

MINUTES of the Planning Advisory Committee held online on Monday 11th January 2021 at 7pm

Membership:

Cllr Brett, (East)	*	Cllr Jeffries, Vice Chair (Copheap)	*
Cllr Doyle (East)	A	Cllr Nicklin, Chairman (West)	*
Cllr Fraser (West)	*	Cllr Spender (Broadway)	*
Cllr Fryer (Broadway)	*		

Key: * Present A Apologies AB Absent

In attendance:

Officers: Tom Dommert (Assistance Clerk), Stuart Legg (Park and Open Spaces Manager)
Judith Halls (Office Manager)

Online meeting attendees: 4 Attendees

PC/20/073 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received and accepted from Cllr Doyle

PC/20/074 Declarations of Interest

Cllr Fryer made a declaration of interest under Warminster Town Council's Code of Conduct issued in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 reference Planning Application 20/06550/FUL. He would speak during public participation but leave the meeting for the discussion and vote.

PC/20/075 Minutes

PC/20/075.1 The minutes of the meeting held on Monday 14th December 2020 were approved as a true record and signed by the chairman.

PC/19/075.2 None.

PC/20/076 Chairman's Announcements

The Chairman, Cllr Nicklin informed the committee that the application for the change of use of land from public space to domestic at Norridge View, was refused by Wiltshire Council. Pleasing to note as the town council had similarly opposed the application.

Signed.....Date.....

Another planning application that the town council had opposed, a proposal to split a garden in two in Ash Walk has now moved to appeal by the owners.

The Chairman, Cllr Nicklin informed the committee that outline planning had been received for the Warminster Western Urban Extension. Nothing immediate will happen, there are 39 conditions that must be complied with, most of which must be implemented before work starts on site. We will be looking at this planning application for many years to come.

PC/20/077 Questions

None.

PC/20/078 Public Participation

The Chairman had received several letters/emails from members of the public which he would read out before discussion of the relevant planning applications.

PC/20/079 Reports from Unitary Authority Members

None.

PC/20/080 Planning Application

20/10141/LBC Partial demolition of listed wall to facilitate proposed development of the site to provide five flats and associated works. Land At, The Close, Warminster, BA12 9AL

Members unanimously proposed refusal of this application owing to the conservation officer still having concerns about removal of this listed structure.

20/07214/REM Reserved Matters Application: Erection of 28 No. dwellings associated works (pursuant to 17/12348/OUT. Land East of Damask Way and East of Upper Marsh Road and North of Smallbrook Lane, Warminster, Wilts BA12 9PP

The Chairman read out comment from Harriet James who objected to the proposals.

Members unanimously proposed refusal of these reserved matters as Warminster Town Council continued to have concerns regarding the detail and the accuracy of submitted documents, particularly the ecological matters to which there may be a new and independent report available for the officer to consider. Warminster Town Council would like the planning officer to confirm that a full and proper assessment has been made and that the developer has conducted all the assessments in sufficient detail.

20/06550/FUL Erection of retirement apartments (category ii type) with communal facilities and car parking. Woodmead Residential Home, 35 Portway, Warminster, BA12 8QR

Cllr Rob Fryer addressed the Committee on behalf of residents of Portway. Their main concern was the visibility splay suggested by the Wiltshire Council Highways Officer and the consequential loss of parking. They all opposed the loss of parking. (Comments attached)

The Chairman, Cllr Nicklin read extracts from letters received from:

Sarah Stocken - Portway

Stephen Kerbel - Portway

Andrew Frostick - Portway,

Signed.....Date.....

M Woods - Portway
Mags Browne - Portway
(letters attached)

Cllr Nicklin proposed, in continuing to support this application, Warminster Town Council welcomed the adjustments to the balconies that McCarthy and Stone have offered following consultation with residents. The committee supports, however, the resident's objections to Wiltshire Council proposals to remove 43m each way of the on-road parking. Warminster Town Council do not believe that this is a necessary adjustment to the existing highway. The financial contributions to the improvement of the pedestrian access along Portway would be welcomed. The drainage officers objections are noted for Wiltshire Council to resolve with the applicant, seconded Cllr Jeffries. Voting 4 in favour, 1 against and Nil abstention. Motion carried

20/10196/FUL and 20/11107/LBC

Proposed 7 bedroom extension and rear Conservatory. Wren House, 32
Vicarage Street, Warminster, BA12 8JF

The Chairman, Cllr Nicklin read extracts of a letter received from Mr Simon Dicker on behalf of his father, Owen Dicker of Wren House Orchard regarding this planning application. Members noted that the documents loaded on the Wiltshire Council planning application portal seem to show different plans, one with 8 bedrooms and one with 10 bedrooms but the application for 7 bedrooms and is not listed.

