for 1 February 2023.

7 **Planning Applications**

The Committee considered and determined the following planning applications:

8 **PL/2022/03760 - Former Wiltshire College, Cocklebury Road, Chippenham, Wiltshire, SN15 3QD**

Public Participation

Gian Bendinelli spoke in support of the application.

Andrew Conroy (Head of Planning) spoke on behalf of Chippenham Town Council.

Senior Planning Officer, Rose Fox presented a report which outlined the proposed erection of retirement apartments (Category II Type) with communal facilities and car parking & erection of assisted living accommodation (Class C2) with communal facilities and car parking.

Details were provided including issues raised by the proposals, including the principle of development; highway impact; drainage; impact on heritage assets (including loss of non-designated heritage asset); design, character, and appearance of area. Additionally, residential amenities of adjoining neighbours; ecological considerations; affordable housing provision and designing out crime.

Members of the Committee had the opportunity to ask technical questions regarding the application. Details were sought on, but not limited to whether the office building which had been granted permission adjacent to the respective site could be implemented, to which it was clarified that theoretically the office could still be built with no linkage between the permitted multi-storey carpark to compel it to happen. Additionally, reference was made to the additional provision of the stated form of accommodation and whether there was a measurement for market need and desirability, to which the Chairman noted that there was a general need in the county for such accommodation. Questions

were also asked regarding what the resale conditions of the properties could be with examples cited of families unable to sell vacant flats designed for elderly residents. Furthermore, it was questioned whether part of the application would constitute affordable housing, to which it was noted that the Anchor element of the application would be affordable as well as meeting an objectified need in the locality.

Further technical questions included but were not limited to whether the application included staff accommodation, to which it was noted that this would not be included in the McCarthy Stone part but would be within the assisted living section. It was questioned whether the old college building had been considered as a heritage asset as part of the previous planning application which had been granted permission, to which it was clarified that the same assessment would have taken place and that the building had been submitted for listing, but a decision was made not to list it. Further clarity was provided that regarding the decision-making process and the heritage asset, the weight of the asset attributed to any decisions made would be down to the Committee with nothing in statute proposed. Additionally, reference was drawn to the report, in which it was acknowledged that the conservation area had identified key buildings and conservation areas and that the respective building made a positive contribution to the townscape and that the proposal would add a wall and railings, which the conservation statement suggested might be of benefit.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views to the Committee as detailed above.

The neighbouring Local Unitary Member, Councillor Liz Alstrom then spoke regarding the application. Cllr Alstrom provided the Committee with two statements, one of which was provided by an individual who wished to voice their experience of McCarthy Stone, the other the experience of a resident in Chippenham who had struggled to sell their retirement property due to the current market. Cllr Alstrom stated that she believed that the application was in breach of the following Core Policies of the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The application would be in breach of CP9 (5.1.1) as having done market research online, there were currently 50 empty retirement properties, therefore suggesting that the application would make use of land in an unsustainable way and consequently exclude young people and that the needs of older people had clearly been met due to the number of vacant properties. CP9 (5.5.4) was cited as a breach as within the Chippenham Central Masterplan, as the site would sit within a designated civic and academic zone though it would be exclusively designed for elderly residents.

Cllr Alstrom suggested that the application would also be in breach of CP10 as the application would not support local economic growth, nor would it provide a mix of housing types, or the infrastructure needed in Chippenham to support growth. CP45 was referenced as a breach as the application would not address local housing need, with the housing market suggesting that Chippenham was currently saturated with retirement properties. Reference to CP57 (4) was made with it suggested that the proposed development would be a breach as the

design would not be in keeping with the historic area and would not be complimentary to the local area.

Further points raised by Cllr Alstrom included, but were not limited to, that the application would conflict with CP58 which would aim to protect, conserve, and preserve historic environments and heritage assets, with weight placed on the undesignated historic building currently located on the site. Reference was also made to CP6 with it suggested that the application was within a conservation area which had been designated within the Chippenham Central Masterplan and would therefore not enhance local distinctiveness.

The Local Unitary Member, Councillor Dr Nick Murry then spoke regarding the application. Cllr Murry stated that the site had been increasingly derelict since 2015 and had been placed on the market at least twice, though no applications for youth facilities or social housing, or any other type of development had been brought forward. It was noted that though the previous application for this site had been granted permission for retirement homes, at the time lobbying had taken place for the preservation of the grammar school element, which could not be listed.

Cllr Murry noted that the two previous applications reflected the fact that there was a need for retirement accommodation in Chippenham, with it cited that the elderly population of Chippenham was set to double in proportion by 2036. It was also referenced that having spoken to residents in the Monkton Park area, there was a desire for the old college building to be replaced with something of good quality and in keeping with the residential area. As well as a desire for minimal increase to traffic, an increase in local jobs and that any potential residential accommodation might assist to curtail the anti-social behaviour in the Sadlers Mead carpark.

Cllr Murry noted that there were several elements within the proposal which had concerned people, such as that the demolition of the grammar school would harm the Chippenham conservation area and that the previous application granted in 2018 had a much higher design quality and materials; with the current application falling short of what would be expected from the Neighbourhood Plan set to be published later in 2023. It was also acknowledged that though the application had made minor amendments to the existing scheme, this had not removed objections and would not be sufficient to justify the loss of a heritage asset.

Concerns were raised by Cllr Murry in relation to the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure and reducing the reliance on motorised vehicles, with it noted that the Chippenham Cycle Network Development Group had provided recommendations which had not been taken up in the revised application; including to ensure car-free access from nearby cycle ways to onsite cycle parking to comply with the NPPF paragraph 112. Additionally, it was suggested that there be a zebra and parallel cycle crossing over Sadlers Mead as well as to provide at least 15 residential cycle parking spaces; all of which would allow for compliance with Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 61.

A third set of concerns raised by Cllr Murry was in relation to the overall sustainability and energy strategy of the proposed development, with it suggested that with there being a national target of a reduction of 78% greenhouse emissions by 2035 and net zero by 2050, which the application would fail to comply with. Reference was also drawn to the use of solar panels on the application, which would not be sufficient as well as there not being a statement provided regarding minimising embodied energy and carbon.

Cllr Murry concluded by stating that the application would not be in keeping with Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policies 57, 58 and 61. Additionally Cllr Murry suggested that proposed Condition 9 be amended to ensure secure cycle parking could be provided for at least 15 spaces and that Condition 15 be amended to include greenhouse gas emissions under the definition for pollution. Furthermore, it was suggested that a condition be added regarding renewable onsite electricity production, and that the applicant contribute to the construction of a zebra and parallel cycle crossing as part of a Section 106 agreement.

Following the conclusion of Cllr Murry's speech, the Chairman read out a note provided by a resident of the Monkton Park Area, which had been received in support of the application.

At the start of the debate a motion to reject the officer's recommendation for planning permission to be granted subject to conditions was moved by Cllr Gavin Grant seconded by Cllr Nic Puntis. The reason for refusal was that the application would conflict with Core Policies 57 (3), 57 (4), 57 (6), 58 and 61. A friendly amendment of Core Policies 9 and 10 were added by Cllr Puntis and accepted by Cllr Gavin Grant, however Core Policies 10 and 61 were later removed from the reason for refusal,

During the debate, issues were raised, but not limited to that there was a need to balance both the policies in support and policies in conflict with the proposal, with it noted that the overriding policy in support of the proposal was public benefit, however there was other policies within the local plan which mitigated this. Additional reference was drawn to how the Urban Design Officer had placed an objection to the application. It was suggested that there would not be a public benefit to the application being granted due to an oversupply for retired people in Chippenham, which could be evidenced through online property market searches. It was suggested that given the location of the site within the town centre and proximity to the railway station, a proposal which included old and young residents might be better, especially given the recent investment on the station to enable access for all abilities and commute times to London. Furthermore, it was suggested that consultation had not been considered properly, with Chippenham Town Council, who would have known what developments were needed and where.

