

**MINUTES of the Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council
held on Monday 14th September 2026 at Melksham Without Parish Council
Offices (First Floor), Melksham Community Campus, Market Place, SN12
6ES at 7:00pm**

Present: Councillors Richard Wood (Chair), Alan Baines (Vice-Chair), David Pafford (Vice-Chair of Council), John Glover (Chair of Council), Mark Harris, Peter Richardson and Martin Franks.

Officers: Teresa Strange (Clerk) and Fiona Dey (Parish Officer)

In attendance: Councillor Haffenden (part as an observer)

On Zoom: None

193/26 Welcome, Housekeeping and Announcements

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

As there were no new members of the public or businesses present, the usual housekeeping announcements were not repeated. Everyone present was aware that the meeting was being recorded and that the recording would be published on YouTube following the meeting and deleted once the minutes were approved.

There were no announcements.

194/26 Apologies

All members of the committee were present.

195/26 Declarations of Interest

a. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Franks declared a non-pecuniary interest in PL/2026/04916 Land west of Semington Road (agenda item 7a) as he knew the landowner. He remained in the meeting and took part in the discussion on the item but did not take part in the vote on the resolution.

b. Dispensation Requests

None received.

196/26 Consideration of Items in Closed Session

Under the Public Bodies (Admission to Meetings) Act 1960, the public and representatives of the press and broadcast media should be excluded from the meeting as required, as publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest because of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

Resolved: To hold agenda Item 13 (Planning Enforcement) in closed session at the end of the meeting due to the potential start of legal action.

197/26 Public Participation

Standing Orders were suspended for public participation.

Councillor Haffenden, speaking as a member of the public addressed the Committee on applications PL/2026/04916 Land west of Semington Road (agenda item 7a), PL/2026/05002 Car park North of the New Inn (agenda item 7b) and PL/2025/00626 Land North of Berryfield Lane (agenda item 9a).

PL/2026/04916 Land west of Semington Road, Berryfield

Councillor Haffenden considered that the proposed development of up to 225 dwellings was too large for the location, particularly when considered alongside other completed, approved and proposed developments around Berryfield.

Concern was raised that the site would need to accommodate not only housing but also public open space, landscape buffers, existing rights of way, drainage infrastructure and the proposed Melksham Link Canal corridor. It was suggested that the starting point should be to establish how many dwellings the site could reasonably accommodate without causing unacceptable harm, rather than seeking to fit 225 dwellings onto it. If this resulted in fewer homes, the number should be reduced accordingly.

Councillor Haffenden was particularly concerned about the proposed building heights. The plans allowed substantial areas of three-storey development, which would be more visually prominent and create a much more urban character on the edge of the Berryfield settlement. It was considered that development should be limited to two storeys, providing a more appropriate relationship with existing properties along Semington Road and the two-storey dwellings at the related Bowood View development opposite. Building upwards should not be used simply to achieve the proposed number of dwellings.

The likely effect on Semington Road was also highlighted. Up to 225 additional homes would generate a substantial number of extra vehicle movements each day, adding to traffic from existing and proposed developments. This was likely to increase congestion, delays and road-safety concerns, particularly at peak times. The Parish Council was asked to consider the cumulative traffic impact rather than assessing the development in isolation.

More generally, concern was expressed about the cumulative scale of development around Berryfield. Although each application might be presented as manageable individually, the combined effect was changing the character of the area through additional housing, roads, traffic and infrastructure, while progressively reducing the surrounding open countryside.

Councillor Haffenden emphasised that the proposed canal corridor should be protected as a meaningful area of green and blue infrastructure. It should not simply become a narrow boundary between the canal and a large, densely developed housing estate.

In summary, the member of the public asked the Parish Council to consider whether 225 dwellings, including substantial areas of three-storey development, were appropriate for the site. In his view, the number and proposed scale of the dwellings were unacceptable.

Members were also asked to consider the detailed representation submitted on the Planning Portal by another resident on 8th September, which was described as factual and comprehensive.

PL/2026/05002 Car park north of The New Inn, Berryfield

Councillor Haffenden questioned the principle of constructing three dwellings on this site and whether they could be accommodated safely without adversely affecting The New Inn and existing highway conditions.

