|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **NORTH BRADLEY PARISH COUNCIL**  **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON**  **MONDAY, 1 NOVEMBER 2021 AT**  **NORTH BRADLEY PROGRESSIVE HALL** |

**COUNCILLORS PRESENT**

|  |
| --- |
| Cllr Bernard Clarkson (BC) |
| Cllr Tom Conner (TC) |
| Cllr Nick Crangle (NC) |
| Cllr Roger Evans (Chairman) (RE) |
| Cllr Mrs Pam Kettlety (PK) |
| Cllr Mrs Lee Lee (LL) |
| Cllr Horace Prickett (HP) |
| Cllr Mrs Viv Regler (VR) |
| Cllr Russell Willsmer (RW) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | There were 7 members of the public including Mr Nigel Bedford, architect for 54 Woodmarsh planning application. | | | |
| **Item** | **Record** | | | |
| 86 | Cllr Roger Evans welcomed everyone to the meeting and explained the proceedings. | | | |
| 87 | **APOLOGIES** Cllrs Mrs Jenny Joyce (JJ) Francis Morland (FM) | | | |
| 88 | **MEMBERS’ DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** None | | | |
| 89 | **ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING FOR MEMBERS OF PUBLIC 19:35** | | | |
| 89.1  89.2  89.3  89.3.1  89.3.2  89.3.3  89.3.4 | 54 Woodmarsh - Nigel Bedford addressed the parish council. He is working for Mr Shane Marshall, the owner of 54 Woodmarsh. He apologised for not having engaged with the parish council prior to the application which was registered sooner than he expected. There are some variations with the Neighbourhood Plan, but he explained that these things will be addressed at a later date. This application is purely for the outline. Wiltshire Council will be carrying out its own surveys, e.g. for archaeology and ecology. The principles of the Neighbourhood Plan will be ratified when the site moves on to a developer who will be responsible for the types of houses, possibly by summer 2022. He said that there will be an inevitable reduction in the number of houses due to the need for green space and perhaps wider boundaries. LL emphasised the need to preserve the landscape gap and to carefully consider lighting to protect the Bechstein bats known flight path. Mr Bob Sparke, a Woodmarsh, resident asked why he had not been consulted. RE advised that only residents in the closer vicinity were officially consulted and that there would be an opportunity for wider consultation with residents in the near future. Nigel Bedford assured everyone that there was no connection between the H2.2 development site and this application. RE thanked Mr Bedford for attending the meeting.  Flooding on Axe and Cleaver Lane – Mrs Gina Lunt addressed the parish council. She referred to her email dated 28 October about standing water on her property which is not usually there this early in autumn. She is also aware of water gushing across the bridle path from a drainpipe at the football club site. She would like to arrange an urgent meeting with concerned parties – Trowbridge Town Council, Trowbridge Town Football Club, Wiltshire Council drainage team, Wessex Water and the Parish Council. HP will co-ordinate this meeting. The Parish Council fully endorsed HP’s action and councillors resolved for the clerk to write to the football club and Trowbridge Town Council agreeing the need to carry out any necessary remedial work to alleviate the problem. RE is happy to take part in any discussions.  Unitary Cllr HP:  noted the damaged bench on Axe and Cleaver Lane. He asked if the Parish Steward could make it safe and if consideration could be given to purchasing a replacement. BC will check with the Parish Steward regarding insurance and RE asked for the matter of a new bench to go on next month’s agenda. Clerk to ask Idverde for quote to remove it.  Half hourly bus service was reduced to hourly during the pandemic. Timetabling was governed by central government. It is possible the that hourly service will not be reinstated in December due to the reduced number of passengers. HP will research how to make representations.  Waterloo train service – will be reducing to only one direct train a day and no through train back. There has been no prior consultation for this. Councillors resolved to make representations to MP Andrew Murrison.  Vandalised bus shelter – HP asked if the bus shelter was being replaced. The Clerk has been told that there is no budget for a new bus shelter and that it will be replaced by a pole. BC stressed the need to retain the flag and the timetable. | | | |
| 90 | **MINUTES**  The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 4 October, having been circulated previously, were approved and signed as a true record of the meeting. | | | |
| 91 | **MATTERS RISING** | | | |
| 91.1 | 76.2 Vehicles using The Rank bridleway – clerk has again chased this with Ali Roberts. | | | |
| 91.2 | 76.3 Plaque for Michael Holland for bench at Pine Walk – has been installed with thanks to TC and BC. | | | |
| 91.3 | 79 Traffic calming measures – Grant Shapps assistant stated that any decisions should be taken locally. | | | |
| 91.4 | 80 Flooding on Church Lane – Answer from Parvis Khansari, Director of Highways and Environment to Andrew Murrison – Flooding problems have been brought to the attention of WC drainage manager, Danny Everett who raised it with Wessex Water. Wessex Water Assessments are being carried out on Church Lane by WC Highways Dept and Wessex Water has commissioned a High-Level Assessment to determine the extent and likely cause of the flooding problems. Outcome unlikely to be known for several months. Following a site visit with the Parish Steward, Pat Whyte has also arranged for Ringway’s Vactor crew to visit the third site as part of their next scheduled visit. | | | |
| 91.5 | 82.2 Oak tree on The Common – due to be reduced and made safe 4th January and also carrying out protective work on Pine Walk sapling. | | | |
| 92 | **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL – APPLICATIONS RECEIVED** | | | |
|  | [PL/2021/09739](https://development.wiltshire.gov.uk/pr/s/planning-application/a0i3z000016TNLVAA4/pl202109739) **Application for** Outline Planning Consent for the construction of up to 32 residential units. Access on land to the rear of No. 54 Woodmarsh, North Bradley with all other matters including appearance, landscaping, layout and scale to be reserved. Councillors resolved to object agreeing the draft response previously circulated (Appendix 1) but to incorporate Mr David Feather’s objections. See final incorporated document (Appendix 2). | | | |
| 3  93.1  93.2 | **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL - DECISIONS MADE BY WILTSHIRE COUNCIL**  16/00547/FUL Land to the West of Drynham Lane and to the East of Eagle Park, Southview  Farm, Drynham Lane. Provision for 91 dwellings, ecological mitigation and associated infrastructure Applicant Wainhomes NB Objected, WC Refused  PL/2021/06047 - Lawful Development Certificate for an Existing Use at Kings Farm Annex, 6 Little Common, North Bradley, Trowbridge, BA14 0TX Use of annex as a separate dwelling house for a period in excess of four years NB Objected Withdrawn by applicant. Councillors resolved to request that Wiltshire Council’s Enforcement team investigate why the annexe is being used as a separate dwelling. | | | |
| 94 | **CORRESPONDENCE**  Email 18 October from Richard Havergal, lay minister, St Nicholas Church about Remembrance Sunday service and laying of a wreath. The Clerk is taking delivery of the wreath and will pass it on to HP who will lay the wreath. | | | |
| 95  95.1  95.2  95.3 | **MAINTENANCE** – For the latest list of Parish Steward tasks please contact the Clerk.  Allotments sign – HP has offered to fix sign on to the allotments site gate.  Broken manhole cover near allotments, Church Lane. Clerk to request repair by WC.  Holmfield Hum – Southwick Road resident reported to BC and JJ a very low frequency sound that is annoying her. It may be known as the Holmfield Hum. a village near Halifax. Halifax has spent months trying to find the source. Having researched it, the Parish Council was unable to offer a solution to the problem and wish to express their sympathy to the resident. | | | |
| 96 | **FINANCE** | | | |
|  | The following payments having been previously circulated, were approved and will be paid on-line. | | | |
|  |  | **Payee** | | **Amount** |
|  | 96.1 | Zoom subscription 10.10.21-09.11.21 | | £14.39 |
|  | 96.2 | K Elder Salary, office/travel expenses | | £528.91 |
|  | 96.3 | HMRC September | | £118.40 |
|  | 96.4 | Mirage Signs – Allotments sign | | £96.00 |
|  |  |  | |  |
|  |  |  | |  |
| 97 | **DATE OF NEXT MEETING Monday 6 December 2021, 19:30 at the Progressive Hall.** | | | |
|  | The meeting closed at 21:05  Signed ………………………… | | Date …………………… | |

**Appendix 1**

The Parish Council is very disappointed by the applicant’s lack of engagement with residents before submission of the application.

The applicant has been oblivious to the made Neighbourhood Plan, ignoring the proposed 25 dwellings on this site which the plan states “is more than large enough to accommodate immediate local needs as demonstrated in the HNS and SSR.” This site should be for the benefit of the parish; there is no mention of affordable housing.

This plan should not be considered in isolation; heed should be taken of the proposed H2.2 development.

Priority of the Neighbourhood Plan is for a landscape gap to be preserved between North Bradley and Trowbridge’s town boundary. There must be no potential for future vehicular access from this site to H2.2.

The Parish Council is concerned about access/egress in the event of an emergency and request that the northerly “hammerhead” be continued as a road to join up with the southerly cul-de-sac, removing plots 20 and 31, thus creating a loop and potentially a one-way system.

Assurance must be made that the Statutory Yard is maintained and that land belonging to The Hall is not encroached upon.  
The Hall relies on light through the windows on this side of the building, and this must be given due consideration.

**Appendix 2**

**Suggested special conditions/reasons for decision based on local knowledge**

The applicant’s proposal is dull and based on previous types of development that the White Paper rightfully criticises. The residents of North Bradley could not be proud of it. As mentioned in the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government’s White Paper of August 2020 “**Planning for the Future”** we have moved away from the principle of “no net harm” to one expecting some definite evidence of quality. Yes, this is an outline application but there is no evidence in the Design and Access Statement of any effort to provide a development fit for the future.

The Parish Council is disappointed not to have had the opportunity to engage with the applicant in advance of the application.

The applicant has been oblivious to the made Neighbourhood Plan, ignoring the acceptable 25 dwellings on this site which the plan states “is more than large enough to accommodate immediate local needs as demonstrated in the Housing Needs Survey and Site Selection Report.” This site should be for the benefit of the parish; there is no mention of affordable housing. The range of properties intended to be provided does not reflect the character of the village. Some bungalows are required, to allow existing older households to downsize and make larger homes available to developing families.

This application fails to take account of the White Paper which contains the following section:

“Pillar Two – **Planning for beautiful and sustainable places**

To do this, planning should be a powerful tool for creating visions of how places can be, engaging communities in that process and **fostering high quality development**: not just beautiful buildings, but **the gardens, parks and other green spaces in between**, as well as the facilities which are essential for building a real sense of community. **It should generate net gains for the quality of our built and natural environments - not just ‘no net harm.”**

As the report of the Building Better, Building Beautiful Commission has shown, all too often that potential has fallen short. Too many places built during recent decades fail to reflect what is special about their local area or **create a high-quality environment of which local people can be proud.**”

In the introduction to the document the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government wrote “This Government doesn’t want to just build houses. We want a society that has re-established powerful links between identity and place, between our unmatchable architectural heritage and the future, between community and purpose. **Our reformed system places a higher regard on quality, design and local vernacular than ever before, and draws inspiration from the idea of design codes and pattern books that built Bath, Belgravia and Bournville.** Our guiding principle will be as Clough Williams-Ellis said **to cherish the past, adorn the present and build for the future.**”

This plan should not be considered in isolation; heed should be taken of the proposed H2.2 development and incorporated into a master plan. Priority of the Neighbourhood Plan is for a landscape gap to be preserved between North Bradley and Trowbridge’s town boundary. There must be no potential for future vehicular access from this site to H2.2.

The Parish Council is concerned about access/egress in the event of an emergency and request that the easterly “hammerhead” be continued as a road to join up with the southerly cul-de-sac, removing plots 20 and 31, thus creating a loop and potentially a one-way system.

There is no provision for visitor parking. Whilst the Master Plan drawing shows a commercial vehicle completing a three-point turn, this is academic, as a simple visit to any development shows that on-road parking is not removed with any parking standards. A development of this type with double garages and two vehicles wide drives up to them will require a refuse vehicle to reverse to access the wheelie bins because of street parking. This is real life experience, not theoretical standards.  A loop system would mitigate this, and the road layout needs to reflect it.

There must be appropriate lighting to protect the flight path for the Bechstein bats.

There is no suggestion that the building heating will be by heat pumps, as the Government has just indicated will be a requirement. There is no mention of electric vehicle recharging facilities.

Importantly, the whole of the site is taken up by properties and roads. There is no communal facility for recreation. If there are to be a significant number of affordable properties, then some play provision is needed for young children, as the gardens to be provided are minimal in extent.

Assurance must be made that the Statutory Yard is maintained and that land belonging to The Progressive Hall is not encroached upon.

The Progressive Hall relies on light through the windows on this side of the building, and this must be given due consideration.

Overall, this is a very deficient application, well below the standards that the village would expect and, **so the application should be refused.**

**Date 02.11.21**