Further issues that were debated included that though the developer had conducted their own assessment of the demographic, they had not considered the challenge that had been provided by Councillors at the Chippenham and Villages Area Board, nor from the Environment and Transport Committee, which had suggested an oversupply of such properties. Further reference was made

to how an application which included both elderly and young people would have greater benefit to the health and sustainability of the Chippenham community. The need to protect the architecture and history of Chippenham in the form of the grammar school building was also stressed.

Additionally, points raised included that the pressures experienced by Early Years settings had been raised with the Children's Select Committee and that having a mixed residency of elderly and young people might enable such provisions as a nursery whilst assisting with the wellbeing of older people. It was further suggested that the developer communicate with the Town Council and people of Chippenham to enquire about what is required within the town.

A discussion took place in relation to the previous application which had been permitted in 2018, with it stressed by the Planning Officer that the previous application should not be used as a yardstick to compare and determine the current application. Reference was drawn to the materials which had been used for the 2017 application and how the Core Policies and treatment of the grammar school building had been the same within the report. It was noted that the building had changed in appearance since 2017, with the addition of red brick, in reference to the heritage building, and a lower roof.

During the debate it was acknowledged that the application would contribute to the housing land supply due to meeting an identified objectified need, with it also noted that the permitted block of offices was within the conservation area.

A further point was reiterated that robust discussions had taken place at the Area Board between Members and the developer and that it did not seem as though the developer had taken notice of the points that had been raised. Regarding the heritage asset, it was suggested that the building could be integrated into a new development and to destroy such buildings would set a precedent as a planning authority. Additionally, that a mixed-use site would provide the facilities needed by the town and would enhance the area and that the current derelict status for the site should not be a reason to allow development but rather development in the right way.

Regarding the reason for refusal, it was suggested that the application would conflict with CP9 (5.5.4.1) as the development would not add to the development of Chippenham town centre and would not meet with high quality standards of design as well as not being mixed use. The use of CP10 was discussed, however it was decided that this would not be a reason for refusal as it was suggested that there was a need for such accommodation in Chippenham and the county as a whole and that the proposal could not be more sustainable.

It was stated that the application would not comply with Core Policies 57 (3 and 4) as the proposal was inferior due to a linear roofline and lack of distinctiveness; additionally; the look and feel of the proposal was not appropriate with additional reference to the application sitting within a conservation are and there being a need to preserve historical landscapes. CP57 (5) was not cited as a reason for refusal as the application had provided an energy statement which would meet Part L of building regulations.

Core Policies 57 (6) and 58 were cited due to the need to protect, conserve and where possible, enhance non-designated heritage assets, which it was suggested that the development would not do, with the harm outweighing any benefits of granting permission. The use of CP61 was discussed, however it was removed due to the location being high sustainable.

At the conclusion of the debate, it was,

Resolved:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. On this highly prominent site and by reason of its layout, built form, building line, elevational design, materials, streetscape, as well as its lack of any included commercial and community uses, the proposed development is not considered to be of a high quality design and does not display exemplary public realm or take account of its local context. Accordingly, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to Core Policy CP57 (iii and vi) and Core Policy CP9 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.**
- 2. On this highly prominent site in the Chippenham Conservation Area, and by reason of the layout, built form, building line, elevational design, materials, street-scape of the proposed building, as well as the resulting loss of the historic school building on the site, the proposals are considered to harm to the character and local identity of the Conservation Area and do not protect, conserve or enhance the historic environment. The public benefits associated with the development do not outweigh that harm and the development is contrary to the requirements of core policies CP58 and CP57(iv) to the Wiltshire Core Strategy and section 16 to the NPPF.**

Chairman called the Committee to a break at 15:55pm and then resumed at 16:05pm.

9 PL/2022/00541 - Chelworth Industrial Estate, Chelworth Road, Cricklade, Swindon, SN6 6HE

Public Participation

Giles Brockbank spoke in support of the application.

Cllr Jonathan Hill spoke on behalf of Cricklade Town Council.

Acting Development Management Team Leader, Raymond Cole presented a report which outlined the demolition of three existing buildings and the erection of three light industrial buildings use Class E, B2 and B8.

Details were provided including issues raised by the proposals, including the principle of development; highways impact; drainage impact; ecological impact; effect on character and appearance of the area; the impact on neighbouring uses.

Members of the Committee had the opportunity to ask technical questions regarding the application. Details were sought on, but not limited to the potential for a bypass around Cricklade and whether the HGVs would take a 50/50 split in travelled direction; to which it was clarified that this was an assumption made within the transport assessment. Clarity was provided regarding weight restrictions in the area and that routes had been sign-posted to indicate which direction HGVs should travel in and that any enforcement would be down to the police. It was queried why there couldn't be a travel plan for the for the HGVs as they would likely either travel through Cricklade town centre or Cowleaze housing estate, which consisted of 650 homes.

Further technical questions included, but were not limited to, the onsite parking of the application, to which it was clarified that there would be 20 additional parking spaces for employees which would meet adopted standards. It was acknowledged that the site was within 8km of a recreation impact zone, to which the officer stated that those employed on the site would more likely use the land to the south of the site for recreation. It was also clarified by the officer that there had been no issues raised regarding the accident history of the immediate vicinity of the application site.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views to the Committee as detailed above.

The Local Unitary Member, Councillor Bob Jones MBE then spoke regarding the application. Cllr Jones stated that the assumed 50/50 traffic split within the report was flawed due to weight restrictions in Purton and how the HGVs would not want to travel through the new residential area; therefore, meaning they would travel through Cricklade town centre. Cllr Jones raised concerns that the 10 new units, if granted, would generate more HGVs through the town and that the trading estate could not be afforded to get any bigger as it would encourage more HGVs.

At the start of the debate a motion to accept the officer's recommendations for planning permission to be granted subject to conditions was moved by Cllr Steve Bucknell and seconded by Cllr Tony Trotman.

During the debate, issues were raised, but not limited to that the units would be broken down into 10 sub-units, therefore potentially meaning that there would be less HGV movements. It was suggested that there was a need to promote the growth of small businesses and that the application was looking to improve facilities that already existed; potentially meaning that people would have to travel less to get to their place of work whilst adding more local services to Chelworth. It was also acknowledged that the increase of HGV traffic would be small, to which it was argued that though the impact would be small now, it would be worth in the future encouraging the local transport companies to get

together to discuss routes in the best way possible. Additionally, the degradation of local roads due to HGV traffic was referenced.

Further issues that were debated included whether it would be possible for the applicant to contribute to a possible Cricklade by-pass through a section 106 agreement. However, it was argued that this application had taken a year to be determined and that construction costs would have risen during this time; therefore, it would potentially be unfair to place more cost on the applicant. Additionally, flooding and drainage concerns of the area were discussed, with it noted that conditions had been recommended to be imposed by the officer.

Additional points raised included sympathy for those living in Cricklade, with the example of lorries passing through Malmesbury cited. The need to support small businesses was also echoed, with reassurance provided that the existing southern piece of land would not be built on and that earlier indications had been made that there would be a landscaping scheme for this land.

At the conclusion of the debate, it was,

Resolved:

That the application be GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

1. **The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:**

Drawing No. 004 Revision P4: Proposed North West and South East Elevations, dated 14/01/22 and received 21 January 2022;

Drawing No. 005 Revision P4: Proposed North East and South West Elevations, dated 14/01/22 and received 21 January 2022;

Drawing No. 010 Revision P4: Proposed Site Plan, dated 14/01/2022 and received 21 January 2022;

Drawing No. 011 Revision P4: Unit P Proposed Floor Plan, Section and Elevations, dated 14/01/22 and received 21 January 2022;

Drawing No. 013 Revision P3: Unit G1 Proposed Floor Plan, Section and Elevations, dated 14/01/22 and received 21 January 2022;

Drawing No. 014 Revision P3: Units H2 & H3 Proposed Floor Plan, Section and Elevations, dated 14/01/22 and received 21 January 2022;

Drawing No. 017 Revision P1: Demolition Plan, dated 24/01/2022 and received 24 January 2022;

Drawing No. 0001: Visibility Splays, dated 16/12/2021 and received 21 January 2022;

Drawing No. 2200: Articulated Vehicle Tracking Plan, received 21 January 2022;
Drawing No. 507/01: Landscape Strategy, dated Mar 22 and received 13 April 2022;
Building Areas and Eaves Heights, dated 14/01/2022 and received 21 January 2022;
Design and Access Statement Revision B, received 21 January 2022;
Document No. 16200012519-BFSSA: Baseline Flood Study and SuDS Appraisal, dated January 2022 and received 21 January 2022;
Technical Note No. 1620012519-RAM-RP-WA-00001 Version 2: Drainage Strategy, dated 07/06/2022 and received 09 June 2022;
Travel Plan, dated January 2022 and received 21 January 2022;
Biodiversity Net Gain Note, dated August 2022 and received 08 August 2022;
Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Issue No. 01, dated 20 September 2021 and received 21 January 2022; and
Application Form, dated 13/01/2022 and received 21 January 2022.

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), the site shall be used solely for purposes within Classes B2, B8 and E(g)(iii) of the Schedules to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) (or in any provisions equivalent to that class in any statutory instrument revoking or re-enacting that Order with or without modification).**

REASON: The proposed use is acceptable, but the Local Planning Authority wish to consider any future proposal for a change of use, other than a use within the same class(es), having regard to the circumstances of the case.

- 4. No development shall take place until a CCTV survey report including a capacity and condition assessment has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The survey report should make recommendations for improvement if it is discovered that upgrades are required. The development shall proceed in accordance with any recommendations made in the approved report.**

REASON: To ensure that drainage is sufficient in capacity and of suitable condition to address the drainage impacts of the development.

5. **No development shall take place until a revised drainage strategy, where hydraulic calculations have been updated using a MADD factor of 0m³/ha, and any required changes made to the proposed attenuation volumes to fully attenuate the 1 in 100yr + climate change rainfall without flooding, have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved drainage strategy.**

REASON: To ensure that surface water flood risk is safely managed.

6. **No development shall take place until details of building-based flood defence measures have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. This should include any maintenance and operational measures required, including for the 'blue roof' installation. The development shall proceed in accordance with the approved details.**

REASON: To ensure flood resilient design that is adequately managed and maintained.

7. **No development shall take place until a Flood Risk Emergency Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan should follow the guidance set out in the document 'Flood Risk Emergency Plans For New Development', published by the Environment Agency and ADEPT. The Emergency Plan shall include a timetable for monitoring and review, and shall detail where the Plan will be recorded and/or publicised. Once approved the Emergency Plan shall be adhered to thereafter.**

REASON: To ensure that an emergency plan is in place in the event of a flooding emergency.

8. **No development shall take place until a maintenance plan for the proposed surface water drainage & SuDS features, showing details of proposed maintenance activities, frequency, and their responsible parties, has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.**

REASON: To ensure drainage is sufficiently maintained, in order that surface water is managed safely throughout the lifetime of the development.

9. **No development shall commence on site until a scheme of Ultra Low Energy Vehicle (ULEV) infrastructure has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Details shall include:**

- a) **Location and number of active charge points;**
- b) **Specification of charging equipment; and**

c) Operation/management strategy.

No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the approved Scheme of ULEV Infrastructure has been implemented in full, and that all specified active charge points are live and ready for use. The approved equipment and operation/management strategy shall be actively maintained thereafter.

REASON: Core Policy 55; Development proposals, which by virtue of their scale, nature or location are likely to exacerbate existing areas of poor air quality, will need to demonstrate that measures can be taken to effectively mitigate emission levels in order to protect public health, environmental quality and amenity.

- 10. No development shall commence on site until details of secure covered cycle parking have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall accord with dimensions, access, location, design and security principles laid out in Appendix 4 of Wiltshire's LTP3 Cycling Strategy. These facilities shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the development hereby permitted and shall always be retained for use thereafter.**

REASON: To ensure that satisfactory facilities for the parking of cycles are provided and to encourage travel by means other than the private car.