The principal concern related to the proposed vehicular access, which would be positioned directly at the established pedestrian crossing point serving the non-vehicular entrance to Berryfield Village Hall. It was considered that this would

create a conflict between vehicles entering and leaving the proposed dwellings and pedestrians using the crossing, including disabled people and those with impaired mobility. Members were asked to consider whether this was an appropriate location for a new residential access.

Concern was also expressed that the application understated the effect on parking provision for The New Inn. Although the application suggested that only five parking spaces would be lost, Councillor Haffenden explained that six of the remaining spaces would be required for the three proposed dwellings. Further spaces were routinely required by the publican and members of staff, potentially leaving only four or five spaces available for customers.

The New Inn was described as a successful and well-used pub and restaurant which attracted customers from a wide area, with particularly high demand from Thursday to Sunday. The existing car park already struggled to accommodate vehicles at busy times, resulting in overspill parking and parking along Semington Road. Reference was made to an incident on Friday 21st August when parked vehicles obstructed an X34 bus on Semington Road, reportedly resulting in damage to several vehicles. It was felt that reducing the pub's parking provision could lead to more incidents of this kind.

Councillor Haffenden also referred to the recent Walk Wheel Cycle Trust assessment of Semington Road, which had identified: relatively high vehicle speeds; poor and inconsistent footway provision; inadequate pedestrian crossing facilities; and difficulties experienced by pedestrians and cyclists. It was considered that the proposal would add further vehicle movements and access conflicts to a road where existing conditions for walking, wheeling and cycling were already inadequate.

Concern was also raised about the size and layout of the proposed dwellings. Councillor Haffenden considered that three houses would represent an overdevelopment of the site and that the limited footprint would require the buildings to be disproportionately tall, making them inconsistent with the character of the surrounding area.

In summary, Councillor Haffenden asked the Parish Council to consider whether three dwellings could be accommodated appropriately and safely, taking account of the proposed access, the loss of effective pub parking, existing congestion and overspill parking, pedestrian safety and the scale and design of the proposed dwellings.

PL/2025/00626 Land north of Berryfield Lane

Councillor Haffenden recalled that, having been present at the meeting, the Western Area Planning Committee had intended building heights to be limited to two storeys in both fields of the development. The revised parameter plan, submitted after the planning committee meeting, appeared to retain buildings of up to two-and-a-half storeys in the western field opposite existing bungalows on Berryfield Lane. Clarification and correction were requested.

Standing Orders were reinstated.

198/26 Planning Policy

a. National Planning Policy Framework

The Committee noted the new National Planning Policy Framework published on 17th August 2026. Members noted the new approach to well-connected stations and that Melksham station did not meet the stated service-frequency definition.

They also discussed the Department for Transport connectivity tool and considered that, where Wiltshire Council relied upon its score, the methodology, thresholds and significance of the score should be clearly explained.

b. Statements for major planning applications

Members considered three versions of a standard statement for existing speculative applications, former draft Local Plan allocation sites and new major proposals. The statements recognised the changed national and local planning context without abandoning the Parish Council's earlier positions.

Councillor Richardson referred to national Housing Delivery Test results comparing how local planning authorities were performing against their housing requirements. He highlighted that Wiltshire Council had delivered approximately 93% of its assessed housing requirement. He considered that this presented a more positive picture of housing delivery than the five-year housing land supply position alone.

He explained that the two measures were different and should be presented alongside each other. The Parish Council should acknowledge Wiltshire's shortfall in its five-year housing land supply but also make clear that the authority had delivered 93% of its overall housing requirement. He considered that relying only on the five-year land supply figure did not provide the full context.

Resolved: To approve the three statements, subject to incorporating the housing-delivery test performance, and to submit the appropriate version as supplementary comments on current major applications and with initial comments on new major proposals.

c. Wiltshire Council Local Plan

The Clerk explained that the draft response to the Local Plan scoping consultation was based on the principles agreed by the Council at the Full Council meeting on 7th September plus input from priorities and responses to the earlier iteration of the Local Plan and council decisions. These included infrastructure provision, education, transport, cemetery capacity, heritage, settlement separation, energy development and the evidence prepared for the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (JMNP2).

Members considered the additional comments received from Community Action Whitley and Shaw (CAWS) and Councillor Richardson, which had been circulated as a late paper. It was noted that there was considerable consistency between the proposed Parish Council and CAWS responses.

The importance of protecting the separate identities of settlements was discussed. Members agreed that the Local Plan should reinforce the strategic gaps already identified in JMNP2, including those between Shaw and Whitley. The response should also renew the case for protecting the remaining separation between Melksham and Berryfield and between Melksham and Bowerhill. Members noted that although these areas had not been included as designated

gaps in JMNP2, the Examiner had not concluded that they were therefore suitable for development.

Members also discussed whether further protection should be sought between Shaw and Atworth and between Whitley and Gastard. It was noted that land between Bowerhill and Berryfield had previously been identified by the Parish Council as potentially suitable for employment development. Care would therefore be needed to avoid seeking a designation which conflicted with the Council's previously stated need for additional employment land.

Members considered that the Local Plan must assess cumulative impacts across a wider area and not limit its assessment to development within Melksham and Melksham Without. Development around Trowbridge, including the proposed developments between Hilperton and Semington and housing at Ashton Park near Yarnbrook, was likely to generate additional traffic travelling north along the A350 towards the M4. This would add further pressure to the A350 through Melksham and Lacock and to alternative routes through Shaw and towards Bowerhill. Members agreed that these wider cross-boundary transport impacts should be addressed through the Local Plan and its supporting transport evidence.

The Committee also discussed Wiltshire Council's use of the Department for Transport Connectivity Tool. Members agreed that if the tool was being used to assess planning applications, it should also be applied consistently when assessing potential Local Plan sites. Wiltshire Council should explain how the scores were calculated, what thresholds or benchmarks were used and what weight the results would carry in decision-making.

Members agreed that the response should include stronger comments on the cumulative impact of battery energy storage systems, solar farms and associated infrastructure. It should reflect the evidence gathered by the Parish Council and CAWS during consideration of recent energy proposals.

Resolved 1: To approve the Local Plan scoping response in principle, subject to incorporating:

- The supplementary comments submitted by CAWS and Councillor Richardson.
- Stronger protection for settlement separation and strategic gaps.
- Assessment of cumulative and cross-boundary transport impacts arising from development across the wider area.
- Consistent and clearly explained use of the Department for Transport Connectivity Tool.
- Stronger comments on the cumulative impact of energy developments.

Members noted that the separate Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document had ceased and that this work would now be incorporated into the Local Plan.

It was noted that Wiltshire Council's spatial planning team had offered to attend a meeting with the Parish Council. Members considered that a small group would allow a focused discussion while ensuring that the relevant Council representatives were present. The value of obtaining professional planning support from Vaughan Thompson from Place Studios was also recognised.

Resolved 2: Councillors David Pafford, Richard Wood, Alan Baines and Peter Richardson to represent the Parish Council at future meetings with Wiltshire Council's spatial planning team, with planning consultant Vaughan Thompson attending where appropriate.

199/26 New Planning Applications

a. [PL/2026/04916](#) - Land west of Semington Road, Melksham

Comments: OBJECT

Members agreed to submit the notes from the meeting with the developer held on 24th June 2026, the additional comments submitted to the public consultation plus the following concerns about the application:

Scale and capacity of the site

The proposed development of up to 225 dwellings represents an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site, particularly when considered alongside completed, approved and proposed development around Berryfield.

The site must accommodate public open space, landscape buffers, existing rights of way, drainage infrastructure and the safeguarded corridor for the proposed Melksham Link Canal. The number of dwellings should be determined by the site's genuine capacity to accommodate a well-designed development without unacceptable harm, rather than by seeking to fit 225 dwellings onto it.

Building heights and character

The Parish Council objects to the proposed areas of three-storey development. Buildings of this height would be visually prominent, create an urbanising effect on the edge of Berryfield and be inconsistent with the predominantly two-storey character of existing properties along Semington Road and the Bowood View development opposite.

Building upwards should not be used to achieve the proposed number of dwellings. Development should be limited to two storeys throughout the site.

Cumulative development

The application must not be considered in isolation. Its impacts should be assessed cumulatively with completed developments, existing permissions, current planning applications and other known proposals around Berryfield and southern Melksham.

The cumulative effect would be a substantial increase in housing, traffic and pressure on local services and infrastructure, accompanied by the progressive loss of open countryside. Berryfield remains a village with limited infrastructure and no local shop, yet it is experiencing a disproportionate level of development.

Settlement separation

Members remain concerned that the proposal would erode the open land separating Berryfield from Melksham. Although the Melksham–Berryfield gap is not specifically identified in JMNP2 Policy 19, the remaining land contributes to the physical and visual distinction between the settlements. Its importance has increased as other developments have been approved and built. Wiltshire Council should assess the proposal's effect on that remaining separation, including its cumulative effect with other development, having regard to the JMNP2 supporting text and Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 51.

Canal corridor

The proposed Melksham Link Canal corridor must be protected as a meaningful area of green and blue infrastructure. It should not become a narrow boundary between the canal and a large, densely developed housing estate.

The application does not provide sufficient certainty about the relationship between the housing, canal corridor, associated crossings and necessary infrastructure. The layout must allow for the future construction, operation and maintenance of the canal without compromising its landscape, recreational or ecological value.

Highways and Semington Road

The development would generate a substantial number of additional vehicle movements on Semington Road. These would be added to traffic from existing and proposed developments in an area where concerns have already been identified regarding congestion, vehicle speeds, road safety and inadequate provision for pedestrians and cyclists.

The Transport Assessment does not adequately reflect the latest cumulative position, including the recently approved development north of Berryfield Lane. A comprehensive assessment of the combined effect of all relevant developments is required.

The application should also contribute to a coordinated package of improvements along Semington Road, rather than addressing the development's immediate access in isolation.

Walking cycling and public transport

The proposal does not demonstrate that residents would have safe, convenient and attractive walking, cycling and public transport connections to schools, employment, shops, the town centre and Melksham railway station.

The Parish Council requests a public transport contribution towards a service connecting Semington Road with Bowerhill Industrial Estate and Melksham railway station.

Any travel plan must contain measurable targets, effective monitoring and suitable corrective measures if those targets are not achieved. Aspirational measures such as encouraging car sharing are insufficient without a clear means of securing delivery.

Education

The education information indicates that additional primary school places will be required. However, the proposed contribution does not demonstrate that suitable places would be available within a safe and realistic walking distance of the development.

The Parish Council considers that the previously planned primary school at Pathfinder Way should be progressed. Given the cumulative number of homes completed, approved and proposed across the wider area, further education provision is also likely to be required.

Infrastructure and Section 106 obligations

If Wiltshire Council is minded to approve the application, the Parish Council requests that the Section 106 agreement secures, as a minimum:

- A comprehensive package of highway, pedestrian and cycle improvements along Semington Road.
- Delivery and safeguarding of the canal corridor and all necessary crossings.
- Appropriate education provision.
- Improved public transport, including connectivity with Bowerhill Industrial Estate and Melksham railway station.
- Adequate healthcare and community infrastructure.
- Appropriate open space, play provision, drainage and flood-mitigation measures.
- Measures addressing the cumulative effects of development across Berryfield and southern Melksham.

The obligations must be supported by clear evidence, delivery timescales and effective monitoring arrangements.

Resolved 1: To write directly to National Highways drawing attention to this application and the other major developments likely to affect the A350, A36 and M4 strategic road network.

Resolved 2: To ask Wiltshire Council to consult National Highways formally on the application.

Resolved 3: To ask Wiltshire Council to explain the differing approaches taken by its Northern and Western Area Planning Committees following publication of the revised National Planning Policy Framework.

Resolved 4: To consider the application again on 5th October, following detailed review, and to seek a meeting with the developer later that week.

b. [PL/2026/05002](#) - **Car Park North of The New Inn, Semington Road, Berryfield**

Comments: STRONGLY OBJECT

Melksham Without Parish Council strongly objects to the application for the following reasons:

Overdevelopment and residential amenity

The proposed three dwellings would represent an overdevelopment of this confined site. The layout provides insufficient private amenity space for future occupants and would result in a cramped form of development that is inappropriate for the location.

The proposed vehicular access would also conflict with the established pedestrian route and disabled-access crossing serving Berryfield Village Hall, creating an unacceptable risk to pedestrians and other vulnerable users.

Loss of parking and highway safety

The proposal would remove a substantial proportion of the effective parking provision serving The New Inn. The remaining spaces would need to accommodate residents of the proposed dwellings, pub staff and customers. This would increase overspill parking on Semington Road, where parked vehicles already cause obstruction, restrict traffic movements and create highway-safety concerns.

The Parish Council is already concerned about the existing level of overspill parking on Semington Road. Vehicles parked outside The New Inn have caused difficulties for the X34 bus, obstructing its route and making it difficult to pass safely, resulting in the bus causing damage to parked vehicles. There is also anecdotal evidence that employees of a local business regularly use the pub and its car park for after-work drinks. The pub is also popular for Sunday lunches and as a starting point for walks along the canal, attracting customers from outside Berryfield who are more likely to travel by car. It should therefore not be assumed that The New Inn primarily serves local residents who walk to the premises. Reducing its car-parking provision would be likely to increase on-street parking and worsen the existing obstruction and highway-safety problems

Impact on The New Inn

The New Inn is Berryfield's only public house and one of the village's few community facilities. The loss of parking and introduction of noise-sensitive residential development immediately beside the pub could restrict its operation and undermine its long-term viability. Members commented that they felt it could cause the demise of the pub.

The proposal therefore conflicts with policy 15 (Community Facilities) of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 (JMNP2) which seeks to protect valued community facilities, including public houses.

Noise and the agent of change principle

The submitted Design and Access Statement does not adequately assess the potential impact of noise from the established pub upon future occupants of the proposed dwellings.

The revised National Planning Policy Framework (P4 Impact of development on existing activities) requires applicants to address the effect of existing activities, including pubs and music venues, upon new noise-sensitive development. The responsibility rests with the applicant for the new development to provide suitable mitigation and avoid placing unreasonable restrictions on the established business.

A suitable acoustic assessment should therefore be required, together with details of any necessary mitigation within the proposed dwellings. This assessment must demonstrate that acceptable living conditions could be provided without restricting the existing or future operation of The New Inn.

Conflict with the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan

The negligible contribution of three dwellings towards Wiltshire's housing requirement would not outweigh the identified harm or the proposal's conflict with JMNP2 Policy 6 (Housing at Defined Settlements). The Parish Council considers that the proposal fails to provide appropriate infill development and would adversely affect the character, operation and amenities of the surrounding area.

c. [PL/2026/04901](#) - 10 Birch Grove, Bowerhill

Members discussed whether the front extension would appear incongruous but concluded that it did not project beyond the established building line and that there was insufficient planning harm to justify an objection.

Comments: NO OBJECTION

d. [PL/2026/02476](#) - Land North of 16, Berryfield Park, Melksham

Members noted that the principle of development had already been established. The current application related principally to window acoustic performance and changes to approved windows, including replacement of full-height bedroom doors and a Juliet balcony with a casement window. No planning reason for objection was identified.

Comments: NO OBJECTION

e. [PL/2026/05437](#) - Land at Blackmore Farm, Sandridge Common

The proposed hedgerow removal had been anticipated and considered through outline permission PL/2023/11188 and the approved plans.

Comments: NO OBJECTION

f. [PL/2026/04556](#) - 39 Bader Park, Bowerhill

Members noted the position of the proposed wooden container within the private driveway, its distance from the highway and the absence of neighbour objections.

Comments: NO OBJECTION

g. [PL/2026/05225](#) - Mavern House, Corsham Road, Shaw

Comments: NO OBJECTION

Members supported investment in and improvement of an existing care business. The modest single-storey additions, materials and revised entrance were considered sympathetic, while the internal changes, additional en-suite bedrooms, access improvements and new fire escape would improve the facility without material highway or neighbour impacts. Members noted that the proposal supported investment in and improvement of an existing business, in accordance with the objectives of JMNP2 Policy 10 (Employment Sites)

The Parish Council request that the opportunity presented by construction work be used to rectify the blocked drainage connection affecting the adjacent Vicarage, so that the proposal helps address existing flooding, in accordance with JMNP2 Policy 3 (Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management). It is noted that Mavern House was the Old Vicarage and the reasons for flooding at the new adjacent Vicarage have been extensively investigated by Wiltshire Council Highways (Stuart Renfrew) and Salisbury Diocese and have been established to be caused by a blockage within the curtilage of Mavern House and not under the Highway.

200/26 Amended Plans / Additional Information

a. [PL/2025/07044](#) Former Countrywide Site, Bradford Road, Melksham

Comments: Members considered the amended information alongside the objections submitted by Holt Parish Council and Broughton Gifford Parish Council earlier in the year. It was emphasised that the neighbouring councils did not object to redevelopment of the site in principle, but remained concerned that a safe, reliable and flood-resilient access arrangement had not been demonstrated.

