

AGENDA Planning 22nd June 2026 FIN _____	2
AGENDA ITEM 06a Meeting Gleesons regarding land East of Blackmore Farm 5th March 2026 _____	7
AGENDA ITEM 06a Response to consultation Land East of Blackmore Farm _____	11
AGENDA ITEM 06c - Wick Farm Cover Letter & Planning Statement _____	12
AGENDA ITEM 08b - Correspondence with WC re possibility of plans changing _____	20
AGENDA ITEM 08b & 08c - Correspondence re s73 variation to highway requests _____	22
AGENDA ITEM 08e Correspondence regarding A365 junction for Old Loves Farm development _____	24
AGENDA ITEM 08h - Correspondence from applicant agent_Redac- ted _____	26
AGENDA ITEM 09a(ii) MWPC submission to LDS Planning Inspector re cumulative impact _____	32
AGENDA ITEM 10b(ii) 26-07_5Year_Housing_Land_Supply_and_Gy- psies_Travellers_Accommodation_Assessment _____	33
AGENDA ITEM 11a - Response to PINS for further comments _____	40
AGENDA ITEM 11a APPEAL DECISION - 6003438 _____	44
AGENDA ITEM 12 - Enforcement for cable runs before permission granted _____	48
AGENDA ITEM 14c - correspondence re comm building funding in Woodrow s106 _____	50
AGENDA ITEM 14c - correspondence re lack of flood mitigation funding in Upside s106 _____	53



MELKSHAM WITHOUT PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk: Mrs Teresa Strange

First Floor
Melksham Community Campus,
Market Place, Melksham,
Wiltshire, SN12 6ES
Tel: 01225 705700

Email: clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk

Web: www.melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk

Monday 15th June 2026

To all members of the Council Planning Committee: Councillors Richard Wood (Chair of Committee), Alan Baines (Vice Chair of Committee), David Pafford (Vice-Chair of Council), John Glover (Chair of Council), Mark Harris, Peter Richardson and Martin Franks

You are summoned to attend the Planning Committee Meeting which will be held on **Monday 22nd June 2026 at 7.00pm at Melksham Without Parish Council Offices (First Floor), Melksham Community Campus, Market Place, SN12 6ES** to consider the agenda below:

PLEASE NOTE THAT THERE IS WORK BEING UNDERTAKEN IN THE CAMPUS CARPARK SO LEAVE PLENTY OF TIME TO ARRIVE AND FIND A PARKING SPACE AS THERE WILL BE FEWER SPACES AVAILABLE THAN USUAL. YOU MAY NEED TO USE ALTERNATIVE CAR PARKS IN THE AREA.

TO ACCESS THE MEETING REMOTELY, PLEASE FOLLOW THE ZOOM LINK BELOW. THE LINK WILL ALSO BE POSTED ON THE PARISH COUNCIL WEBSITE WHEN IT GOES LIVE SHORTLY BEFORE 7PM.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/2791815985?pwd=Y2x5T25DRIVWVU54UW1YWWE4NkNrZz09&omn=86924162069>

Or go to www.zoom.us or Phone 0131 4601196 and enter: **Meeting ID: 279 181 5985**
Passcode: 070920. Instructions on how to access Zoom are on the parish council website www.melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk. If you have difficulties accessing the meeting please call (do not text) the out of hours mobile: 07341 474234

YOU CAN ACCESS THE AGENDA PACK HERE

Yours sincerely,

Teresa Strange, Clerk



Serving rural communities around Melksham

AGENDA

1. **Welcome, Announcements & Housekeeping**
2. **To receive Apologies and approval of reasons given**
3. **Declarations of Interest**
 - a. To receive Declarations of Interest.
 - b. To consider for approval any Dispensation Requests received by the Clerk and not previously considered.
4. **To consider holding items in Closed Session due to confidential nature**

Under the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, the public and representatives of the press and broadcast media be excluded from the meeting during consideration of agenda items where publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest because of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.
5. **Public Participation**
6. **To consider the following new Planning Applications, including Permission in Principle applications received within the required timeframe (14 days):**
 - a. **[PL/2026/02966](#) - Blackmore Farm, Sandridge Common, Melksham, SN12 7QS (East of Blackmore)** Outline planning application for the erection of up to 275 dwellings (including affordable housing), associated infrastructure, landscape and biodiversity enhancements, with all matters reserved except for the main access from Sandridge Common. Applicant name: Gleeson Land. **Comments by: 26 June 2026**
 - b. **[PL/2026/03064](#) - Barns at Beanacre Manor, Beanacre** Listed building consent (Alt/Ext): Repair external cladding and replace floor plus missing doors and windows: Applicant name: Mr Peter Hood. **Comments by: 26 June 2026**
 - c. **[PL/2026/02752](#) - Land North of Melksham Substation, Near Melksham, Wiltshire (Wick Farm)** Removal/variation of conditions: Variation of Conditions 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 of 20/06840/FUL - Construction of a solar farm and battery storage facility together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure. Applicant name: JBM Solar Projects 13 Ltd. **Comments by: 02 July 2026**
 - d. **[PL/2026/03357](#) - Home Farm, Shaw Hill, Shaw, Melksham, SN12 8EW** Reserved matters planning application for the erection of 2No. dwellings with all matters reserved apart from appearance, landscaping and scale. Applicant name: Mr & Mrs Weaver. **Comments by: 10 July 2026**
7. **Amended Plans/Additional Information:** To comment on any revised/amended plans/additional information on planning applications received within the required timeframe (14 days).
8. **Current planning applications:** Standing item for issues/queries arising during period of applications awaiting decision.

- a. [PL/2024/10345 \(FULL\)](#) and [PL/2025/09780 \(OUT\)](#) **Land north of the A3102, Melksham (New Road Farm)**. The construction of 295 homes; public open space, including formal play space and allotments; sustainable drainage systems; and associated infrastructure; with 0.4ha of land safeguarded for a nursery. The principal point of access is to be provided from a new northern arm on the existing Eastern Way/A3102 roundabout junction, with a secondary access onto the A3102. Additional access points are proposed for pedestrians and cyclists. Applicant: Bloor Homes South West
- PL/2024/10345 (FULL) – No new documents or comments
 - PL/2025/09780 (OUT) – No new documents or comments
- b. [PL/2026/01555](#) - **Land at Blackmore Farm, Sandridge Common, Melksham, SN12 7QS**. A reserved matters application (appearance, layout, scale and landscaping) for 229 dwellings and associated infrastructure – Reserved Matters pursuant to Outline permission PL/2023/11188 Applicant name: BDW Trading Ltd (David Wilson Redrow South West).
- No new documents or comments
 - To consider feedback from Wiltshire Council (if received) on scheme revisions
 - To consider alignment of the proposed development with the following sections of Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2:
 - Policy 5 (Pre-application Community Engagement)
 - Policy 8 (Infrastructure Phasing and Priorities)
 - Policy 11 (Sustainable Transport and Active Travel)
 - Priority Statement 1 (Transport Infrastructure – Bypass)
 - Priority Statement 2 (Levels of Growth and Infrastructure)
- c. [PL/2025/07391](#) - **Land South of Western Way, Melksham, Wiltshire**. Reserved Matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for 210 residential dwellings (Use Class C3), along with associated open space, landscaping, and parking, pursuant to Condition 2 of Outline Planning Permission ref. PL/2022/08504. Applicant name: BWD Trading.
- No new documents or comments
 - [PL/2026/01378](#) Discharge of Condition 18 (Construction Management Statement) of PL/2022/08504 – no new comments or documents.
 - [PL/2026/01660](#) Discharge of Condition 19 (Noise Protection Scheme) of PL/2022/08504 – no new comments or documents.
- d. [PL/2025/06749](#) - **Land North of Bath Road (A365), Melksham (Adjacent to Melksham Oak Community School)**
Outline planning application (with all matters except access reserved) for mixed use development comprising residential (up to 205 dwellings), land reserved for expansion of secondary school, public open space, landscaping and associated engineering works. Applicant Name: Hannick Homes & Developments Ltd
- No new documents or comments.
- e. [PL/2025/06105](#) **Land at Bowerhill Lane, Bowerhill, Melksham (Old Loves Farm)**
Outline Planning Permission: Erection of up to 50 No. dwellings and associated works. Applicant name: The Silverwood Partnership. **Comments by 11 June 2026**

- No new documents or comments
 - To consider feedback from Wiltshire Council, if received, regarding access arrangements
- f. [PL/2025/00626](#) **Land North of Berryfield Lane, Melksham, SN12 6DT**: Outline planning application for up to 68 dwellings and formation of new access and associated works (All matters reserved other than access).
- No new documents or comments
- g. [PL/2024/09725](#) **Land off Corsham Road, Whitley, Melksham (Middle Farm)** Outline planning application (with access, layout and landscaping to be approved) for up to 22 dwellings, new access off Corsham Road, public open space, drainage and associated works.
- To consider responses to recent correspondence (if received)
- h. [PL/2026/02084](#) - **554 Canal Bridge, Semington, Trowbridge, BA14 6JT** Full planning permission: Proposed erection of 1no. high-quality, sustainable, single storey dwelling including car port, home office; new planting and biodiversity enhancement measures.
- To consider any additional comments further to correspondence from applicant

9. Proposed Energy Installations

- a. Lime Down Solar (LDS)
- i. To note Planning Inspectorate updates on the Lime Down Solar Project
<https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010168/project-updates>
 - ii. To note the comments submitted to the LDS Planning Inspector on behalf of Melksham Without Parish Council in response to the question on cumulative impact.
 - iii. To note Wiltshire Council's Local Impact Report including an assessment of the Lime Down Solar project with the policies in the Melksham Joint Neighbourhood Plan (page 183)
[EN010168-001245-Lime Down LIR FINAL.pdf](#)
- b. Cable Route for Norrington Spring Park Project (Aureos for SSEN Distribution) and Studley Solar Farm (DNOC for Verdant Energy)
- i. To note the meeting planned with Aureos on Wednesday 1st July at 10am
- c. [PL/2025/05552](#) **Land South of Brockleaze, Neston, Corsham, SN13 9TE**. Full planning permission: Battery Energy Storage System with associated infrastructure.
- No new documents or comments
- d. Wiltshire Council Engagement about Cumulative Impact.
- To consider Wiltshire Council response to 12 recommendations from the parish council (if received).

10. Planning Policy:

a. Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan (NHP):

- i. To reflect on responses to planning applications for future review of the Neighbourhood Plan (standing item)

b. Wiltshire Council's Draft Local Plan:

- i. To consider any information, if received, on the impact of the withdrawal of the draft Local Plan
- ii. To note the revised 5-year Land Supply figure from Wiltshire Council

11. Appeals

- a. To note the Planning Inspector's request for further comments on the Snarlton Farm appeal, the comments submitted due to short timescales, and to ratify the cost of advice sought to inform the response.
- b. To note appeal decisions (if determined)
 - To note the decision to dismiss the appeal for Land South of 214B Corsham Road, Whitley, Melksham (PL/2025/08613 / appeal ref: 6603438) and consider any further comments on current planning applications in light of the decision

12. Planning Enforcement: To note any new planning enforcement queries raised and updates on previous enforcement queries.

- 13.** To consider latest updates and follow up for the build of the development behind Townsend Farm, Semington Road PL/20/07334 (Phase 1)& PL/2022/08155 (Phase 2)
- To note proposed meeting with developers

14. S106 Agreements and Developer meetings: (Standing Item)

a. Updates on ongoing and new S106 Agreements

- i. Pathfinder Place
- ii. To note any S106 decisions made under delegated powers

b. Contact with developers:

- i) To note the proposed meeting with Bellway on 24th June 2026

c) Transparency of draft s106 agreements: to consider correspondence with Wiltshire Council (if received)

Copy to all Councillors

Meeting with representatives of Gleesons regarding land East of Blackmore Farm held on Thursday 5th March 2026 at 4:00pm at Melksham Without Parish Council Offices at Melksham Community Campus

Present: Councillor Richard Wood (Chair of Planning)
Councillor Alan Baines (Vice Chair of Planning)
Councillor John Glover (Chair of Council)
Councillor David Pafford (Vice Chair of Council)
Councillor Mark Harris

Wiltshire Councillor Nick Holder, Bowerhill
Councillor Saffi Rabey, Mayor of Melksham

Teresa Strange, Parish Clerk
Fiona Dey, Parish Officer

Ellen Timmins, Gleeson
Emily Pearson, I Transport
Clare Danks, Origin3
Emily Bell, Turley

Developer Presentation – Land at Sandridge Common (Proposed Phase 2 of Blackmore Farm Development)

As Chair of Planning, Councillor Wood chaired the meeting. He welcomed Emily, Emily, Ellen and Clare to the meeting and introduced those present.

The developers delivered a presentation using a series of slides summarising the site, the development proposals, layout and height parameters plan, illustrative masterplan, landscape proposals, access arrangements, connectivity, consultation undertaken and next steps.

It was noted that Gleeson Homes are considering this development as Phase 2 of the consented Blackmore Farm site to the east (PL/2023/11188). Members also noted, however, that the site is not included in Policy 18 (Land East of Melksham) within the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan.

The developers explained that the layout of the site is constrained by overhead power lines and proximity to the Grade II listed Blackmore House. Members also noted that the proposal only includes 30% affordable housing and that no bungalows have currently been specified within the development.

Members raised a number of concerns and discussed several aspects of the proposal:

Access

Vehicular access to the site is proposed via a new T-junction from Sandridge Common, located between Blackmore House and Lopes Close. The developers advised that the proposed access meets the required design standards.

Members expressed significant concern regarding the proximity of this access to the entrance serving Phase 1 of the development, which would result in two new junctions connecting to the already busy and potentially dangerous A3102. Members also noted that the proposed junction does not include a separate right-turn lane for vehicles entering the site.

Members reiterated their preference for a roundabout at this location. Wiltshire Councillor Holder commented that the proposed access arrangement is not acceptable and indicated that he may need to call-in the application due to these concerns.

Melksham By-Pass Route

Members noted that the proposed Melksham by-pass route passes through the site.

The developers responded that the by-pass is currently considered an aspiration, and that there is no defined route set out within current planning policy that would require safeguarding within the site layout.

Members expressed concern that it would be cavalier to disregard the potential route, particularly given that the A350 has been identified by National Highways as the preferred strategic route for traffic travelling between the M4 and Poole.

The Clerk will share available information regarding the Melksham by-pass.

Bus Plan

Plans indicate a bus gate within the development, although this could potentially evolve into a vehicle access point in the future.

The developers advised that a transport assessment and travel plan will be undertaken. Wiltshire Councillor Holder questioned whether the proposed bus services would realistically materialise.

Members noted that the Section 106 agreement for Phase 1 includes contributions towards an East of Melksham bus strategy. Members also requested that any new bus stops include shelters, seating and Real Time Information displays.

Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2

Members noted that the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan is referenced within the proposal.

Councillor Pafford explained that the site is not allocated within either the Neighbourhood Plan or the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan and is therefore considered speculative development.

The developers acknowledged that the site sits outside current allocations but stated that they are promoting it as a sustainable extension to the consented development. They also advised that the proposals have been developed with regard to the policies and themes within the relevant plans, and that further detail would be provided as part of the planning application.

Wiltshire Councillor Holder commented that it was disappointing that the site had not been brought forward earlier, allowing it to be incorporated into a single comprehensive masterplan alongside the consented site.

Connectivity

The plans include pedestrian, cycle and vehicle connections between the consented Phase 1 site and the proposed Phase 2 development.

There will also be pedestrian access to Praters Lane Bridleway (MELW40). However, there will be no public access to the existing Eight Acre Plantation.

Members also noted that the footpath along the A3102 will be widened.

Lopes Close

Members queried the cluster of housing proposed adjacent to Lopes Close, expressing concern that this group of properties could become isolated from the remainder of the development.

The developers explained that the orientation of the new dwellings has been designed to align with the existing properties on Lopes Close.

BESS Safety

The Parish Officer raised concerns regarding the distance between the proposed dwellings and the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) located at Sandridge Solar Farm. She reiterated the Parish Council's concerns regarding BESS safety.

Public Consultation

Members requested that the developers undertake further consultation once the issues raised at the meeting have been addressed.

They advised that the developers should hold an in-person consultation event and ensure that residents along Sandridge Common are fully included in the consultation process.

The Clerk will provide details of suitable venues for such an event. It was also noted that the developers intend to meet with residents of Lopes Close.

Members considered the existing two-week consultation period to be too short.

Noise Impact Report

The Clerk questioned whether the noise impact report would consider noise and vibration from the nearby BESS, as well as the cumulative impact of air source heat pumps within the development.

Further Information

The Clerk will provide the developers with a list of items routinely requested by Melksham Without Parish Council when reviewing development proposals.

The meeting closed at 5:30pm

Fiona Dey

From: Fiona Dey
Sent: 23 March 2026 16:11
To: Alice Jones; Emily Bell
Cc: John Glover; Lola Newton; nick.holder@wiltshire.gov.uk; Teresa Strange
Subject: RE: Notification of EIA Scoping Submission – Land East of Blackmore Farm, Melksham
Attachments: Meeting Gleesons regarding land East of Blackmore Farm 5th March 2026.pdf

Dear Alice,

Re: Land at Sandridge Common (Proposed Phase 2 of Blackmore Farm Development)

Please find enclosed notes from the meeting held on Thursday 5th March 2026 between representatives of Melksham Without Parish Council, Wiltshire Council, Melksham Town Council, and Gleeson Homes, together with their consultants, regarding proposals for the development of land at Sandridge Common.

The meeting provided an opportunity for members to receive a presentation from the developer outlining initial proposals for what is being considered as Phase 2 of the consented Blackmore Farm development. The discussion covered a range of matters including site layout, access arrangements, connectivity, landscape considerations, and community infrastructure.

While members welcomed the early engagement, a number of significant concerns were raised. In particular, these relate to highway access arrangements and the lack of clarity regarding the safeguarding of a potential Melksham by-pass route.

Additional concerns were expressed regarding the cumulative impact on the A3102, the level and type of affordable housing provision, and the absence of bungalows public transport viability, connectivity, potential isolation of parts of the development, and safety considerations in relation to the nearby Battery Energy Storage System.

Members also noted that the site is not currently allocated within the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan or the emerging Wiltshire Local Plan, and therefore consider the proposal to be speculative in nature.

The Parish Council has requested that the developer undertake further, more comprehensive public consultation once the issues identified have been addressed. This should include an in-person event and broader engagement with local residents.

The enclosed notes provide a detailed record of the discussions and matters raised, which the Parish Council expects to be fully considered and addressed as the proposals progress.

Please consider the notes, together with this email, the formal response from Melksham Without Parish Council to the consultation.

Kind regards
Fiona

Fiona Dey
Parish Officer
Melksham Without Parish Council
First Floor
Melksham Community Campus
Market Place, Melksham
Wiltshire, SN12 6ES
01225 705700

Our Ref: PL/P20-0137/S73

22nd April 2026

Wiltshire Council,
County Hall,
Bythesea Road,
Trowbridge,
BA14 8JN

Planning Portal Reference: PP-14747209

Dear Sir/Madam,

Section 73 Application – Variation of Conditions 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20 attached to Planning Permission (Reference: 20/06840/FUL) on:

Land North of Melksham Substation, Near Melksham, Wiltshire.

Please find enclosed an application made under the terms of Section 73 (“S73”) of the Town and Country Planning Act (“TCPA”) 1990 (as amended) at the above site. This application is submitted on behalf of our client JBM Solar Projects 8 Ltd.

Application Background

A request for a Screening Opinion under Regulation 6 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment ‘EIA’) Regulations 2017 was submitted to Wiltshire Council on 15th April 2020 (reference: 20/03232/SCR). A Screening Opinion was subsequently adopted on the 18th May 2020 which stated that an EIA was not required.

Planning Permission (reference: 20/06840/FUL) for ‘Construction of a solar farm and battery storage facility together with all associated works, equipment and necessary infrastructure’ was granted by Wiltshire Council on 17th December 2021 subject to 20 conditions.

The following conditions have been discharged;

Condition	Application Ref:	Description	Discharged
4	PL/2023/00556	Surface Water Drainage Scheme	29/3/23
5	PL/2023/06596	Construction Method Statement	28/9/23
8	PL/2023/06596	Construction Traffic Management Plan	28/9/23
10	PL/2023/06978	Construction Environmental Management Plan	11/10/23

33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ
T 01285 641717 E Cirencester@pegasusgroup.co.uk
Offices throughout the UK.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales.
Registered Office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, Gloucestershire, GL7 1RQ

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE



11	PL/2023/08039	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan	11/10/23
12	PL/2023/06978	Monitoring Strategy (Biodiversity and Ecological Management Plan)	11/10/23
15a	PL/2023/10436	Partial Discharge of Archaeology in respect to WSI / Works	3/1/24
16a	PL/2023/10436	Partial Discharge of Archaeology in respect to programme	3/1/24
17	PL/2023/10438	Geotechnical Stability	21/2/24
18	PL/2023/10889	Battery Details	6/2/24
20	PL/2023/10889	Equipment Details	6/2/24

Additionally, a Non-Material Amendment (PL/2023/10437) was granted 4th January 2024 in respect to changes to the Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan. This was following discussions with the County Archaeologist Neil Adam, as part of the ongoing archaeological works in relation to Conditions 15 and 16 and involved the reduction in ballasted area and seed mix.

As part of this Non-Material Amendment, the following plans were approved which supersede those listed on the decision notice for the planning permission.

Approved NMA Plans

- Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan Updated (reference: P20-0137 10/11/2023).
- Site Layout and Planting Plan (reference: P20-0137_09 Rev M).
- Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (reference: P20-0137_19 Rev F).
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (reference: P20-0137_EN_20B).

Application Documents

In support of this S73 application, please find enclosed the following:

1. Application Form and Ownership Certificates

Plans:

2. Typical 3P Fixed Table Ballasted – Drawing No: NIO3-0001 Rev 2
3. Typical Above Ground Cabling – Drawing No: NGO3-0405 Rev 1

Documents:

4. Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (AMMP) Updated (Ref: P20-0137 17/04/2026)
5. Written Scheme of Investigation for a Programme of Archaeological Monitoring and Recording (Ref: CR1588, Rev E) – March 2026



Proposed Variations

Variation 1 – Internal Cable Route Change

The purpose for seeking a Section 73 variation to planning permission 20/O6840/FUL is for a change of the approved HV/LV cabling route via a different railway underpass which is required by the client for practical reasons.

Details of the existing approved HV/LV cabling route are controlled by plans found within the Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (“AMMP”) and are included in Appendix 1: Development Layout (Plan Name: Solar Farm Layout).

As set out in the updated AMMP submitted with this application, a number of archaeologically sensitive areas have been identified termed exclusion zones which the updated cable route passes through. The AMMP requires that within these areas, mitigation is necessary when work occurs, including trenching. Please refer to the submitted AMMP for further details.

As such, an updated Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan is being submitted, making amendments to Appendix 1 as well as wording within the document reflecting the change in internal cable route and any subsequent mitigation requirements.

Conditions affected in respect to the route change include the below which all make reference to the AMMP;

- Condition 15 (Archaeology)
- Condition 16 (Archaeology)
- Condition 3 (Approved Documents and Plans)

Justification

The proposed change to the internal cable route is acceptable on the account that mitigation works are proposed as part of the AMMP which account for the amended route which traverse the archaeological exclusion zones. An updated WSI has been submitted to and agreed by the County Archaeologist which take into consideration these route changes. There are no impacts/changes to the previously agreed proposed overground proposals and as such can be considered acceptable in relation to other planning considerations.

Variation 2 – Change of fixing method of PV to ground

A further requirement for seeking a Section 73 variation to planning permission 20/O6840/FUL is to include and alternate method for fixing of the PV array from the use of concrete monobloc / ballast, to gabion baskets.

Details of the existing approved ‘ballasted solar system’ are controlled by plans previously found within the Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (“AMMP”) and are also set out separately in Condition 3 under the respective plan/document names;

- Drawing Title. Typical Ballasted PV Table Details Rev A.
- Document. Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (Version



3 / November 2021).

As such, an updated Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan is being submitted, making amendments to Appendix 3 as well as wording within the document (Para 2.5) reflecting the change in fixing method/materials.

Conditions affected in respect to the change of fixing method include the below which all make reference to the AMMP;

- Condition 15 (Archaeology)
- Condition 16 (Archaeology)
- Condition 3 (Approved Documents and Plans)

Justification

The proposed changes to the fixing method are not considered to be materially different to the previous method and they are equally suitable from an archaeological perspective. As such, the proposed variation is considered to be acceptable.

Proposed Variations to Conditions

Proposed changes to conditions 15, 16 and 3 are set out below in order to address Variations 1 and 2 as set out above.

Proposed Variation to Condition 15 (Archaeology)

Condition 15 states:

"No development shall commence until:

a) A written programme of archaeological investigation, and mitigation where appropriate, for:

i. the required cable connection across National Grid-owned land to the south of Westlands Lane, as detailed within paragraphs 2.9 – 2.11 of the approved Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (Version 3 / November 2021); and

ii. selected other construction groundworks within the main site area, as detailed within paragraph 3.12, where relevant, and paragraph 3.21 of the approved Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (Version 3 / November 2021), and anywhere else within the site area not evaluated, – which should include on-site work and off-site work such as the analysis, publishing and archiving of the results – has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority; and

b) The approved programme of archaeological work has been carried out in accordance with the approved details."

It is proposed to vary this condition to ensure compliance with the documents previously approved under application PL/2023/10436 as well as the updated AMMP submitted with this application.



A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was previously discharged under application PL/2023/10436. An updated WSI is being submitted which accounts for changes as set out in this s.73 application. This document has been reviewed and agreed by the County Archaeologist.

Submitted with this application

- Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (AMMP) Updated (Ref: P20-0137 17/04/2026)
- Written Scheme of Investigation for a Programme of Archaeological Monitoring and Recording (Ref: CR1588, Rev E) – March 2026

Proposed Variation to Condition 16 (Archaeology)

Condition 16 states:

"No development shall commence until:

a. A written programme of archaeological investigation for the selected areas within Fields 9, 10 and 12 that will be subject to strip map and sample excavation, as detailed within paragraph 2.7 of the approved Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (Version 3 / November 2021) and shown on drawing no. P20-0137 within Appendix 7 of that Plan – which should include on-site work and off-site work such as the analysis, publishing and archiving of the results – has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority; and

b. The approved programme of archaeological work has been carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the commencement of the development."

It is proposed to vary this condition to ensure compliance with the documents previously approved under application PL/2023/10436 as well as the updated AMMP submitted with this application.

A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) was previously discharged under application PL/2023/10436. An updated WSI is being submitted which accounts for changes as set out in this s.73 application. This document has been reviewed and agreed by the County Archaeologist.

Submitted with this application

- Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (AMMP) Updated (Ref: P20-0137 17/04/2026)
- Written Scheme of Investigation for a Programme of Archaeological Monitoring and Recording (Ref: CR1588, Rev E) – March 2026



Proposed Variation to Condition 3 (Approved Documents and Plans)

Variation of Condition 3 is proposed to resolve two distinct matters:

- Incorporate plan changes to account for change of fixing method of PV to ground as per updated drawing Typical Ballasted PV Table Details as per Variation 2 above. This sits alongside submission of the updated AMMP.
- Ensure the approved plans listed in Condition 3 account for updated documents submitted as part the Non-Material Amendment (PL/2023/10437) which was granted 4th January 2024 and updated plans/documents submitted with this application.

On the basis of the above, the following plans/documents previously listed in Condition 3 should be removed:

- Document. Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (Version 3 / November 2021).
- Drawing no. P20-O137_09 Rev J. Title. Site Layout and Planting Plan.
- Drawing no. P20-O137_19 Rev C. Title. Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan.
- Drawing Title. Typical Ballasted PV Table Details Rev A.

The following plans/documents are to be added:

- Archaeological Mitigation and Management Plan (AMMP) (Ref: P20-O137 17/04/2026)
- Site Layout and Planting Plan (reference: P20-O137_09 Rev M) (as approved through NMA)
- Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan (reference: P20-O137_19 Rev F).
- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (reference: P20-O137_EN_20B).
- Typical 3P Fixed Table Ballasted – Drawing No: NIO3-0001 Rev 2
- Typical Above Ground Cabling – Drawing No:NGO3-0405 Rev 1

Variation 3 – Discharged Conditions to Compliance Conditions

Further to the above changes, this application also seeks to vary conditions that previously required details to be submitted for approval to reflect where these have already been discharged. As such, the following conditions also need to be made compliance conditions:

- Condition 4 – Surface Water Drainage Scheme
- Condition 5 – Construction Method Statement
- Condition 8 – Construction Traffic Management Plan
- Condition 10 – Construction Environmental Management Plan
- Condition 11 – Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
- Condition 12 – Monitoring Strategy (Biodiversity and Ecological Management Plan)
- Condition 17 – Geotechnical Stability;
- Condition 18 – Battery Details
- Condition 20– Equipment Details



The proposed variations to the conditions are set out below:

Proposed Variation to Condition 4 (Surface Water Drainage)

Condition 4 should be amended to require compliance with the following document approved on 29th March 2023 under application reference PL/2023/00556:

- Discharge of Planning Condition 4 (Ref: 20/06840/FUL) Note, dated December 2022, prepared by PFA Consulting. (Version J115-DOC04-DISCON 4-Issue 1)

Proposed Variation to Condition 5 (Construction Method Statement)

Condition 5 should be amended to require compliance with the following document approved on 28th September under application reference PL/2023/06596

- Construction Method Statement (CMS) (Rev P20-0137 TRO2 July 2023) by Pegasus Group

Proposed Variation to Variation Condition 8 (Construction Management Plan)

Condition 8 should be amended to require compliance with the following document approved on 28th September 2023 under application reference PL/2023/06596

- Construction Traffic Management Plan (P20-0137 TRO1 Sept 2023 Rev A) by Pegasus Group

Proposed Variation to Condition 10 (Construction Environmental Management Plan)

Condition 10 should be amended to require compliance with the following document approved on 11th October 2023 under application reference PL/2023/06978

- Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (V2 09/08/2023) by Avian Ecology

Proposed Variation to Condition 11 (Landscape and Ecological Management Plan)

Condition 11 should be amended to require compliance with the following document approved on 11th October 2023 under application reference PL/2023/08039

- Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (P20_0137_EN_20A).

Proposed Variation to Condition 12 (Monitoring Strategy)

Condition 12 should be amended to require compliance with the following document approved on 11th October 2023 under application reference PL/2023/06978

- Monitoring Strategy (Biology) (V2 09/08/2023) by Avian Ecology

Proposed Variation to Condition 17 (Geotechnical Stability of Rail Line)

Condition 17 should be amended to require compliance with the following document approved on 21st February 2024 under application reference PL/2023/10438

- Wick Solar Geotechnical Risk Assessment Report (Dated 15th October 2023) by Natural Power"



Proposed Variation to Condition 18 (Equipment Details)

Condition 18 should be amended to require compliance with the following document(s) approved on 6th February 2024 under application reference PL/2023/10889

- Battery Storage System Details 1 – Rev A
- Battery Storage System – Auxiliary Equipment Details – Rev A
- Site Layout and Planting Plan – P20-O137_09 Rev M

Proposed Variation to Condition 20 (Battery Details)

Condition 20 should be amended to require compliance with the following document approved on 6th February 2024 under application reference PL/2023/10889

- Table 1 – Building Material and Colour Finishes – December 2023

Draft Conditions List

During the application process, we would be grateful if the LPA could provide a full list of draft conditions prior to determination, so the parties can agree that the decision notice will correctly reflect any previous approvals and updated to plans and documents provided as part of this application.

Validation

The planning application fee of £2,167 inc VAT (plus Planning Portal service charge) has been paid direct to the Planning Portal in line with the requirements of an online submission.

I trust that the submitted details are sufficient to allow the validation of this application and progression towards determination.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at the earliest opportunity should you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,



Adam Clegg

Senior Planner

adam.clegg@pegasusgroup.co.uk

Teresa Strange

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 04 June 2026 23:07
To: stevensims
Cc: Nick.Holder@wiltshire.gov.uk; Fiona Dey
Subject: Blackmore Farm Reserved Matters PL/2026/01555

Hi Steve

Hope you are well.....

Melksham Without Parish Council are going to spend a considerable amount of time reviewing all the documents for the Reserved Matters application.

As several consultees have already asked for some reviews to the plans, do you think they will change - we don't want to spend a lot of time commenting, and then they change!

Any insight before our next Planning Committee would be useful, Many thanks, Teresa

Teresa Strange
Clerk, Melksham Without Parish Council

-----Original Message-----

From: Wiltshire Council <planning@sf.wiltshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 June 2026 15:35
To: Teresa Strange <clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>
Subject: Thank you for your comments PL/2026/01555

This email is confirmation that Wiltshire Council has received your comments as set out below. Your response to this consultation will be reviewed prior to it being made public and whilst every effort is made to publish comments as soon after receipt as possible, sometimes there can be a delay of up to 48 hours for which we apologise and for any inconvenience the delay may cause. During this time your comment is available for inspection by the Planning Officer.

Melksham Without Parish Council
Consultee (Statutory)
Stance : Object

Your Comment:

Melksham Without Parish Council raise the following concerns:

- The application is being considered in isolation from the remainder of the wider site allocation and lacks a comprehensive masterplan demonstrating how future phases will integrate with this phase of development. This makes it difficult to properly assess movement, connectivity, open space provision, drainage, landscape treatment and infrastructure delivery across the site as a whole.
- Significant concerns have been raised by Wiltshire Council's Urban Design, Landscape and Housing Enabling Teams. The Parish Council supports these concerns and considers that amendments should be made before the application is determined.
- Clarification is required regarding compliance with the affordable housing requirements contained within the approved Section 106 Agreement. Comments from the Housing Enabling Team suggest that the affordable housing provision proposed do not accord with the agreed obligations.
- The Parish Council shares the concerns raised regarding the quality of the layout, public realm, landscaping, character areas and overall design approach. The development should demonstrate compliance with Policy 20 (Locally Distinctive, High Quality Design) and Policy 18 (Landscape Character) of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2.

- The application should clearly demonstrate how walking, cycling and public transport connections will integrate with surrounding development parcels and the wider allocation in accordance with Policy 11 (Sustainable Transport and Active Travel).
- The Parish Council supports the detailed comments submitted by the Environment Agency and Drainage officers and requests that all drainage, flood risk and maintenance issues are fully resolved before any approval is granted, in accordance with Policy 3 (Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management).

Based on the comments made by the statutory consultees, members expect to see significant revision of the scheme prior to determination. Members will continue the review the application.

Planning Team
Wiltshire Council

This email originates from Wiltshire Council and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information and may be subject to Copyright or Intellectual Property rights. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete the email from your inbox. Any disclosure, reproduction, dissemination, modification and distribution of the contents of the email is strictly prohibited. Email content may be monitored by Wiltshire Council to ensure compliance with its policies and procedures. No contract is intended by this email, and any personal opinions expressed in this message are those of the sender and should not be taken as representing views of Wiltshire Council. Please note Wiltshire Council utilises anti-virus scanning software but does not warrant that any e-mail or attachments are free from viruses or other defects and accepts no liability for any losses resulting from infected e-mail transmissions. Receipt of this e-mail does not imply consent to use or provide this e-mail address to any third party for any purpose. Wiltshire Council will not request the disclosure of personal financial information by means of e-mail any such request should be confirmed in writing by contacting Wiltshire Council.

Teresa Strange

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 15 June 2026 16:39
To: stevensims
Cc: Nick.Holder@wiltshire.gov.uk; Fiona Dey
Subject: RE: Re cumulative impact of developments at East of Melksham & Bowerhill

Hi Steve

I hope you are well.....

As the planning officer for both Land South of Western Way and Blackmore Farm – are you able to confirm if a s73 application for a change of condition could be applied to these two applications please, or if part of the outline permission and so would require a fresh application?

Further to the meeting below, we have not had a response.

1. Blackmore Farm PL/2023/1118 for 500 dwellings – the parish council would like to see the access changed back to a roundabout, especially in light of the new application for another application to the east, PL/2026/02966, for another 275 dwellings
2. Land south of Western Way PL/2022/08504 for 210 dwellings and care home – further to the highways comments that the access for construction should not go via Maitland Place the parish council but via the emergency access on to the A365 – the parish council agree with the recent resident comments that the main development access should be directly onto the A365 and a left in/left out arrangement, with only emergency access via Maitlands Place

With many thanks for any comments here,
With kind regards, Teresa

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 22 May 2026 14:20
To: 'Collins, Gary' <gary.collins@wiltshire.gov.uk>; 'Corps, Kimberly' <kimberly.corps@wiltshire.gov.uk>; 'Foster, Adrian' <adrian.foster@wiltshire.gov.uk>; 'Smith, Martin' <martin.smith@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Nick.Holder@wiltshire.gov.uk; Fiona Dey <office@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Re cumulative impact of developments at East of Melksham & Bowerhill

I should have mentioned that on the Blackmore Farm site, its not to change where the access is, just back to a roundabout.

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 22 May 2026 14:19
To: Collins, Gary <gary.collins@wiltshire.gov.uk>; Corps, Kimberly <kimberly.corps@wiltshire.gov.uk>; Foster, Adrian <adrian.foster@wiltshire.gov.uk>; Smith, Martin <martin.smith@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Nick.Holder@wiltshire.gov.uk; Fiona Dey <office@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>
Subject: Re cumulative impact of developments at East of Melksham & Bowerhill

Dear Gary, Kim and Cllrs Smith and Foster

Thankyou for your time when you met at the Melksham Without Parish Council offices for the meeting arranged by Cllr Nick Holder about the cumulative effect of the many developments in the Bowerhill ward.

At the time, you mentioned that although regrettable, there was nothing that could be done to change the approved access of the 500 dwelling Blackmore Farm development as this had been approved at outline permission.

On another development in Bowerhill, residents are asking if a s73 agreement can be used to change the access agreed at outline (appeal) and so I am asking the question if this is possible the Blackmore Farm application.

They have supplied the following example where this was used at another local planning authority

<https://democracy.teignbridge.gov.uk/documents/s16333/3.17.02330.MAJ%20CH1%20Chudleigh%20S73.pdf>

The reference number of the approved Blackmore Farm application (Local Plan site allocation policy 18) is PL/2023/11188 (current Reserved Matters is PL/2026/01555. We have been advised by the applicant that they have now submitted their application for the site to the east, and is with yourselves for validation at present.

The site that the residents are asking for the change of access is Land south of Western Way (PL/2022/08504) approved at appeal with access through the residential Maitland Place for 210 dwellings and a care home. The highway officer comments that construction traffic should not come through Maitland Place but use the emergency access on the A365 (agreed by the parish council) means that they are now challenging again the approved access for the site through Maitland Place too. You may have a comment on that too.

With many thanks for any consideration,
Enjoy the sunny long weekend!
With kind regards, Teresa

Teresa Strange
Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer
Melksham Without Parish Council
First Floor
Melksham Community Campus
Market Place, Melksham
Wiltshire, SN12 6ES
01225 705700
www.melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk

Wellbeing Statement I may send emails outside office hours but never with any expectation of response. Please just get back to me when you can within your own working hours. Thank you.

Want to keep in touch?

Follow us on facebook: [Melksham Without Parish Council](#) or [Teresa Strange \(Clerk\)](#) for additional community news

On X: [@melkshamwithout](#)

On Instagram: [melkshamwithoutpc](#)

On LinkedIn: [Melksham Without Parish Council](#)

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, please forward it to admin@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk

Please be aware that information contained in this email may be confidential and that any use you make of it which breaches the common law protection may leave you personally liable. Our privacy notice can be found [HERE](#).

We do not guarantee that any email is free of viruses or other malware.

Fiona Dey

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 04 June 2026 23:16
To: Corps, Kimberly; Collins, Gary
Cc: nick.holder@wiltshire.gov.uk; Fiona Dey; david.lear@wiltshire.gov.uk
Subject: Land at Bowerhill Lane (Old Love's Farm) PL/2025/06105

Hi Kim and Gary

Hope you are both well.....

When you both visited our offices recently for the meeting that Cllr Nick Holder arranged, you mentioned that there was no scope for any holistic review highways approach for the application for 50 dwellings on the A365 for the Old Loves Farm application.

The parish council note however that amended plans have just been submitted for this outline application, so question why this cannot be still looked at.

They are concerned, as you know, about the cumulative effect of the developments proposed on this short stretch of the A365 and that they are being looked at in isolation.

They don't understand why a ghost lane/island is proposed for the Hannick development on the other side of the road, and for the Gompels application next door but not this one; its not consistent.

Can this please be looked at again?

The parish council's latest comments of the amended plans are below, but their detailed comments, particularly on the highways aspect, are on the planning portal, which includes the details of the safety improvements being installed shortly via LHFIG for the turning at Hornchurch Road, and the ones recently installed for Bowerhill Lane - all as a result of the accident, and covert camera evidence.

I have also copied to the Highways Officer who I think made the comments, for information, and for a request for a review of the parish council's concerns.

With many thanks,

Teresa

Teresa Strange

Clerk

Melksham Without Parish Council

01225 705700

-----Original Message-----

From: Wiltshire Council <planning@sf.wiltshire.gov.uk>

Sent: 04 June 2026 15:28

To: Teresa Strange <clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>

Subject: Thank you for your comments PL/2025/06105

This email is confirmation that Wiltshire Council has received your comments as set out below. Your response to this consultation will be reviewed prior to it being made public and whilst every effort is made to publish comments as soon after receipt as possible, sometimes there can be a delay of up to 48 hours for which we apologise and for any inconvenience the delay may cause. During this time your comment is available for inspection by the Planning Officer.

Melksham Without Parish Council

Consultee (Statutory)

Stance : Object

Your Comment:

Melksham Without Parish Council noted that amended plans had been submitted but remain concerned regarding the principle of development.

Whilst acknowledging minor improvements to the layout, members considered that the amendments did not overcome the fundamental objections previously submitted. They emphasised that:

- The proposal remains speculative development outside the defined settlement boundary and outside allocations within Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (JMNP2).
- Highway concerns remain unresolved, particularly the creation of an additional junction without a turning lane/ghost islands onto the A365 and cumulative impacts alongside other approved and proposed accesses.
- The development would adversely affect the setting of the listed farmhouse, contrary to Policy 21 (Local Heritage) and Policy 18 (Landscape Character).
- Members rejected the suggestion that the proposal represented “infill” development.
- Members considered that approval of the nearby Gompels warehouse application should not be used as a precedent to justify residential development on this site.

Planning Team
Wiltshire Council

This email originates from Wiltshire Council and any files transmitted with it may contain confidential information and may be subject to Copyright or Intellectual Property rights. It is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender and delete the email from your inbox. Any disclosure, reproduction, dissemination, modification and distribution of the contents of the email is strictly prohibited. Email content may be monitored by Wiltshire Council to ensure compliance with its policies and procedures. No contract is intended by this email, and any personal opinions expressed in this message are those of the sender and should not be taken as representing views of Wiltshire Council. Please note Wiltshire Council utilises anti-virus scanning software but does not warrant that any e-mail or attachments are free from viruses or other defects and accepts no liability for any losses resulting from infected e-mail transmissions. Receipt of this e-mail does not imply consent to use or provide this e-mail address to any third party for any purpose. Wiltshire Council will not request the disclosure of personal financial information by means of e-mail any such request should be confirmed in writing by contacting Wiltshire Council.

Teresa Strange

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 15 June 2026 15:26
To: 'Adam Brill'
Cc: [REDACTED] Fiona Dey
Subject: RE: Planning application: PL/2026/02084

Dear Adam

Thank you for your email and for setting out your response to the Parish Council's comments.

The Parish Council's objection was resolved by its Planning Committee following consideration of the application against the adopted development plan and relevant material planning considerations. Under the Council's procedures, the Council cannot revisit or reverse a decision within six months unless there is new material information or a properly made motion to do so.

I will, however, report your correspondence to the next Planning Committee meeting (22nd June) so that members are aware of the points you have raised. The Committee can then decide whether it wishes to submit any further comments to Wiltshire Council.

With regard to the previous application 16/06564/OUT, I note your comments. However, the current application must be assessed against the current development plan including the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 that was made in Summer 2025.

The Parish Council's request for the application to be called in, should officers be minded to approve it, remains in place unless and until the Council resolves otherwise.

With kind regards,
Teresa

Teresa Strange
Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer
Melksham Without Parish Council
First Floor
Melksham Community Campus
Market Place, Melksham
Wiltshire, SN12 6ES
01225 705700
www.melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk

Wellbeing Statement I may send emails outside office hours but never with any expectation of response. Please just get back to me when you can within your own working hours. Thank you.

Want to keep in touch?

Follow us on facebook: [Melksham Without Parish Council](#) or [Teresa Strange \(Clerk\)](#) for additional community news

On X: [@melkshamwithout](#)

On Instagram: [melkshamwithoutpc](#)

On LinkedIn: [Melksham Without Parish Council](#)

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, please forward it to admin@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk

Please be aware that information contained in this email may be confidential and that any use you make of it which breaches the common law protection may leave you personally liable. Our privacy notice can be found [HERE](#).

We do not guarantee that any email is free of viruses or other malware.

From: Adam Brill <adambrill@abadesign.co.uk>

Sent: 12 June 2026 09:38

To: Teresa Strange <clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED] Fiona Dey <office@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>

Subject: RE: Planning application: PL/2026/02084

Morning Teresa,

Apologise for taking my time to respond to the Parishes concerns.

Based on your reasons for refusal I understand you have requested that Andrew Griffin call the application in to the planning committee if it were to be recommended for approval by the case officer.

I don't however understand your reasons for doing so. I have set out below my response to your reasons for refusal below to help you better understand the proposals and alleviate any concerns you may have.

1. Impact on the Green Wedge and Settlement Separation (Policies 18 & 19 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2)

- **Logical Contiguity:** The site is physically adjacent to the existing residential form at No. 554 and the Canal Bridge cluster. It is not "isolated" but represents a sensitive "rounding off" of the built environment.
- **Maintaining the "Gap":** The proposal is for a single dwelling on a small 0.15ha plot, which is insufficient to "erode" the wider strategic gap between Berryfield and Semington.
- **Landscape Protection:** By proposing a **single-storey** profile with a **sedum roof**, the design maintains the open, horizontal character of the canal-side landscape. Unlike a two-storey development, this low-profile structure will be largely screened by existing boundary hedgerows, which are to be retained in their entirety. I also note that the Parish council did not previously object to 2No. proposed 2 storey dwelling houses as an outline application.

2. Sustainability and Transport (Policy 11 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2)

- **Active Travel Integration:** The objection regarding "limited accessibility" is factually contradicted by the site's location. The site is less than **100m** from the Kennet & Avon Canal towpath and adjacent to **National Cycle Routes 4 and 403**.

- **Service Proximity:** The site is within a **2–13-minutes walk** (100m–1.1km) of core village services, including the primary school, village hall, and public house.
- **Digital Connectivity:** The provision of a dedicated **home office** paired with available **gigabit-capable fibre broadband** in Semington creates a genuine "live-work" environment, actively reducing the need for private car use.

3. Design and Heritage (Policies 18, 20 & 21 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2)

- **Contextual Materiality:** The design utilises **dry-stone effect walls** and **parapet gables**, reflecting the traditional vernacular of the West Country and the historic canal infrastructure.
- **Architectural Quality:** The "incongruous" claim is rebutted by the high-quality "eco-dwelling" specifications, including **sedum and zinc-roofs** and **native wildflower landscaping** that enhances the canal-side aesthetic rather than detracting from it.
- **Heritage Preservation:** The proposal respects the historic canal environment setting with a **single storey low level building** with a **sedum roof** and maintaining a 12m Root Protection Zone for the mature Ash tree, and the vegetation on the eastern boundary therefore preserving the natural "green" frame of the canal bridge area.

4. The "Precedent" and Infill Argument (Policies 6, 18 & 19 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2)

- **Case-by-Case Basis:** Planning applications must be determined on their own merits. A single, high-quality self-build does not set a precedent for "sporadic" development, as few sites share this unique combination of contiguity and sustainable transport links.
- **Genuine Infill:** Given the site is bounded by a residential property to the south and a road to the east, it functions as a small-scale infill opportunity.

5. The "Tilted Balance" (NPPF Paragraph 11)

- **Housing Land Supply Deficit:** Critically, Wiltshire Council currently reports a significant shortfall in its 5-year housing land supply, with figures as low as **2.42 years**.
- **Legal Weight:** Under the NPPF, the policies cited by the Parish Council for "Settlement Separation" are currently deemed **out-of-date and should be given reduced weight in determining this application**. Permission should be granted unless the harm *significantly and demonstrably* outweighs the benefits. The environmental and housing delivery benefits of this eco-home clearly meet this threshold.

I would also like it noted that the Parish Council did not object to the previous application 16/06564/OUT for the erection of two detached dwellings and new access on this site.

Therefore my conclusion is that the Parish Council's objections rely on a geographic interpretation of the village boundary that fails to account for the site's actual functional connectivity and the Council's current housing deficit. The proposal is a high-quality, sustainable response to a specific site that protects the landscape while delivering a much-needed self-build home.

I would very much appreciate it if the Parish council would see fit to remove their objection to this proposal with a revised statement to the case officer in support of the application or indeed a no comment.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Kind Regards

Adam Brill

Director



Follow US - [INSTAGRAM](#) - [FACEBOOK](#) - [LINKEDiN](#)

Belmont House, 53 High St, Chapmanslade, Wiltshire, BA13 4AN - Tel: +44 (0) 1373 832 133 - Mob: 07713 635 121 - Email: adambrill@abadesign.co.uk

AB Architectural Design Ltd. Registered in England & Wales: 5974368. Registered office: The Barn Bangle Farm, Stoney Lane, Chantry, Frome, BA11 3LH

The content of this message is confidential. Do not copy this message to anyone outside your organisation. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me by return and destroy your copy. Although we take reasonable precautions against viruses, we cannot guarantee that email is always secure, complete and error-free. Protect your systems and check for viruses on incoming emails.

Please don't print this email unless absolutely necessary

From: Teresa Strange <clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 May 2026 14:34
To: Adam Brill <adambrill@abadesign.co.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED] Fiona Dey <office@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Planning application: PL/2026/02084

Dear Adam

Further to the parish council's Planning Committee on Monday evening, here are the comments that are being submitted to Wiltshire Council – we are aware there is a delay for checking before Wiltshire Council upload them hence sending to you directly as you have been in touch.

With kind regards, Teresa

PL/2026/02084 - 554 Canal Bridge, Semington, Trowbridge, BA14 6JT.

Full planning permission: Proposed erection of 1no. high-quality, sustainable, single storey dwelling including car port, home office; new planting and biodiversity enhancement measures.

Councillor Wood did not take part in any discussion)*as had declared an interest earlier in the meeting as knows the applicant*)and Councillor Baines (Vice Chair) chaired the discussion.

Comments: OBJECT

Members acknowledged the sustainability measures proposed but expressed concerns regarding:

- Loss of open countryside within the green gap/wedge Berryfield and Semington, contrary to Policy 19 (Separation of Settlements) and Policy 18 (Landscape Character) of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2, which seek to protect the open countryside that maintains the separation and distinct identity of settlements and preserves the rural character of the area. Members considered that the proposal would erode the openness of the canal-side landscape and contribute to incremental encroachment into the countryside. It considers the canal to be the edge of Semington village.
- Concern that the proposal represented an unsustainable form of development in a location heavily reliant on private car use, contrary to Policy 11 (Sustainable Transport and Active Travel) of the Joint

Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2. Members noted the limited accessibility to services, facilities and public transport and considered that the site did not promote sustainable travel choices.

- Concern regarding the inappropriate and incongruous design of the proposal within the rural canal-side setting, contrary to Policy 20 (Locally Distinctive, High Quality Design), Policy 18 (Landscape Character) and Policy 21 (Local Heritage) of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2. Members considered that the scale, form and appearance of the proposed dwelling and associated domestic features would fail to respond positively to the character of the surrounding landscape and historic canal environment.
- Concern that approval of the proposal could create a precedent for infill and sporadic residential development within the surrounding countryside and green wedge, undermining the objectives of Policy 19 (Green Wedges) and Policy 18 (Landscape Character) of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2.
- Members also considered that the site did not constitute genuine infill development and that the proposal would instead represent isolated encroachment into the open countryside, contrary to the spatial principles and settlement objectives of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2, including Policies 6 (Housing at Defined Settlements), 18 (Landscape Character) and 19 (Separation of Settlements).

Resolved: To object to the application on the grounds of inappropriate design, unsustainable location and impact on the green wedge.

Councillor Wood resumed the Chair.

From: Adam Brill <adambrill@abadesign.co.uk>

Sent: 07 May 2026 12:21

To: Teresa Strange <clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>

Cc: [REDACTED]

Subject: Planning application: PL/2026/02084

Dear Members of the Parish Council,

Re: Planning Application PL/2026/02084 – Full Planning Permission: Proposed erection of 1no. high-quality, sustainable, single storey dwelling including car port, home office; new planting and biodiversity enhancement measures.

As the Architectural Designer for this project I am writing to formally register my support for the proposed single-storey dwelling at Land North of 554 Canal Bridge. As I am unable to attend the upcoming planning meeting in person, I would like my comments to be considered during your deliberations.

I believe this application should be supported for the following reasons:

- **Sympathetic Design and Scale:** Unlike previous multi-storey proposals for this site, this scheme is for a single-storey dwelling of a high quality. The use of dry-stone walling and a sedum roof ensures the building will blend into the rural fringe rather than dominate it.
- **Logical Infill:** The site is physically adjacent to the existing residential cluster at Canal Bridge. It represents a sensible "rounding off" of the village boundary in a way that does not lead to significant encroachment into the open countryside.

- **Exceptional Sustainability:** The inclusion of a Solar PV array, an Air Source Heat Pump, and a specialised SuDS attenuation pond sets a high standard for sustainable construction in Semington.
- **Active Travel and Connectivity:** The site is perfectly positioned to utilise the village's existing infrastructure. It is within a short walk of the primary school and village hall, and its immediate proximity to National Cycle Routes 4 and 403 encourages non-car travel.
- **Ecological Enhancement:** The plans explicitly protect the mature Ash tree on the eastern boundary and include new habitats such as bird and bat boxes, which will provide a net gain for local biodiversity.

In light of the current shortfall in Wiltshire's housing land supply, I believe this high-quality, low-impact self-build project is exactly the kind of sustainable development the community should welcome.

I urge the Parish Council to return a "No Objection" or "Support" response to Wiltshire Council for this application.

If you have any questions on the above, then please don't hesitate to ask and I will be happy to address any concerns.

Kind Regards

Adam Brill

Director



Follow US - [INSTAGRAM](#) - [FACEBOOK](#) - [LINKEDiN](#)

Belmont House, 53 High St, Chapmanslade, Wiltshire, BA13 4AN - Tel: +44 (0) 1373 832 133 - Mob: 07713 635 121 - Email: adambrill@abadesign.co.uk

AB Architectural Design Ltd. Registered in England & Wales: 5974368. Registered office: The Barn Bangle Farm, Stoney Lane, Chantry, Frome, BA11 3LH

The content of this message is confidential. Do not copy this message to anyone outside your organisation. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify me by return and destroy your copy. Although we take reasonable precautions against viruses, we cannot guarantee that email is always secure, complete and error-free. Protect your systems and check for viruses on incoming emails.

Please don't print this email unless absolutely necessary

Fiona Dey

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 02 June 2026 14:58
To: CAWS
Cc: Peter Richardson; Fiona Dey
Subject: FW: We have your examination submission SB4C47CB1

Hi CAWS

Just to confirm that MWPC have submitted comments as a Local Authority for the Inspector's Questions published 29th May, as follows:

Lime Down Solar Project

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010168

Response to ExQ1 CE1.2 – Cumulative Effects – List of Cumulative Projects

Submitted by: Melksham Without Parish Council

Relevant Representation Reference: RR-3141

Deadline 3: 15 June 2026

Melksham Without Parish Council submits the following response to ExQ1 CE1.2.

As the parish council for a directly affected area, the northern part of our parish covers Shaw, Whitley and Beanacre, including the location of the Melksham substation at Westlands Lane, Beanacre. The Council has direct local knowledge of the communities, roads, public rights of way, local infrastructure, landscape, flooding issues and residential areas that may be affected by the Lime Down Solar Project and by other energy and enabling schemes in the wider Melksham and surrounding areas.

The Council supports the concerns raised by Community Action: Whitley and Shaw (CAWS) in relation to cumulative effects, including the matters identified in Annex A: Energy and Enabling Schemes in Shaw, Whitley and the Wider Melksham Substation Area [REP1A-019].

Melksham Without Parish Council considers that the cumulative assessment should not look at the Lime Down Solar Project in isolation, or only within individual parish boundaries. The assessment should take full account of all known and emerging energy, grid, battery storage, substation, cable route, highway, construction access and enabling works in the wider Shaw, Whitley and Melksham substation area.

The Council is particularly concerned that the combined effect of these schemes could result in significant cumulative impacts on local roads, construction traffic, residential amenity, public rights of way, landscape character, flooding and drainage, local infrastructure and the day-to-day amenity of local communities.

These impacts are shared across parish and town boundaries and should therefore be assessed on a wider area basis. Looking at each project or component separately risks underestimating the overall effect on this part of Wiltshire.

Melksham Without Parish Council therefore asks that the Applicant and the Examining Authority fully review and update the cumulative effects assessment, taking into account the schemes identified by CAWS and any further relevant schemes known to the Applicant, Wiltshire Council, parish councils, town councils, statutory bodies, National Grid, infrastructure providers or other relevant organisations.

Kind regards, Teresa

From: NI Mail Distribution <ni.mail.distribution@notifications.service.gov.uk>

Sent: 02 June 2026 14:55

Briefing Note

No. 26-07

Service: Planning
Further Enquiries to: Nic Thomas, Director - Planning, Economy and Climate
Email: nic.thomas@wiltshire.gov.uk
Date Prepared: 5 June 2026

FIVE-YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

AND

UPDATED GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS' ACCOMMODATION ASSESSMENT

Summary

This briefing note reports on the annual update to Wiltshire's five-year housing land supply, and an update on the latest need assessment for Gypsies and Travellers.

For five-year housing land supply, the updated position is a **2.8 years** supply using a base date of **1 April 2025**. It is an improvement on the 1 April 2024 position, which was 2.42 years. The updated position will inform decision-taking of planning applications and appeals for proposals for housing, but as it is still below 5 years the presumption in favour of sustainable development (or 'tilted balance') will continue to apply (see section 5). The five-year land supply is discussed further in sections 1 - 6 below.

The updated need assessment reflects recent changes in national policy to the definition of Gypsies and Travellers, which means that there is an increase in levels of need for pitches in the future. This is discussed in sections 7-10 below.

The Government requires that an adequate supply of land for housing and for Traveller accommodation is provided and uses five-year land supply as a measure for this. Supply can be replenished with new planning permissions and site allocations brought forward through the development plan to ensure that requirements in the future can be met. Where there is an insufficient land supply both for housing, or Travellers' accommodation over the next five years (for example, through allocated sites not being brought forward promptly or sufficient sites being permitted), the council can be exposed to unplanned, 'speculative' planning applications to help improve the land supply (see sections 5, 6, 9 and 10).

This briefing note provides information on the Government measures for assessing land supply for both housing and Gypsies and Travellers' accommodation, and what the implications are for decision-taking on planning applications.

FIVE-YEAR HOUSING LAND SUPPLY

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Government policy, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), includes two measures that are designed to drive the delivery of housing:
- (i) the five-year housing land supply measures the level of 'supply' that can be expected to come forward over a five-year period of time i.e. the number of homes that it is anticipated **will be** built (see sections 2 and 3 below);
 - (ii) the Housing Delivery Test measures the number of homes that **have been** built over a set period (see section 4 below).
- 1.2 Both measures have established methodologies and assess the expected delivery of homes, and homes that have been delivered respectively, against the housing requirement for a local authority area. Many local authorities find themselves in the same position as Wiltshire, given the increases to housing required by the Government and national policy.

2. What is the five-year housing land supply?

- 2.1 The latest NPPF (December 2024) sets out how the five-year housing land supply operates. The housing requirement used in the five-year housing land supply calculation is the local housing need which is set using the Government's standard methodology¹. This is calculated using data on existing housing stock and housing affordability in the local authority area. It has set inputs and is recalculated every year based on the latest data which is applicable at the base date of 1 April 2025.
- 2.2 The annual update for Wiltshire has now been completed and the results of the assessment, using a base date of 1 April 2025 is set out in the 2025 Housing Land Supply Statement (HLSS). This will be available shortly on the council website via this [link](#). Key points:
- The council cannot demonstrate the requisite five-year housing land supply. The current position indicates there is a **2.8 years'** supply.
 - The deliverable supply has increased from the previous position (2.42 years) due to a number of factors, including a slight reduction in the local housing need figure, an increase in the number of new housing planning permissions being granted, greater prospects of delivery at major strategic sites, and a limited number of housing completions in the past year (which means a greater number of dwellings are retained in the housing land supply).

¹ Planning Practice Guidance (MHCLG, December 2024) - <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/housing-and-economic-development-needs-assessments>

3. How is the housing land supply calculated?

3.1 Housing land supply is calculated using a base date from which calculations are made to ensure a consistent position is established. An explanation is provided below:

Calculation at base date of 1 April 2025:

Elements of calculation	Value
(A) Local Housing Need as at 1 April 2025 (homes per annum)	3,488
(B) Local Housing Need over 5 years (2025-2030) = (A) x 5	17,438
(C) Add buffer (established from Housing Delivery Test results) to arrive at five-year housing requirement = (B) + 5%	18,310
(D) Deliverable housing land supply	10,268
(E) Calculate number of years housing land supply = (D) / (C) x 5	2.8

What can be included in the deliverable housing land supply?

- Sites with full planning permission at the base date. For small sites (less than 10 homes), a delivery rate is applied based on historic rates of lapsed permissions and delivery timescales. For large sites (10 or more homes) the delivery timescales and how many homes can be delivered in five years need to be taken into account, reflecting that some sites will not deliver in their entirety, or at all, in the five-year period.
- Sites with outline planning permission, a resolution to grant planning permission, or non-permitted sites which are allocated in the development plan² at the base date. Again, delivery timescales and homes that can be delivered within five years are taken into account. As these sites are less advanced through the planning process, the NPPF requires us to show clear evidence to demonstrate that sites at this stage are deliverable over the five-year period being assessed. This means that for large sites, which take time to deliver, we may only be able to include the early phases of development in the five-year housing land supply.
- A windfall allowance to include delivery from homes on new 'windfall' sites (sites that are not allocated in the development plan and do not have planning permission at the base date) over the five-year period from 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2030.

² Wiltshire Core Strategy, Chippenham Site Allocations Plan, Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan, and allocations in Neighbourhood Plans which do not yet have planning permission.

4. What is the Housing Delivery Test (HDT)?

- 4.1 This measures net homes delivery (i.e. net homes built) in a local authority area, against the homes required (set by the local housing need) over the preceding three years. It uses local authority completions statistics and planning data to carry out the calculation.
- 4.2 The results are published for each local authority area by the Secretary of State annually, see [Housing Delivery Test \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/housing-delivery-test). The most up to date result, at the time of writing, is the 2023 results. These show that Wiltshire has performed well against the HDT and scored 135% against in the latest results. This means that only a 5% buffer needs to be added to the housing requirement in the calculation (5% is the usual buffer which all local authorities must apply as a minimum.)³ Where authorities score below 85% in the test then a 20% buffer will apply.

5. What are the implications of not having a five-year housing land supply?

- 5.1 The implications of not having an adequate housing land supply for decision-taking have been set out in previous briefing notes, for example in [No. 24-18](#) (September 2024) and [No. 24-20](#) (December 2024). These explain that the presumption in favour of sustainable development (often referred to as the 'tilted balance') applies when determining planning applications. This reflects the Government's approach to ensure that sufficient land is being released to meet its aspirations for housing growth as set out in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF.

6. What can we do to improve the housing land supply?

- 6.1 Where applications are being considered for sites at settlements (including those outside the defined settlement boundaries), there may be the opportunity to improve housing supply by favourably considering housing development proposals, even where there may be some conflict with the development plan policies.
- 6.2 Since the base date of 1 April 2025, consents have continued to be granted permission on suitable sites (including just over 1,000 dwellings on large sites). While these do not currently contribute to the housing land supply because they were permitted after the base date of 1 April 2025, they will help to increase the housing land supply in the future. New permissions help replenish the housing land supply as it is reduced due to housing completions, planning permissions lapsing, and unexpected delays in delivery on large strategic sites, which are more complex to deliver.
- 6.3 Work will now start on the preparation of the next housing land supply position, which will have a 1 April 2026 base date. These statements take time to prepare, particularly for

³ Where delivery falls below the housing requirement over the three year period the local authority can be penalised, requiring it to (a) produce an Action Plan to set out steps to address the under-delivery, (b) apply a 20% buffer on the housing requirement in the calculation, and (c) the presumption in favour of sustainable development applying for housing proposals (irrespective of the five-year housing land supply position). Which of these penalties are applied will depend on the degree of under-delivery as set out in the HDT results.

authorities the size of Wiltshire, and typically take around nine months from the base date to publication.

UPDATED NEED ASSESSMENT FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

7. Introduction

- 7.1 The Government’s planning policy for Travellers is set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS), which was published in December 2024. This requires that local authorities use a robust evidence base to establish accommodation needs to inform the preparation of local plans and make planning decisions. The council has recently updated its need assessment in the [Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment \(GTAA\)](#), completed in March 2026.
- 7.2 For the purpose of determining planning applications, the targets for provision of Traveller accommodation are set out in the GTAA (March 2026). Accommodation is known as a ‘pitch’ for a Gypsy or Traveller, and a ‘plot’ for travelling showpeople. The terminology differentiates between residential pitches for “Gypsies and Travellers” and mixed-use plots for “travelling showpeople”, which may / will need to incorporate space or be split to allow for the storage of show equipment.

8. What is the five-year land supply for Gypsies and Travellers?

- 8.1 As with housing (sections 2 and 3 above) the Government also requires that local authorities identify, and update annually, a five-year supply of specific deliverable sites against the local targets for pitches and plots.
- 8.2 The approach to five-year land supply for Gypsies and Travellers is similar to housing land supply with regard to assessing the deliverable supply against the housing need or requirement to be met in the forthcoming five-year period. However, it differs from the housing land supply as there is no Housing Delivery Test to assess past completions, and no buffer to be added to the requirement in the five-year calculation.
- 8.3 The current five-year land supply position, using a 2026 base date, is shown in the table below:

Elements of calculation	Gypsy and Traveller Pitches	Travelling Showpeople Plots
(A) 2026-31 Accommodation Need	205	11
(B) Completions	0	0
(C) Deliverable land supply (planning permissions)	41	0
(D) Calculate number of years supply $C / (A-B) \times 5$	1.0	0.0

- 8.4 At present the deliverable supply is wholly made up of planning permissions granted up to the base date of 1 April 2026, and includes 31 pitches granted permission since 1 April 2025. There are currently no site allocations for Gypsies and Travellers accommodation in the development plan.

9. What are the implications of not having a five-year land supply for Gypsies and Travellers?

- 9.1 As with housing land supply, where a five-year supply of pitches for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation cannot be demonstrated, the presumption in favour of sustainable development (often referred to as the 'tilted balance') applies when determining planning applications. This is set out in paragraph 28 of the PPTS which indicates that the provisions in paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF apply (see section 5).

This reflects the Government's approach to ensure that sufficient land is being released to meet its need for all members of the community, including Gypsies and Travellers.

For Wiltshire, as the supply for pitches or plots is well below five years (1 years land supply), the 'tilted balance' is engaged. For further advice please refer to the briefing notes on general housing supply and the application of the 'tilted balance' (see section 5 above), as the same considerations apply.

10. What can we do to improve the land supply for Gypsies and Travellers?

- 10.1 Core Policy 47 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy alongside national planning policies including the PPTS will inform the determination of planning applications for traveller sites to help meet identified need. The council has a track record of approving proposals for new traveller sites either by way of delegated officer decision or at Strategic Planning Committee. Officers will continue to advise, in their reports, how to apply planning policy requirements under the 'tilted balance'. Approving sustainable development forms an important plank of improving supply. This does not mean all proposals are acceptable, but that careful consideration needs to be given to the merits of sites put forward.
- 10.2 There are different ways to meet the accommodation needs in the updated GTAA and it is not anticipated that all of these will be on new sites. These are:
- **Intensification of existing sites:** some sites where there is a need for accommodation have potential to include additional pitches while maintaining reasonable living standards, this can involve reducing the size of existing pitches to make space for additional pitches to be added to the overall site or redesign of sites to accommodate additional pitches.
 - **Meeting need on existing pitches:** the GTAA has identified need from single adults and teenagers as they reach adulthood. There may be the opportunity for their need to be met through allowing additional touring caravans on existing pitches (a pitch is typically made up of a static home, touring caravan and dayroom), rather than a new pitch.
 - **New sites:** considering proposals for new sites in sustainable locations according to national policy set out in the PPTS.

- 10.3 In the past, officers have provided informal pre-planning advice at no cost to travellers because the community has poorer knowledge of the planning system. This can involve site visits, written correspondence and telephone conversations to discuss a possible proposal or site informally; and obtaining informal advice from internal specialists i.e. highways. This may assist in bringing sites forward that have potential and can be approved, improving the quality of proposals and planning applications.

Teresa Strange

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 04 June 2026 21:34
To: robert.wordsworth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
Cc: PlanningAppeals
Subject: FURTHER COMMENTS FROM MELKSHAM WITHOUT PARISH COUNCIL: 3373278 - Land South of Snarlton Farm, Snarlton Lane
Attachments: ID21. Woodrow Appeal Decision 3374421.pdf; ID23. Wiltshire Council LP Withdrawal Letter.pdf
Importance: High

Dear Mr Wordsworth

Further to our email earlier today, please find below additional comments.

Apologies for sending in two separate emails, we have been concentrating on getting a quick response to you due to the tight deadline.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Wiltshire Local Plan

Concurrent with the withdrawal of the Draft Wiltshire Local Plan, at the Council meeting on 19 May 2026, Wiltshire Council committed to the progression of a new Local Plan that addresses increased housing requirements within timescales and gateway processes set out in MHCLG's letter to Wiltshire Council dated 15 January 2026. As a result, Wiltshire Council have committed to a process that leads to an adopted and up-to-date Local Plan 30 months from gateway 1 on 31 October 2026; April / May 2029.

Policy DM4 of the 2025 draft NPPF sets out the process for determining development proposals. It states that 'when preparing and considering development proposals, relevant policies in emerging development plans may be given more weight according to....' criteria a,b,c & d. It is therefore also likely that policies in the new Local Plan will be material prior to its adoption following successful passage through preceding gateways.

There is little doubt that the new Local Plan strategy for Melksham will involve significantly more mixed-use strategic development allocations than the withdrawn plan. It is most likely that a significant amount of this growth will be located in the 'Broad Locations for Growth' at Melksham including to the NE of the withdrawn WLP site allocations (as indicated in Policy 17 of the withdrawn plan). The disconnected nature of the proposed development of this appeal has already been highlighted. It is in a key location adjacent to Eastern Way, forming a potential access to the further extension of Melksham. In the context of the commitment to plan for increased growth through the new Local Plan, including at Melksham, consenting this particular scheme risks the proper planned delivery of the efficient use of land and the sustainable development of the town.

Whilst the 2038 Local Plan has being withdrawn, the great majority of the strategic site allocations at Melksham it proposed are 'in the pipeline'. This is supplemented by the potential development of further non-allocated sites given permission, including that at Woodrow Road. In total there is currently 1,070 dwellings likely to be delivered through such consents. This will make a very significant contribution towards meeting Wiltshire's housing needs until the new Local Plan is adopted in 2029. Furthermore, it will rapidly increase the demand on Melksham's infrastructure. Allowing 300 further dwellings at Snarlton Farm will unacceptably exacerbate this issue.

JMNP2 contains allocations to deliver 453 dwellings within the NP area, with 398 of these at Melksham. This figure is substantially higher than the housing requirement provided by Wiltshire council in the withdrawn Local Plan. It is quite likely to be sufficient to address the potential uplifted Neighbourhood Plan housing requirement which is to be provided by Wiltshire Council as part of its duties to qualifying

bodies. Nonetheless, should a review of the Neighbourhood Plan be required to address an uplifted requirement, there is ample time for this to be undertaken in the period until 2029.

JMNP2 site allocations at Melksham Library and Land South of Western Way are allocated to deliver c270 dwellings at Melksham. Both of these proposals are within the detailed pre-application or planning application process and are highly likely capable of making a very significant delivery of JMNP2 commitments and meeting housing needs within the first years of its planned life.

Development at Melksham that is in the pipeline is likely to deliver very significant growth regardless of the withdrawal of Wiltshire's Local Plan to 2038. It is therefore important that this decision does not allow un-planned development at Snarlton Farm to prejudice Melksham's proper sustainable development now and in the coming plan period.

Woodrow Road

In his assessment of the Woodrow Road proposal, the Inspector noted 'the provision of 70 dwellings on the appeal site would not be of such magnitude to have a detrimental effect on its ability to grow in a sustainable manner or materially disrupt its future planning' and 'nor, in my view, would it seriously undermine confidence in the plan-making process'.

These opinions relate solely and distinctly to the decision made at Woodrow Road. The opposite is the case in relation to the Snarlton Farm proposal. Therefore, the decision should not be held up as a precedent in the determination of the Snarlton Farm application.

With kind regards,
Teresa Strange
Clerk to Melksham Without Parish Council
01225 705700

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 04 June 2026 13:47
To: 'robert.wordsworth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk' <robert.wordsworth@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>
Cc: PlanningAppeals <planningappeals@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: 3373278 - Land South of Snarlton Farm, Snarlton Lane
Importance: High

Dear Mr Wordsworth,

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/25/3373278
Land South of Snarlton Farm, Snarlton Lane, Melksham, SN12 7QP
Comments on ID21 and ID23

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on ID21, the Woodrow appeal decision, and ID23, Wiltshire Council's confirmation that the Wiltshire Local Plan has been withdrawn from examination.

Melksham Without Parish Council, both in its own right and as a qualifying body for the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (JMNP2), does not consider that either document changes the Parish Council's position on this appeal.

On the contrary, the withdrawal of the Wiltshire Local Plan makes the status and purpose of the recently made JMNP2 even more important. JMNP2 forms part of the adopted development plan and provides the local, plan-led framework for housing growth in the Melksham area. The appeal

site at Land South of Snarlton Farm is not allocated in JMNP2 and does not form part of the spatial planning strategy for Melksham.

The Parish Council remains firmly of the view that the appeal proposal conflicts with the adopted development plan, including the spatial strategy and JMNP2. The withdrawal of the emerging Local Plan does not remove or lessen that conflict. Rather, it reinforces the need to give proper weight to the made Neighbourhood Plan and to avoid undermining the plan-led approach.

The Parish Council is particularly concerned that, with the Wiltshire Local Plan now withdrawn, Melksham should not be expected to absorb speculative development in order to address a Wiltshire-wide five-year housing land supply shortfall. Melksham has planned positively for its own growth through the recently made JMNP2, and the housing numbers in the JMNP2 site allocations already significantly exceed the level of growth that had been identified for the neighbourhood area. In addition, the allocated sites in both JMNP2 and the former emerging Local Plan are already progressing well.

The Woodrow appeal decision should not be taken as support for allowing this appeal. That decision related to a different site, a smaller proposal, and its own specific planning circumstances. It does not alter the position that the Snarlton Farm proposal is a substantial development of up to 300 dwellings on a site which is not allocated in JMNP2 and which would undermine the strategy that the local community has recently prepared, examined, voted for and had made.

The Parish Council also notes that Wiltshire Council's own position, as set out in its previous response to the implications of the Local Plan Examination Letter, was that the Snarlton Farm proposal remained in clear conflict with the adopted spatial strategy and JMNP2, and that paragraph 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework continued to apply. The subsequent withdrawal of the Local Plan does not alter the fact that JMNP2 remains part of the adopted development plan.

If this appeal were to be allowed, the Parish Council considers that it would not only undermine JMNP2 in relation to current and future speculative planning applications in the Melksham area, but could also have wider implications for neighbourhood plans across Wiltshire. Neighbourhood plans are community-led documents, prepared through significant local effort, subject to examination and referendum, and then made as part of the statutory development plan. Allowing major unplanned development on a non-allocated site in these circumstances would risk weakening confidence in that democratic, plan-led process.

For these reasons, Melksham Without Parish Council maintains its objection to the appeal proposal and respectfully requests that the appeal be dismissed.

Yours sincerely,
Teresa Strange
Clerk to Melksham Without Parish Council

From: PlanningAppeals <PlanningAppeals@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 04 June 2026 09:34
Subject: FW: 3373278 - Land South of Snarlton Farm, Snarlton Lane
Importance: High

Good morning,

Please see the message below from the Case Officer of the Appeal 3373278 against PL/2024/07097 - Land South of Snarlton Farm, Snarlton Lane, Melksham, SN12 7QP - APP/Y3940/W/25/3373278 with the following attachments showing more recent developments. Both attachments are also available in the document list at [Appeal: AP-37487](#).

Please note any replies should be emailed to ROBERT.WORDSWORTH@planninginspectorate.gov.uk, who will be able to pass your comments directly to the Inspector.

Kind Regards,

Janine Mead
Planning Appeals
Development Services

Wiltshire Council

Tel: 0300 456 0114

Email: planningappeals@wiltshire.gov.uk

Web: www.wiltshire.gov.uk

Your opinion matters - how did we do? [Feedback Survey](#)

[Sign up](#) to Wiltshire Council's email news service

From: Laurie Wordsworth <ROBERT.WORDSWORTH@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Sent: 04 June 2026 08:33

To: Laurie Wordsworth <ROBERT.WORDSWORTH@planninginspectorate.gov.uk>

Subject: 3373278 - Land South of Snarlton Farm, Snarlton Lane

Importance: High

Dear Sir/Madam

Following the close of the Inquiry, an appeal decision was issued for a nearby site, attached ID21. At the Inquiry there was some discussion regarding the emerging plan for Wiltshire, this was recently withdrawn by the Council (see attached ID23). If you wish to make any comments on either of these documents in terms of any implications that they may have in relation to the determination of the appeal, please submit these within the next 5 working days.

Kind regards

Mr Wordsworth



**Planning
Inspectorate**

RL Wordsworth (He/Him)

Inquiries and Major Casework Team

The Planning Inspectorate

Tel: 0303 444 5608

www.gov.uk/pins

This communication does not constitute legal advice. Our Customer Privacy Notice sets out how we handle personal data in accordance with the law.

Please note that the contents of this email and any attachments are privileged and/or confidential and intended solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient of this email and its attachments, you must take no action based upon them, nor must you copy or show



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 May 2026

by **SE Hughes BA (Hons) PGDip MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2026

Appeal Ref: 6003438

Land South of 214B Corsham Road, Whitley, Melksham, Wiltshire SN12 8QF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Tom Nicholas against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/08613.
 - The development proposed is the erection of up to 5 dwellings.
-

Decision

1. **The appeal is dismissed.**

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal is for permission in principle. The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) advises that this is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. The permission in principle (PIP) consent route has two stages: the first establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle and the second (technical details consent - TDC) is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these two stages.
3. The scope of the considerations for PIP is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted. All other matters are considered as part of a subsequent TDC application if permission in principle is granted.
4. I have taken the description of development from the application form. However, any grant of permission in principle must be expressed as a minimum and maximum of dwellings. In this case, the application form goes onto clarify that a minimum of 2 dwellings and maximum of 5 dwellings are sought.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the site is suitable for the residential development, having regard to its location, the proposed land use and the amount of development.

Reasons

6. Policies CP1 and CP15 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, January 2015 (WCS) outline the hierarchical spatial strategy for accommodating new housing in Wiltshire, with development focused on principal settlements, then market towns, then local service centres, then large villages, such as Whitley, and small villages.

7. Policy CP2 of the WCS sets out the Council's housing delivery strategy and states that, unless permitted by other policies within the WCS as set out at paragraph 4.25, development will not be permitted outside the limits of development.
8. Likewise, Policy 6 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2, 2020 – 2038¹ (JMNP2) supports housing development within existing settlement boundaries.
9. The appeal site is not allocated for housing development and is classified as a location outside the defined limits of development under both Policy 6 of the JMNP2 and Policy CP2 of the WCS. None of the paragraph 4.25 exceptions of Policy CP2 apply in this case.
10. The appeal site is part of an undeveloped field with a mature hedgerow boundary adjacent to Corsham Road. As an undeveloped area of land, the site's natural, verdant qualities make a positive contribution to the setting of Whitley. It also forms part of a wider area which is identified as a green wedge or green gap under Policy 19 of the JMNP2. Accordingly, I observed it acts as a clear visual buffer of open countryside between Whitley and Shaw which helps to preserve the separate identity of the two villages.
11. Whilst details of the design are not before me at this stage, the appeal site is of a size which is capable of accommodating up to five dwellings in a spacious low density manner, corresponding with the low density of the village. The extent of the proposed development would match the southern limit of existing built development on the opposite side of Corsham Road. Also, I acknowledge that further structural landscaping is proposed, and that this would help to redefine the southern edge of the settlement. However, despite this, the introduction of built form to the site and associated hard surfacing, lighting, and residential activity, would significantly alter the appearance of the appeal site, harmfully extending the settlement edge of Whitley into the open countryside and eroding the gap that distinguishes the separate identities of Whitley and Shaw.
12. Accordingly, for the reasons explained above, I find that the location, land use and amount of the proposed development would be contrary to locational Policies CP1, CP2 and CP15 of the WCS. Furthermore, as the appeal site is located within land identified as a green wedge, it would also conflict with Policy 6 and Policy 19 of the JMNP2 and Policy CP51 of the WCS which seeks to protect, conserve and enhance Wiltshire's distinctive landscape character. My findings are reinforced by the judgment of the Inspector in the appeal brought to my attention² who also found conflict with the aforementioned WCS policies.
13. The Council's decision notice also refers to loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land, but does not cite conflict with a development plan policy. Paragraph 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires decision-makers to take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, preference should be given to using areas of poorer quality over higher quality land. The Framework defines the best and most versatile agricultural land as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification. Whilst there is no detailed and compelling evidence to establish whether the appeal site is grade 3a or 3b, since the

¹ Made August 2025

² Appeal Reference APP/Y3940/W/17/3185863

development would lead to a small loss of 0.3 ha, I am satisfied that it would not amount to significant development. Therefore, the preferential requirement to utilise poorer quality land does not apply. Accordingly, I do not consider that the proposal would result in a harmful loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.

Other considerations

14. My attention has been drawn to two appeal decisions where either limited weight was attributed to the conflict with the spatial strategy of the WCS or the benefits of providing additional dwellings outweighed the WCS policy conflict. However, the circumstances and locational context of the appeals are not directly the same as this appeal. The Glenmore Farm appeal³ concerned a much larger development of 145 homes to the north west of Westbury, a town which benefits from more services. Whilst the West Street appeal⁴ is also located on the edge of a large village, unlike the appeal proposal it does not affect land identified as a green gap. Consequently, I disagree that the appeals are directly comparable. Therefore, I am not bound by the weightings applied by the Inspectors in those cases, although I have taken account of them. I have reached my own conclusions on the merits of the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.
15. I have been made aware that the Wiltshire Local Plan Review 2020-2038 is in the process of examination, but that process has paused. Nevertheless, it has limited weight and as such it does not materially change the circumstances surrounding the proposal and the primacy of its determination against the adopted development plan.
16. Whilst the Council does not raise any objections to the proposal from a sustainability or accessibility perspective, compliance with the development plan in these respects is a neutral factor. I have also taken account of the representation received in support of the planning application. However, I have addressed the matters raised within it, in my reasoning on the main issue.

Planning balance

17. There is no dispute that there is a substantial shortfall in housing land supply, both parties refer to it as comprising 2.42-years. Paragraph 11 of the Framework is engaged. This states that planning permission should be granted unless (i) policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a strong reason for refusing the development, or (ii) any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. There is nothing to suggest 11(d) (i) is relevant to this case, hence the balance in 11(d) (ii) applies.
18. Paragraph 14 of the Framework advises that in situations where the presumption at paragraph 11(d) applies, the adverse impact of allowing development that conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is likely to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. This is provided that the NP became part of the development plan five years or less before the date on which the decision is made, and that it contains policies and allocations to meet its identified housing requirement.

³ Appeal Decision APP/Y3940/W/24/3345598

⁴ Appeal Decision APP/Y3940/W/24/3345527

19. The JMNP2 is less than a year old and the parties agree it meets the requirements of paragraph 14(a). However, they do not agree in relation to paragraph 14(b). The appellant contends there is a shortfall in allocation for Shaw and Whitley and that there has been a significant uplift in the level of housing need. Nevertheless, paragraph 14(b) refers to the identified housing requirement of the neighbourhood plan overall, which covers Melksham and Melksham Without. It allocates land for new housing through policies 7.1 to 7.5. The Examiner's report for the JMNP2, amongst other things, found overall that it addresses housing delivery in the plan period. Therefore, based on the evidence before me, I find that the requirements of paragraph 14(b) are also met and so it applies in this case.
20. The proposal would add to the housing stock and so it would help boost the supply of dwellings. Paragraph 73 of the Framework recognises that small and medium sized sites, like the proposal site can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area.
21. In economic terms, the proposed development would provide construction jobs and some local investment during its build out, as well as longer term expenditure in the local economy, including Council Tax payments to the Council. Although a matter for the TDC stage, associated landscaping and the requirements to deliver 10% biodiversity net gain would provide biodiversity enhancements.
22. I have attributed these combined social, economic and environmental benefits moderate weight in the planning balance.
23. However, in light of paragraph 14 of the Framework, the adverse impacts of allowing the development that conflicts with policies of the JMNP2 would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposed development. Therefore, I find the presumption in favour of sustainable development as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Framework does not apply.

Conclusion

24. The proposal would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

SE Hughes

INSPECTOR

Teresa Strange

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 15 June 2026 14:50
To: 'Rivans, Natalie'
Subject: RE: ENF/2026/00216

Hi Natalie

I am struggling to get my head round this, this planning application PL/2025/05856 is for “Planning Application for the laying of underground electricity cables in association with Wick Solar Farm (LPA Reference: 20/06840/FUL) **and Studley Solar Farm (LPA Reference: PL/2021/08690)**” which they got permission for on 13th February 2026. The work stated on 26th January in Westlands Lane, before they got planning permission – that was what the complaint was about. The work was for cables by Aerous for SSEN upgrade from Melksham Substation to Norrington Farm but also under that permit was the work by Verdant for the cable laying for Studley Solar Farm – it was done under the same road closure so the work had less cumulative impact.

<https://www.ssen.co.uk/about-ssen/our-works/melksham-to-norrington/>

all the best, Teresa

From: Rivans, Natalie <Natalie.Rivans@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 11 June 2026 14:30
To: Teresa Strange <clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>
Subject: ENF/2026/00216

Hi Teresa

Regarding the above reference. The pre-commencement conditions attached to planning permission PL/2025/05856 have not yet been discharged as the development has not yet commenced.

The road closure in Westlands Lane was in relation to new cables being installed in the road in relation to the planning permission for Studley Solar Farm (PL/2021/08690).

I hope this helps clarify the situation.

Best wishes

Natalie Rivans
Planning Enforcement Officer
Planning Enforcement Team

Please be aware that I am working reduced and flexible hours so response times may vary.

Wiltshire Council

External Tel: 01225 770502
E-mail: natalie.rivans@wiltshire.gov.uk
Website: www.wiltshire.gov.uk
Follow Wiltshire Council



[Sign up](#) to Wiltshire Council's email news service

The views expressed in this e-mail represent an officer's opinion only and are not binding on any future decisions made by elected members of the Council or under powers delegated to officers.

Wiltshire Council Disclaimer: <https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/disclaimer>

Teresa Strange

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 15 June 2026 18:12
To: 'Jones, Becky'; 'Bartlett, Hannah'; 'Herz, Christopher'
Subject: RE: Woodrow Road, Melksham [ASHFORDSLLP-ACTIVE.FID28048601]

Hi WC Legal team

I am just checking in following the publication of the Woodrow appeal decision – and the opportunity to go through the s106 in detail.

At the round table discussion, I raised the request for funding for the community centre at Forest, and the Inspector said that if it met the tests that a contribution should be included. From the correspondence below it was to be raised.

I cannot see that this has been included, and as a parish council we wish to understand why, and what the test was?

Are you able to confirm please?

With many thanks, Teresa

Teresa Strange
Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer
Melksham Without Parish Council
First Floor
Melksham Community Campus
Market Place, Melksham
Wiltshire, SN12 6ES
01225 705700
www.melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk

Wellbeing Statement I may send emails outside office hours but never with any expectation of response. Please just get back to me when you can within your own working hours. Thank you.

Want to keep in touch?

Follow us on facebook: [Melksham Without Parish Council](#) or [Teresa Strange \(Clerk\)](#) for additional community news

On X: [@melkshamwithout](#)

On Instagram: [melkshamwithoutpc](#)

On LinkedIn: [Melksham Without Parish Council](#)

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, please forward it to admin@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk

Please be aware that information contained in this email may be confidential and that any use you make of it which breaches the common law protection may leave you personally liable. Our privacy notice can be found [HERE](#).

We do not guarantee that any email is free of viruses or other malware.

From: Bartlett, Hannah <Hannah.Bartlett@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Sent: 09 February 2026 14:06
To: Teresa Strange <clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>
Cc: Herz, Christopher <Christopher.Herz@wiltshire.gov.uk>; Jones, Becky <Becky.Jones@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Woodrow Road, Melksham [ASHFORDSLLP-ACTIVE.FID28048601]

Hi Teresa,

Thank you for your email.

Following the Round Table, our Planner is now looking into the Community Building Contribution to see if this can be requested from the developer.

Following on from the points you raised in my previous email, please see below:

- Footpath – will now connect to the Forest Community Centre.
- Public Art – the definition is policy compliant and will remain in the 106 as can be delivered onsite or within the vicinity of the development, as per definition.
- Crossing will be dealt with under the s.278 works in schedule 5, please see attached Plan (Plan 2 on the 106), also please note that the transport phasing plan will be agreed in writing with the Council prior to commencement of development.
- NHS contribution, NHS were contacted but no site provided so cannot request from Developer.

I hope this assists.

Kind regards,

Hannah Bartlett
Planning Solicitor
Wiltshire Council

Wiltshire Council

Email: hannah.bartlett@wiltshire.gov.uk
Telephone: 01722 434311

County Hall
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
BA14 8JN

Please note that I only work part-time Monday to Thursday 9am to 2.30pm

IMPORTANT NOTICES

Wiltshire Council does NOT accept service via DX

The information contained in this email is intended for the use of the addressee only; it is confidential and may be the subject of legal professional privilege. Any distribution, dissemination, copying or use of the communication without the permission of the addressee is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it, and any attachments, from your system.



Sign up to Wiltshire Council's email news service

From: Teresa Strange <clerk@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>
Sent: 05 February 2026 14:11
To: Bartlett, Hannah <Hannah.Bartlett@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Cc: Herz, Christopher <Christopher.Herz@wiltshire.gov.uk>; Jones, Becky <Becky.Jones@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Woodrow Road, Melksham [ASHFORDSLP-ACTIVE.FID28048601]

Hi Hannah

Sorry for the delay... got caught in another meeting. Please let me know the etiquette, do I just talk to you? just conscious that Mark Scoot reached out but I have ignored him!

Requests below are also from Melksham Town Council (the appeal site is in the parish, the Forest Community Centre and the crossing to Savernake Avenue just in the town area).

I was asking for community building funding (as per the precedent for funding for the East of Melksham community centre in the Blackmore Farm and Snarlton Farm s106s).

The funding would be for Forest Community Centre; it would be the closest community venue to the appeal site, and in Bowmans Court which the Footpath Improvement funding is improving the route to.

I don't know what the tests are, but have provided information below, that might be useful for the tests, and just for general context/background info. Ask away if you need anything else.

<https://register-of-charities.charitycommission.gov.uk/en/charity-search/-/charity-details/3939284/full-print> details of the organisation here

https://www.facebook.com/melkshamfcc/photos?locale=en_GB photos and activities on their facebook page here

I have (very crudely) marked the appeal site and Forest Community Centre on the map attached.

The community centre is well used, but tired and quite elderly – was built from 2nd hand portacabins.

It suffered some fire damage from arson a couple of years ago to its football changing rooms, it has a football field attached, has been home to the local firework display in the recent past.

<https://www.wiltshiretimes.co.uk/news/24144052.teens-charged-arson-melksham-community-centre-blaze/>

It is home to the Men's Shed who have their "shipping container" premises on site.

It's in the Forest part of Melksham, which is one of the most deprived in Wiltshire, and the country.

The community centre is the focus of a lot of Wiltshire Council funded initiatives as well as serving the wider population of the area, including Woodrow and those moving into the appeal site, if approved. See here

<https://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/article/14306/Melksham-Forest>

Hope that helps....

Other comments below in red

Many thanks for your help with all this – just trying to get the best for the community.

All the best, Teresa

Teresa Strange

Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer

Melksham Without Parish Council

Teresa Strange

From: Teresa Strange
Sent: 15 June 2026 17:46
To: Wise, Isobella
Cc: Alford, Phil (Phil.Alford@wiltshire.gov.uk); saffi.rabey@melksham-tc.gov.uk;
Committee Clerk
Subject: Upside & Land at Corsham Road - application of Melksham NHP Policy 3 wider
flood mitigation

Dear Isobella,

I am writing in relation to application PL/2022/06221 for 112 dwellings at Upside, Melksham, following the recent publication of the decision notice, officer report and S106 agreement.

Melksham Without Parish Council had commented on this application because of its relevance to the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan and the potential impacts on the wider Melksham area, including adjoining communities.

I would be grateful if you could clarify how Policy 3 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan was considered in relation to flood risk. In particular, I am referring to the part of the policy which states that **development proposals in locations with known flooding issues should include appropriate mitigation and construction methods and, where appropriate, contributions to wider catchment projects.**

This is an area with well-known local flooding issues, and with recognised mitigation requirements both locally and further upstream at Shaw and Whitley. In that context, could you please explain why no S106 contribution appears to have been secured towards wider flood mitigation, catchment management, or other measures that would help address these known issues? We would particularly like to understand how the judgement was reached that such a contribution was not appropriate in this case. If a development of 112 houses is not considered proportionate to trigger a contribution towards wider flood risk mitigation, what scale, location or type of development would be considered proportionate? Alternatively, was the view taken that the site-specific drainage measures were sufficient to address the Neighbourhood Plan policy requirement?

This is especially relevant because the same part of Policy 3 is currently being raised in relation to the Land at Corsham Road PL/2024/09725 application as we have not seen it referenced in the draft HoT. We are therefore trying to understand whether there is any issue with applying this part of the policy in practice, or whether there were site-specific reasons why it was not applied through a S106 contribution in this instance.

Your response will help inform our review of whether the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan policies are being used as intended, and whether any clarification is needed in future policy wording and how we raise this as part of our comments for other planning applications moving forward.

For your information, I have raised with Kenny Green and Gary Collins the wider issue of the lack of transparency of draft s106 agreements etc as an example, see below, as part of an ongoing discussion we have been having on this topic.

Many thanks for your help.

Kind regards,
Teresa
Teresa Strange
Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer
Melksham Without Parish Council

From: Teresa Strange

Sent: 11 May 2026 16:53

To: Collins, Gary <gary.collins@wiltshire.gov.uk>; Kenny Green <kenny.green@wiltshire.gov.uk>

Cc: saffi.rabey@melksham-tc.gov.uk; CEO <ceo@melksham-tc.gov.uk>; Committee Clerk <committee.clerk@melksham-tc.gov.uk>; Fiona Dey <office@melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk>; Alford, Phil (Phil.Alford@wiltshire.gov.uk) <phil.alford@wiltshire.gov.uk>

Subject: S106 parish and town council engagement protocol

Hi Kenny/Gary

Hope you have had a good weekend....

I know that you have previously let me know that you are looking to write a protocol for engaging with parish and town councils on draft s106 (and conditions), but wanted to share this as a good example of why its required.

This application for 112 dwellings at Upside, in Melksham Town dates back to 2022, with the last documentation in March 2025 (apart from some tree protection in Feb this year) and a decision date of 8th May 2025 – suddenly a year later the draft s106 was published on 20th April 2026 and the Officers Report on 1st May 2026 – what trigger is there at all to let us know that it had been published? Should we be checking daily since 2022? And then again since the reconsult in early 2025? [PL/2022/06221](#) We didn't know it had been approved until looking at the weekly decision lists on Friday.

The planning officer may have notified the town council of course, but from looking at the Comment and the officer report, you can see that it's the parish council that asked for the s106 contributions. If we had seen the officer report we would have been pushing on NHP2 (and NHP1) policy 3 about flood risk, as nothing has been put in the s106 for this: "Development proposals in locations with known flooding issues should include appropriate mitigation and construction methods, and, where appropriate **contributions to wider catchment projects** as well as pushing our request again for contributions to improve public transport. We would have also chased the NHS for their request for funding for the local surgeries. The parish council will be pleased to see the £100k contribution to cycling and walking – especially the access from Foundry Close which means there is a much more direct route into the station from the parish.

So, my request for your protocol please is to notify neighbouring parishes, not just the one its in, if they have contributed to the comments? Have a neighbourhood plan covering the application area? is close to the boundary?

Can the protocol please also include the officer report so not just the s106 – as otherwise we can't see which requests have been conditioned, as opposed to being in the s106.

And, to note, that this proves that until this is in place, the only way we have to see this information and have chance to comment is by asking the relevant Wiltshire Councillor to call it in (or check every application in the parish almost every day!)

Many thanks, look forward to seeing the draft?

With kind regards, Teresa

Teresa Strange

Clerk & Responsible Financial Officer

Melksham Without Parish Council

First Floor

Melksham Community Campus

Market Place, Melksham

Wiltshire, SN12 6ES

01225 705700

www.melkshamwithout-pc.gov.uk