- 11. The development hereby approved shall not commence until a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The CEMP shall include details of the following relevant measures:**

- i. An introduction consisting of construction phase environmental management plan, definitions and abbreviations and project description and location;**
- ii. A description of management responsibilities;**
- iii. A description of the construction programme;**
- iv. Site working hours and a named person for residents to contact;**
- v. Detailed Site logistics arrangements;**
- vi. Details regarding parking (of site operatives and visitors), deliveries, and storage;**
- vii. Storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;**
- viii. The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;**
- ix. Wheel washing facilities;**

- x. Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
- xi. A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from clearance, demolition and construction works (including confirming that there shall be no burning associated with construction processes at any time);
- xii. Details of the hours of works and other measures to mitigate the impact of construction on the amenity of the area and safety of the highway network; and

Development shall proceed in strict accordance with the approved CEMP.

REASON: Core Policy 57, Ensuring high design and place shaping such that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable.

12. Development, including demolition, ground works/excavation, site clearance, vegetation clearance and boundary treatment works, shall not commence until an Ecological Construction Environmental Management Plan (Ecological CEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Plan shall provide details of the avoidance, mitigation and protective measures to be implemented before and during the construction phase, including but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- a) Identification of ecological protection areas/buffer zones and tree root protection areas and details of physical means of protection, e.g. exclusion fencing.
- b) Working method statements for protected/priority species, such as nesting birds and reptiles.
- c) Mitigation strategies already agreed with the local planning authority prior to determination, such as for great crested newts, dormice or bats; this should comprise the pre-construction/construction related elements of strategies only.
- d) Work schedules for activities with specific timing requirements in order to avoid/reduce potential harm to ecological receptors; including details of when a licensed ecologist and/or ecological clerk of works (ECoW) shall be present on site.
- e) Key personnel, responsibilities and contact details (including Site Manager and ecologist/ECoW).
- f) Timeframe for provision of compliance report to the local planning authority; to be completed by the ecologist/ECoW and to include photographic evidence.

Development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved Ecological CEMP.

REASON: To ensure adequate protection and mitigation for ecological receptors prior to and during construction, and that works are undertaken in line with current best practice and industry standards and are supervised by a suitably licensed and competent professional ecological consultant where applicable.

13. Development shall not commence until a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP will include long term objectives and targets, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for each ecological feature within the development, together with a mechanism for monitoring success of the management prescriptions, incorporating review and necessary adaptive management in order to attain targets. The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which long-term implementation of the plan will be secured. The LEMP shall be implemented in full and for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the long-term management of landscape and ecological features retained and created by the development, for the benefit of visual amenity and biodiversity for the lifetime of the scheme.

14. No development shall commence on site until a final scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The details of the scheme shall include:

- location and current canopy spread of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land;
- full details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development;
- a detailed planting specification showing all plant species, supply and planting sizes and planting densities;
- finished levels and contours;
- means of enclosure;
- all hard and soft surfacing materials; and
- details of restoration work proposed to the pond.

REASON: The application contained a landscape strategy including outline planting specification with details reserved for consideration following a decision. The matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, to ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for

the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

- 15. In the event that contamination is encountered at any time when carrying out the approved development, the Local Planning Authority must be advised of the steps that will be taken by an appropriate contractor to deal with contamination and provide a written remedial statement to be followed by a written verification report that confirms what works have been undertaken to render the development suitable for use.**

REASON: To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors.

- 16. No construction or demolition work shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or outside the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.**

REASON: Core policy 57, Ensuring high design and place shaping such that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable.

- 17. No final surface materials shall be laid until the exact details of the surfacing material to be used for the parking area and the demarcation of the parking bays have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

- 18. The development hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until a plan showing the precise location of any areas of open storage and specifying a maximum height of open storage within such area(s) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No materials, goods, plants, machinery, equipment, finished or unfinished products/parts of any description, skips, crates, containers, waste or any other item whatsoever shall be placed, stacked, deposited or stored on the site outside the approved storage area, or above the height agreed as part of this condition.**

REASON: In the interests of the appearance of the site and the amenities of the area.

19. The development shall be carried out in strict accordance with the following documents:
Biodiversity Net Gain Note (Ecology Solutions, 08/08/2022);
Ecological Assessment, Ecology Solutions, August 2022); and
Landscape Strategy Drawing no. 507/01 (Enderby Associates, March 2022).

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and for the protection, mitigation and enhancement of biodiversity.

20. All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner; All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

21. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first brought into use until the access, parking spaces, and turning area have been completed in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans 'Proposed Site Plan, 21054_010_P3'. The areas shall always be maintained for those purposes thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

22. The development shall not be first occupied until confirmation has been provided to and approved in writing by the local planning authority that either:
- a. All surface water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed; or
 - b. A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with the Local Authority in consultation with Thames Water to allow development to be occupied.

Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan.

REASON: Network reinforcement works are likely to be required to accommodate the proposed development. Any reinforcement works identified will be necessary in order to avoid sewage flooding and/or potential pollution incidents.

23. The development shall not be first occupied until confirmation has been provided to and approved in writing by the local planning authority that either:
- a. Foul water capacity exists off site to serve the development; or
 - b. A development and infrastructure phasing plan has been agreed with the Local Authority in consultation with Thames Water. Where a development and infrastructure phasing plan is agreed, no occupation shall take place other than in accordance with the agreed development and infrastructure phasing plan; or
 - c. All Foul water network upgrades required to accommodate the additional flows from the development have been completed.

REASON: Network reinforcement works may be required to accommodate the proposed development. Any reinforcement works identified will be necessary in order to avoid sewage flooding and/or potential pollution incidents.

24. The development hereby approved shall not enter use until a validation and completion report, prepared by a suitably qualified land contamination specialist, confirming that works have been completed in accordance with the recommendations of the Phase I Environmental Assessment and that there is no or minimal risk to human health or environmental health or to buildings, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

All works must be conducted in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11' and other appropriate authoritative guidance.

REASON: In the interests of environmental health as recommended by the Phase I Environmental Assessment, to ensure that the risk of contamination is managed appropriately.

25. No new external artificial lighting shall be installed at the site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: In the interests of conserving biodiversity.

INFORMATIVES TO APPLICANT:

26. Any alterations to the approved plans, brought about by compliance with Building Regulations or any other reason must first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before commencement of work.
27. The applicant should note that the grant of planning permission does not include any separate permission which may be needed to erect a structure in the vicinity of a public sewer. Such permission should be sought direct from Thames Water Utilities Ltd / Wessex Water Services Ltd. Buildings are not normally allowed within 3.0 metres of a Public Sewer although this may vary depending on the size, depth, strategic importance, available access and the ground conditions appertaining to the sewer in question.
28. The applicant is requested to note that this permission does not affect any private property rights and therefore does not authorise the carrying out of any work on land outside their control. If such works are required it will be necessary for the applicant to obtain the landowners consent before such works commence.
29. If you intend carrying out works in the vicinity of the site boundary, you are also advised that it may be expedient to seek your own advice with regard to the requirements of the Party Wall Act 1996.
30. The applicant is advised that the development hereby approved may represent chargeable development under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and Wiltshire Council's CIL Charging Schedule. If the development is determined to be liable for CIL, a Liability Notice will be issued notifying you of the amount of CIL payment due. If an Additional Information Form has not already been submitted, please submit it now so that we can determine the CIL liability. In addition, you may be able to claim exemption or relief, in which case, please submit the relevant form so that we can determine your eligibility. The CIL Commencement Notice and Assumption of Liability must be submitted to Wiltshire Council prior to commencement of development. Should development commence prior to the CIL Liability Notice being issued by the local planning authority, any CIL exemption or relief will not apply and full payment will be required in full and with immediate effect. Should you require further information or to download the CIL forms please refer to the Council's Website <https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/dmcommunityinfrastructurelevy>.

31. Thames Water will aim to provide customers with a minimum pressure of 10m head (approx. 1 bar) and a flow rate of 9 litres/minute at the point where it leaves Thames Waters pipes. The developer should take account of this minimum pressure in the design of the proposed development.

10 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 2.00 pm - 5.00 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Ben Fielding of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 718656, e-mail benjamin.fielding@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line 01225 713114 or email communications@wiltshire.gov.uk