Cllr Spender proposed that the committee object to the application on the ground that it cannot correctly assess the plans that have been submitted, the complete information is required to make an informed decision, seconded Cllr Fryer. Voting 4 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention. Motion for refusal carried.

20/05587/FUL and 20/06311/LBC

Proposed single storey rear extension. 64 Victoria Road, Warminster,
BA12 8HF

It was resolved that there was no objection to the application

20/10778/FUL Side utility extension & new garage roof 63 Manor Gardens,
Warminster, BA12 8PN

It was resolved that there was no objection to the application

PC/20/081 Tree applications

20/11129/TPO T1 Giant Redwood. Crown clean (remove deadwood and any hazardous branches). Target prune the longer branches in the mid to lower canopy by 1m to remove end weight and further risk of failure. In order to keep the tree safe in a high target area. 5 Heronslade, Warminster, Wilts, BA12 9HR

Noted

20/11238/TCA T1 - Hazel tree in parking area - coppice at 0.6m from ground level. 31 West Street, Warminster, BA12 8JY

Noted

Signed.....Date.....

- 20/11210/TCA
1. Seasonally prune the 3 Apple trees, thinning out congested growth and reducing the vertical growth back to the 3rd or 4th fruit buds from the main framework.
 2. Fell 1 very old Apple tree
 - 3 Thin the Sycamore by removing 20-30% of the central branches
 4. Remove the deadwood from the old Cherry and raise the canopy by pruning the lighter growth away from the cemetery.
 5. Thin out the Plums near the wall, removing the saplings and removing some of the stems within the ivy clad clump of plum. Lott House, 16 The Close, Warminster, BA12 9AL

Noted

PC/20/082 Communications

Members requested for press releases to be issued on their opposition to the proposed loss of car parking at Woodmead Residential Home, (20/06550/FUL) and on their opposition to Land East of Damask Way (20/07214/REM) due to concerns about loss of biodiversity. Cllrs Nicklin and Brett were nominated as spokesmen.

Meeting closed at 8.26.pm

Signed.....Date.....

From: Sarah Baker
Sent: 10 January 2021 20:26
To: Warminster Town Council
Subject: 20/06550/FUL WOODMEAD CARE HOME - RETIREMENT DEVELOPMENT

Warminster Town Council Planning Advisory Committee

To Town Clerk & Tony Nicklin.

Plans 20/06550/FUL Woodmead, 35 Portway

I am a resident of Portway at No 43

Before I go onto the subject of parking, it is really good news to see that McCarthy & Stone have altered what would have been quite large balconies on the north face of the building to Juliet balconies. It's great to see developers taking note of what neighbors have to say, and in some instances recognising that changes are needed. I'd just like to know where you think that we are going to park our cars

However **I am very concerned about Paul Galpin's letter** of 20 November calling for:

"... that the developer fund an amendment to the TRO to **extend no waiting across the site frontage (to ensure suitable visibility 2.4m x 43m)** in order to provide clear access and visibility splays"

Paul Galpin is calling for no parking across the whole 43 metres width of the Woodmead site. The reason given is:

"The Portway* has a significant flow and speed of vehicles in a location just off the town centre and the proposal will create a significant traffic generation. Despite what is stated in the supplied details, on balance there is no need for vehicles to obstruct visibility splays at this access in this location."

The road is called Portway not The Portway.

Let's take these points one at a time.

28.3464pt

1. Whoever thought that the current parked cars were "obstructing visibility splays"?

28.3464pt

2. Flow of traffic and speed. Yes Portway is fairly busy, but won't removing parking from one side of the street for 43 metres allow drivers to increase their speed even more! We need something that actually slows traffic down.

28.3464pt

3. The vehicles parked in Portway are nearly all cars, so there is little visibility obstruction, and the splays are already quite wide. You could make the 43m site frontage concerned for "cars only" (as in parts of Poole) so as to prevent large (visibility obstructing) vehicles from parking. OK, there must be more traffic created, but if you look at the other similar homes in town: Station Road, and Imber Court, you seldom see vehicles entering or exiting these sites. There is no rush hour.

28.3464pt

4. Not a planning Consideration, but this will remove at least 8 car parking places from Portway. Under normal circumstances, i.e. no Covid, parking on Portway is a problem for residents. Drivers sometimes leave their cars for days having taken a train to London for work. Shoppers, as its free parking, residents from further down Portway towards the roundabout are all trying to park. Residents from Portway and perhaps Woodmead visitors too, will end up parking in perhaps Westbury Road. This will be very unpopular with Portway (and future Woodmead) residents and totally unnecessary. Where are we going to park our cars ?

I object to this recommendation,

Kind regards

Sarah Galaun

From: Mags
Sent: 11 January 2021
To: Warminster Town Council
Subject: FW: The redevelopment of Woodmead Portway

Dear Councillors,

It has just been brought to my attention that McCarthy Stone have done an amendment to the original application on the redevelopment of the old Woodmead site in Portway with the possible loss of 12 parking spaces at the front of this development.

My family and I have lived and had various businesses in Warminster going back four generations. I bought my first home in Portway opposite the nursing home twenty seven years ago and still own the property, which is currently being renovated using all local tradesmen.

Parking in Portway never used to be a problem until the council brought in car parking charges. The Hospital car park overflows, as does the Multiple Sclerosis Centre, the Health Clinic and the Avenue School and this doesn't include the various people that park along Portway who do not want to pay the parking fees in the Station car park.

I completely understand that the council are under no obligation to provide parking for local residents but recommending the loss of these 12 parking spaces is absolutely absurd, making a difficult situation even more so for people that live in Portway.

I feel it is also completely unnecessary as Woodmead managed before so what has changed? I wonder if there is another agenda here, e.g. aesthetics, visual impact so people notice the McCarthy development as they drive past?

I hope you defend the local people of Warminster and do not approve this application recommended by Paul Galpin.

I have had personal experience of McCarthy Stone and as they boast on their website, they are the largest developer of privately owned retirement property in the UK, and can therefore run rings around us mere mortals if they so wish.

I hope you do not let this giant affect the lives of local residents, or if you do, then you should offer the people of Portway residential parking permits.

With the kindest of regards

Mags Browne.

To Warminster Town Council Planning Advisory Committee

Plans 20/06550/FUL Woodmead, 35 Portway

I must compliment McCarthy & Stone for taking on board the concerns of locals regarding the planned balconies on the north and west elevations shown on earlier plans and their replacement with Juliet balconies. **I support these plans and thank them.**

However I am very concerned about Paul Galpin's letter of 20 November calling:

"... that the developer fund an amendment to the TRO to extend no waiting across the site frontage in order to provide clear access and visibility splays"

So, Paul Galpin is calling for no parking across 96 metres length of road (12 car parking spaces). The reason given is:

"the proposal will create a significant traffic generation. Despite what is stated in the supplied details, on balance there is no need for vehicles to obstruct visibility splays at this access in this location."

Let's take these points one at a time.

1. Whoever thought that the current parked cars were "obstructing visibility splays"? 2. Flow of traffic and speed. Yes Portway is fairly busy, but won't removing parking from one side of the street for 96 metres actually speed traffic up? Yes it will. This is a dangerous proposal.

3. The vehicles parked in Portway are nearly all **cars**, so there is little visibility obstruction, and the splays are already quite wide. You could make the site frontage concerned for "cars only" (as in parts of Poole) so as to prevent large (visibility obstructing) vehicles from parking. OK, there must be more traffic created, but if you look at the other similar homes in town: Station Road, and Imber Court, you seldom see vehicles entering or exiting these sites. There is no rush hour.

4. Not a planning Consideration, but removing 12 car parking places from Portway will outrage residents of the whole street. Residents and perhaps Woodmead visitors too, will end up parking in perhaps Westbury Road. This is totally unnecessary.

