

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

Meeting: Strategic Planning Committee
Place: Council Chamber, County Hall, Trowbridge, BA14 8JN
Date: Wednesday 26 April 2017
Time: 10.30 am

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on **13 April 2017**. Additional documents are now available and are attached to this Agenda Supplement.

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to Roger Bishton, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line 01225 713035 or email roger.bishton@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Late Items (Pages 3 - 6)

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 26 April 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

26th April 2017

This is information that has been received since the committee report was written. This could include additional comments or representation, new information relating to the site, changes to plans etc.

Items 8 & 9) 14/08060/OUT & 16/06995/FUL- Land at Marsh Farm, Coped Hall, Royal Wootton Bassett SN4 8ER

Late Representations

1 Local Resident wrote to the Council following publication of the Committee papers to confirm their objection to the proposals. Particular concerns were raised in respect of the impact of the retail proposal in the Town centre/High Street; Highways Impact and Road congestion; loss of Greenfield land and the lack of adequate services and facilities to support the proposed development.

Officer Response

These matters are all addressed in the report to Committee with additional/updated information in respect of drainage matters set out below in these late items.

Royal Wootton Bassett Town Council

The Town Council submitted an additional substantive representation relating to both applications on the agenda at this site (N/14/08060/OUT & 16/06995/FUL) yesterday evening. The submission included a technical note on drainage matters. The submission was made to the Chairman of the Committee and copied to Officers and is therefore referenced here in Late Items.

The Council on behalf of the local community reiterate their strong objection to both applications.

In respect of N/14/08060/OUT the Council maintain their view that the development proposed is inappropriate in this location, is not required with adequate provision for housing already made in the locality. Any further development should be delivered through the RWB Neighbourhood Plan and concern is raised as to the applicant's engagement with that process and the local community.

In respect of N/16/06995/FUL reiterate concerns as to the impact of the proposals on the Town Centre/High Street identifying that it is susceptible to out of centre retail proposals. The availability of empty retail facilities within the centre is referenced and identified. The care home element of the scheme is identified as unnecessary with no local need and existing available provision. The available vacant town centre sites are identified as possible alternative locations for the development.

Concern in respect of the highways impacts of both application development proposals in the context of local road congestion is reiterated.

Officer Response

These matters are addressed in the reports to Committee and the additional submissions do not alter the recommendations in respect of either application.

Further Matters of Concern & Objection

The Town Council as managers of the Jubilee Lake are concerned about the impact of the development proposals including surface water drainage on this facility. Peter Brett Associates (PBA) was commissioned by the Town Council to review the available submissions and a technical note setting out their assessment and conclusions has been submitted with the late representation.

PBA conclude that the Drainage Strategy design principles for both applications appear to be reasonable albeit subject to finalisation. Also that subject to being fully implemented and subject to full maintenance that surface water runoff rates will not exceed current Greenfield rates; water quality should not be impacted and the overall surface water runoff rate will increase.

A possibility that the increased volume of runoff will result in accelerated erosion of Thunder Brook is postulated. Similarly that such increased volume could possibly improve the ecology of the Brook and subsequently the Lake.

Consequently and in order to limit potential risks recommendations are made and PBA consider these requirements could be addressed via condition. These are as follows (reproduced in full):-

1. Undertake a ground investigation with infiltration testing to determine the underlying ground conditions and the impact on the surface water drainage arrangements for the development.
2. Undertake soil testing to determine the likely potential risk of contamination to future users.
3. Monitor the water quality of the Thunder Brook downstream of the culvert pre-construction, during and post-construction to determine if there are changes to the baseline condition which may impact the Lake.
4. Agree the maintenance regime of the drainage proposals including the ponds, swales and orifices, as the ongoing maintenance of SuDS is critical to ensure they function as required.
5. Assign the responsibility for maintenance for the development life-cycle.
6. Consider the overflow arrangements if the orifice controls at each pond was to block. Consider the arrangements for trapping silt during an overflow incident.
7. In relation to the site topography, determine the volume of the ponds, particularly Pond 1, following detailed ground investigations, to ensure enough space is retained for them within the development proposals.
8. Consider erosion protection measures at the outfall location from the development.
9. Due to the increase in the overall runoff volume flowing into the Thunder Brook upstream of the Jubilee Lake silt trap, we would envisage that de-silting of the silt trap may be required more frequently. The ongoing maintenance issues and funding for this should be discussed with the developers.

10. Prepare a Construction Environmental Management Plan which is maintained and monitored throughout all construction phases and includes measures for controlling and monitoring water quality.

Officer Response

Officers have reviewed the late representations in full. The conclusions are noted as generally supportive of and in agreement with the surface water drainage strategy submissions and the proposed approach and do not identify significant harmful impacts or increased flood risk on or off site or indeed harmful ecological impacts. This accords with and reflects Drainage Officer and Council Ecologist findings and conclusions.

It should be noted that the applicant has further updated their Flood Risk Assessment to reflect the findings of the additional assessment and information requested by drainage officers as referenced in the report to Committee. Specifically details of the gradient of the piped culvert. Officers have reviewed the updated submissions and concluded that the proposals are fully evidenced and subject to comprehensive assessment of all relevant factors. The proposals make appropriate provision for the surface water drainage requirements of the development at this site and no objection is raised subject to the proposed conditions.

Officers have now considered the recommendations of PBA as set out above. Recommendations 4 and 9 are already covered by condition 25 contained in the Committee report at page 92. Recommendation 10 is already addressed by condition 29 contained at pages 93/94 of the Committee papers.

Officers consider the other recommendations to be reasonable and would agree a condition to address these requirements if members are in agreement. Detailed wording of the condition to be delegated to officers to prepare. Officers have consulted the applicant team in this respect and their position will be reported verbally at the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank