

PLANNING COMMITTEE

10th March 2010

Observations and recommendations made since preparation of agenda

Item	Comments
Planning Applications	
01	<p>W/09/00690/FUL - Sainsbury Store Bath Road Melksham</p> <p>Additional comments received:</p> <p>Conservation Officer</p> <p>Has commented that following a meeting with the agent and architect a revised design of the petrol filling station (PFS) to lower its impact on the Conservation Area has been submitted. The revised design and materials of the PFS canopy overcomes the previous objection in relation to the harm to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Regarding the eastern extension, this is not harmful enough by itself to warrant a maintained objection. The proposed eastern extension would continue the form of the existing building and the proposed 4m high wall would screen the delivery yard and the vehicles within. The proposal would therefore be in keeping with its host building and in the context of the Conservation Area, would not represent a major change in scale or built form.</p> <p>Likewise, the settings of the nearby listed buildings would not be adversely affected. The relative distances between the listed buildings on Church Walk and the proposed development would ensure their settings are preserved and maintained.</p> <p>Councils Area Highway Engineer</p> <p>Has commented in response to Cllr Seed concerning consultation over drainage that the Council's Senior Drainage Engineer had spoken to the Environment Agency about the Sainsbury application. In view of the Environment Agency withdrawing their objection and the proposed mitigation measures included with the development there would be no reason to object to this development on the grounds of flooding.</p> <p>Planning Officer comments</p> <p>Further letters has been received from objectors with regards to questions on the transport assessment, noise report and flood Risk Assessment.</p> <p>The transport assessment, noise report and flood risk assessment have been fully assessed by the Councils Highway, Environmental and Drainage Officers, and Environment Agency who have no objection to the proposal subject to appropriate planning conditions being attached.</p>
02	<p>W/09/02622/FUL – Land at Capps Lane, Bratton</p> <p>Additional comments received:</p> <p>Observations from a local resident:</p> <p>A letter containing various enclosures, including photographs, has been received from a local resident who is concerned that the applicant may be planning to divide the land and turn it into a</p>

	<p>6 pitch gypsy family site.</p> <p>Planning Officer Comments:</p> <p>Although there may be speculation within the local community that the land could be divided into 6 pitches there is nothing within the application to suggest that is the case.</p> <p>The application must be determined on the basis of the submitted information for a mobile home, day room and retention of a pair of sheds, and should be considered on its merits as such. Local speculation is not a material planning consideration and should be disregarded.</p> <p>In the event of the site subsequently being divided into 6 family pitches planning permission would be required. Should this occur any future application would be considered on its merits at that time.</p>
<p>03</p>	<p>W/10/00163/FUL – Dove Inn, Corton</p> <p>Additional comments received:</p> <p>Highways:</p> <p>‘Following a telephone conversation with a resident of the village I have examined the forward visibility available at the proposed access and at the existing main access to the site (at the northern part of the site).</p> <p>I have used the ordnance survey to estimate the forward visibility, i.e. the road/traffic in front as a vehicle travels around the bend in a northerly direction. At the proposed access location the forward visibility for vehicles travelling north, and wishing to turn into the proposed access, is appropriate for vehicles speeds of around 14mph and at the existing access the forward visibility is appropriate for vehicles speeds of approximately 23mph.</p> <p>It is clear the forward visibility is greater at the existing access. However I would expect vehicle speeds to be slow at this location and given the improvement gained by the loss of the two extremely substandard accesses to the south of the site I would not wish to object to the proposal as there is a highway safety gain in the loss of the two southern accesses.’</p> <p>On commenting further having visited the site:</p> <p>‘Having visited the site again I can confirm that the forward visibility at the proposed access point is slightly less than that at the existing northern access point. It also should be noted however that because the forward visibility is lower vehicle speeds would tend to be lower and therefore the stopping distance is reduced. Right turning vehicles benefit from having greater forward visibility to give them more time to manoeuvre.</p> <p>I believe that the use of the existing access would be a slightly better arrangement than using the proposed access. However I would not want the opportunity of closing the existing southern accesses to be lost as I feel that overall the scheme proposed is an improvement to the existing situation with three accesses, two extremely poor, remaining in use.</p> <p>Would it be possible to recommend a condition be attached to any permission granted to agree the northern access arrangement so that amendments were not required at this stage? From the plans I have I am confident that the use of the northern most access (existing access) would not have a detrimental impact on the proposed parking provision and layout.’</p> <p>Planning Officer Comments:</p> <p>The closure of the two original access points will be beneficial to highway safety.</p> <p>The Highway Officer is of the view that the retention of the third access would be a slight improvement on the proposed position which is to the south of the existing third access.</p> <p>However, she acknowledges that there is highway safety gain in closing the two existing points and on that basis would not wish to object. Furthermore, that traffic in the area of the proposed</p>

	<p>would be moving at slow speeds with sufficient space and time for manoeuvre.</p> <p>She has suggested a condition to the effect that notwithstanding the approved plans that the original access to the north is retained. This would be possible but in securing a slight improvement to highway safety other planning gains would be lost.</p> <p>Corton is a small village in which traffic movements are limited by the number of dwellings and visitors. The public house is close to the entrance to the village and the road through the village forms a loop of narrow width with a number of bends on which traffic speeds are slow.</p> <p>Even though there would be a slight improvement to visibility by retaining the existing northern access this would be outweighed by the fact that the entrance to the site would be to the rear of the public house. This is far from ideal.</p> <p>The access as currently proposed would open up the site and enhance its visual appearance and by making it more inviting to users. Views would be seen into the site of an enclosed courtyard arrangement with Cornicks Cottage and the frontage of the original public house would be given due prominence. Furthermore, the formation of the wall in place of the original rear access would act as a screen to parked vehicles and bin storage to the rear of the public house.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>No change to recommendation.</p>