I object to Paul Galpin's recommendations 1 and 2.

On 27.11.20 Vectos wrote a letter with a far more realistic viewpoint. This letter gives evidence why the former recommendations should NOT be followed.

I support Vectos' statement against Paul Galpin's recommendations.

Yours, Rob Fryer

From: Maureen Woods
Sent: 10 January 2021
To: Warminster Town Council
Subject: Planning Application no. 20/06550/FUL

Dear Sirs,

I am a Portway resident who has this evening been made aware of the above planning application which is the subject of a meeting to be held tomorrow, 11 January 2021. I would like to express my astonishment that the residents of Portway have not been informed of this application when it affects us all. Parking is already at a maximum with hospital staff and other workers wanting to park free. These, at times, leave very few parking spaces for Portway residents to park and many times I have had to park beyond the railway bridge or on Portway Lane, which I don't like to do as it affects their available spaces.

I have read through the initial information regarding the application and I do not recall there being any mention of parking spaces being allocated on the main road. I had understood that a set amount of parking spaces had been allocated for the residents on site. I object to the application put forward by Paul Galpin and support Vectos. The existing residents of Portway main road should not be put at a disadvantage and left

with nowhere to park! If it is the case that these parking spaces are to people servicing the flats ie carers, cleaners etc then they should have to park ad hoc along with everyone else.

Yours faithfully

Ms M Woods

From: Sarah Stocker
Sent: 11 January 2021
To: Warminster Town Council
Subject: Possible reduction in available parking on Portway, Warminster adjacent to former Woodmead Care Home ref. Wiltshire Planning Application planning 20/06550/FUL

F.A.O. Tony Nicklin, Steve Jeffries, Denis Brett, Andrew Davis

Dear Councillors,

I have read with interest the communications between Vectos, Paul Galpin and Eileen Medlin, Principal Planning Officer. I am fully in support of Vectos and its proposals appertaining to the McCarthy and Stone development. I cannot see that there is a need for splayed bays to be created as incoming and exiting traffic would be no greater than when the site was used as a care home. This section of Portway is sufficiently wide and straight ensuring good visibility in both directions for road users and pedestrians alike. The speed of road users however needs to be reduced through traffic calming measures as the present limits are rarely adhered to.

It seems that the arguments to force the developers to pay for the construction of splayed bays and the loss of parking spaces is more financially driven than for reasons of safety, greatly to the detriment of current Portway residents.

Parking is always at a premium on Portway and the loss of 12 spaces would be disastrous and would greatly affect the majority of households, who have one and in some cases two vehicles. To find alternative parking elsewhere nearby is always difficult if not impossible. Some local business users, hospital workers and train users persist in using Portway parking spaces during the day, so if a Portway resident moves their vehicle and then returns a little later there is nowhere to park and one risks getting a ticket if temporarily parking at the hospital or in the Iceland car park.

I hope that sense prevails and that the Council do not push for a reduction in this much needed local amenity.

Yours sincerely
Sarah Stocker

From: stephen kerbel
Sent: 09 January 2021 19:28
To: Warminster Town Council
Cc: Mags; demi16
Subject: Subject: 20/06550/FUL WOODMEAD CARE HOME - RETIREMENT DEVELOPMENT

To Planning Department.

Dear Committee

Residents have been alerted to a planning meeting that will take place on Monday 11th January evening at which there may be an agenda item concerning the reduction in the existing Portway street parking provision. Please read this letter to the meeting when this matter is discussed.

We are residents living on Portway. I live opposite the proposed development at 72 Portway. There is already inadequate parking provision on and around Portway for residents. We object to the reduction of parking space. It is difficult to be certain of the origin of a proposal to reduce parking space, but it seems to arise out of an email from Paul Galpin to Eileen Medline on 20 November 2020 found in the Council's online collection of documents. It contained a section:

'Visibility Splay / Traffic Regulation Order / Refuse collection'.

"... there is no need for vehicles to obstruct visibility splays at this access in this location. It is considered reasonable in this location that the developer fund an amendment to the TRO to extend no waiting across the site frontage (to ensure suitable visibility 2.4m x 43m) in order to provide clear access and visibility splays. The TRO will also ensure an extended clear way for the refuse vehicle. The swept path drawing supplied clearly illustrates the existing TRO arrangement is tight with a 11.3m refuse vehicle. The applicant has now confirmed that the refuse arrangement will be the same as the extant use, whereby kerbside collection waste operatives park on Portway and operatives collect bins from designated areas, that are located close to the entrance. Therefore it is considered reasonable that the developer provides a £6,000 contribution in order that the TRO across the site frontage is adjusted accordingly. The TRO should be advertised prior to the commencement of development, in line with a suggested condition."

Mr Galpin thinks that some money from the developer to Council provides a satisfactory resolution to the problem created by kerbside refuse truck waste collection and other large vehicles access. Mr Galpin's solution demonstrates a lack of concern for existing residents. It renders this proposal odious to residents, to common decency and is risible as our cherished legal and democratic processes are sufficiently robust and will defeat it. I know how, in the midst of a complex negotiation, a bit of tunnel vision may momentarily misguide.

The Council is working hard to balance local needs with those of a commercial developer. There are better solutions to this street parking and vehicle access to the site issue.

First principle – Build for the whole community - The developer must provide benefits and accommodate the community, not the reverse.

Take the problem off the road. Mr Galpin should not accept as authoritative the developers desire to keep refuse vehicles from entering the site. That is for Council to decide. Use some of the landscaped frontage between the building and the start of the pavement. Make it sufficiently large for a dust truck to enter, turn, load and exit the site. The developer may be pleased with the visual impact enhanced by an internal, wide and clear turning space inviting visitors to the buildings, close by the entrance from Portway.

The high cab height of a dust truck gives clear visibility over the tops of any cars parked on Portway and cars travelling on Portway will easily see high refuse vehicles emerging.

Apply a height restriction to vehicles parked on the frontage of the development. No high vehicles park on Portway anyway, so no ratepayers will be inconvenienced.

If still concerned about the safety of large vehicles entering and exiting the development, apply a reduced speed limit, say 20 MPH to this section of Portway.

The financial cost of the solution is negligible and should not necessitate the developer paying any more than Mr Galpin proposes.

For implementing a solution that is non-invasive to pedestrians, residents, ratepayers, road users and with little impact on the developer, Council will prove its adherence to sound principles of governance, understanding and community.

Yours faithfully

Stephen and Cathy Kerbel

Assistant Clerk

From: andrew frostick
Sent: 09 January 2021
To: Warminster Town Council;
Subject: Woodmead Redevelopment Application - 20/06550/FUL

Dear Councillors,

It has been brought to my attention that the Planning Application for the redevelopment of the Woodmead site by Vectos 20/06550/FUL has had a Highways requirement added which will significantly affect Portway residents by the loss of twelve on-street parking places.

As a local resident, having supported this redevelopment to this point, I am very greatly concerned by the response from Mr Paul Galpin, Senior Planning Officer, Highways.

The loss of twelve, on-street parking places will have an enormous and detrimental effect to the lives and property values of residents of Portway, who use this invaluable amenity to the full.

The parking is used by households from the entire length of the Portway, along with nursing staff from the hospital.

The existing vehicular, on-street parking makes a marked contribution to the slowing of speeding traffic, which is a significant problem for local residents. Any removal of parking spaces will cause significant issues for residents in terms of the loss of a vital amenity, and a potential increase in the speed of traffic. If the Highways requirement is upheld, I will object at the strongest level to the redevelopment, as will a majority of Portway residents.

In recent years, there has been a marked chipping away at the amenity of Portway on-street parking accessibility by over-development, with no consideration to the impact on the lives of local residents.

It is now a relentless, daily struggle to park. Finding a space for contractors to work on these period properties is nigh-on impossible. Indeed, I have had some contractors say that it is in fact easier to park in Central London, others are not interested to be contracted here at all for this very issue.

I would hope that you will look very closely at the Highways response, and if it is a fixed requirement of development, then sadly I would propose that - on behalf of all Portway residents - the application is rejected by the Town Council.

This is an unfortunate change of circumstance, as Vectos have worked hard to satisfy the concerns of the local residents thus far.

Kind Regards

Andrew and Gaynor Frostick

Warminster Town Council

From: Simon Dicker -
Sent: 02 January 2021
To:
Cc:
Subject: Planning Application 20/10196/FUL
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Yancy,

Please could you look at this application in respect of the target date for decision. This is listed on the Council website as 12th January 2021. I do not understand how this can be in January as the consultation period does not end until 5th February 2021. I would be grateful if you could check and confirm this for me.

I would also like to ask if you could publish a full list of consultees as I understand this is a legal obligation. As of today, 2/1/2021, the consultees listed are Wiltshire Council Highways, Wiltshire Council Archaeology, Historic England, Warminster Town Council, Wiltshire Council Landscape & Arboricultural Officer (Central), Wiltshire Council Drainage Engineer, Wiltshire Council Conservation (Central), and Cllr Pip Ridout. Please can I ask why the list of consultees used on previous applications to this site in 2017 and 2019 has not been used this time? This list includes all leaseholders at Wren House Orchard and other near neighbours impacted by proposals on this garden site.

Lastly the documents loaded on the website appear to contain two different designs. For example, Plan 1803 - 17 GA Existing and Proposed Elevations is not the same design as 1803 -21 Site Plans GA - the first shows a conservatory to the east boundary and the second shows an additional row of bedrooms fronting the pedestrian path. These are significant material differences because the actual footprint of the build is changed as well as the overall building profile and occupancy. Please can you clarify which design is being consulted on as it is not possible to comment fully until this is established?

The next Warminster Town Council Planning Committee meeting is advertised as occurring on 11th January at 7pm. I have copied in the Planning Committee members as I want to ensure they have the correct information in order to make their recommendation. Please be aware that access for construction materials, equipment and staff is only available through the turning into Wren House off Vicarage Street. Wren House Orchard leaseholders will not allow access in or through their car park at the North of the site. There is insufficient space in Wren House to turn a large vehicle. We would ask the Town Council to consider this when assessing the viability of large construction vehicles attempting to reverse out into Vicarage Street between two rows of parked cars and busy pedestrian and vehicle traffic all alongside the day to day business of running a care home. We believe that decisions made by Planning Committees are crucial to maintaining public safety and that Councillors require full understanding of the known constraints and risks in order to responsibly evaluate these proposals. These matters must not be ignored in an area that has already seen fatalities caused by traffic.

I look forward to your reply and clarifications and to be able to make further comment in relation to this application before 11th January 2021.

Best wishes,

Owen F. Dicker,

(transcribed and emailed by Simon Dicker, on behalf of Owen).

Warminster Town Council

From: Giles-Franklin, Verity
Sent: 05 January 2021
To: Warminster Town Council
Subject: RE: Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: 20/06311/LBC

Hi Judith,

Happy New Year to you.

Thank you for your email regarding the above applications. I can confirm that an extension of time until 12 January is acceptable.

The applicant, Gill Withington, has asked whether it is possible for her to discuss their plans with you in order to provide an opportunity for them to explain the rationale behind their plans. The applicant has provided the below summary which she has asked me to share with you.

I have lived at 64 Victoria Road since 2006. We want to stay here and we are committed to ensuring that the property is kept well maintained whilst also adapting it to ensure it meets the needs of our family life for the future. There are a number of things to consider in relation to this:

The need for a fourth bedroom. My parents are both in their late eighties. I would like to be able to offer them accommodation should they need it, either to stay temporarily or perhaps permanently. For this reason we would like to extend to incorporate a fourth bedroom on the ground floor with an en suite bathroom. Furthermore, we would like to consider this a house we could stay in as we get old and so this extension would support us in the future too.

The desire to extend the living space of the kitchen and dining area. This would support our growing family. The ability to extend will also provide us with some flexibility in living, for example I have the opportunity to work from home but currently I cannot set up a working space which facilitates this so I drive to Chippenham Hospital on most days.

We are committed to maintaining the historic fabric of the house and will be guided by the Council as to whether they would advise traditional or a more contemporary style, if permission is granted. We have already voiced our commitment to changing the PVC window frames at the front which were put in before I purchased the house

Would it be best for me to ask Gill to contact you directly?

Kind regards,
Verity