Members discussed the Bradford Road arm of Farmers Roundabout, which is not controlled by traffic signals. It was noted that traffic regularly queued while waiting for a suitable gap to enter the roundabout. Concern was expressed that vehicles leaving the proposed Aldi store would join this existing queue and

increase pressure on the junction. However other Members considered that the existing signal arrangements around Farmers Roundabout worked reasonably well and had significantly improved traffic flow compared with the previous layout. They were concerned that introducing further traffic signals might not improve the situation. It was also noted that Heavy Goods Vehicles already used the Bradford Road arm regularly.

Members discussed the arrangements during flooding, when the principal access from Bradford Road could become unusable. The alternative access would then need to accommodate customers, staff and potentially delivery vehicles. Concern was expressed that HGVs would have to travel through the customer car park and past the store entrance, creating conflict with pedestrians and other vehicles.

Wiltshire Council Highways' response of no objection, subject to conditions, was noted.

Members support and endorse the comments submitted by Holt Parish Council regarding flood risk, the absence of a safe and resilient access arrangement, the operation of the alternative access and the effect of additional traffic on Farmers Roundabout.

201/26 Current Planning Applications

a. [PL/2025/00626](#) Land North of Berryfield Lane, Melksham, SN12 6DT:

It was noted that the application was approved at the Western Area Planning Committee, on Wednesday 19th August 2026 despite the Parish Council's objections.

The Clerk had asked the planning officer to clarify whether the building-height parameter plan had been removed from the approved documents, as recalled by those attending the meeting, and why a replacement plan had subsequently been submitted. The replacement appeared still to allow buildings of up to two-and-a-half storeys in the western field opposite existing bungalows.

Resolved: Unless Wiltshire Council confirms that the two-and-a-half-storey parameter has been removed in its entirety, to object to buildings above two storeys opposite the bungalows on Berryfield Lane.

b. [PL/2025/07391](#) - Land South of Western Way, Melksham, Wiltshire.

[PL/2026/01378](#) Discharge of Condition 18 (Construction Management Statement) of PL/2022/08504

[PL/2026/01660](#) Discharge of Condition 19 (Noise Protection Scheme) of PL/2022/08504

The Clerk reported that there were no substantive updates on the application. Members had previously resolved to seek a meeting with the developer, and the Clerk confirmed that this would be progressed. Members continued to seek a direct access arrangement from the A365 rather than reliance on Western Way and Maitland Place.

c. [PL/2024/10345 \(FULL\)](#) and [PL/2025/09780 \(OUT\)](#) Land north of the A3102, Melksham (New Road Farm).

Comments:

Wiltshire Council Highways had indicated that pedestrian and cycle connectivity through adjoining development land towards local shops and services would be difficult to deliver. Members challenged the suggestion that the proposed was

unachievable. It was noted that a connection from a previous development into Churchill Avenue had also been difficult to secure but had ultimately been delivered. Members considered that the parties should be required to explore a solution, rather than dismissing the connection because it crossed land in different ownership.

- d. [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

Members were concerned that a mobility hub concept plan had been submitted on land intended for transfer to the Parish Council for a community hub, without prior discussion. Its proposed bus shelter, cycle parking and parking layout could constrain the size and position of the future community building and its relationship with the play area. Following the Clerk's enquiry, the applicant stated that the plan was a starting point for discussion. The matters would be raised at the proposed developer meeting at 2.30pm on 22nd September 2026 and Wiltshire Council was asked not to discharge the condition meanwhile.

The Committee noted progress on the equipped play area specification. Wiltshire Council Legal and its play officer supported the Parish Council's requests for wet-pour surfacing, additional swings and appropriate equipment and materials rather than the developer's proposed grass mesh and assumed timber specification.

Members questioned the applicant's statement that the 6.5m carriageway connection to Eastern Way would be delivered as Phase 2, as the applicant did not control the intervening land and no relevant application was in place. Clarification would be sought urgently. Further questions included use of a representative Wiltshire bus for tracking tests, failure to address previous consultation comments and the unsuitability of mown paths as year-round routes.

A prior notification for demolition of agricultural buildings was also noted.

- e. [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.

Members remained concerned that Wiltshire Council Highways' response did not assess the development's effect on a future eastern bypass for Melksham and referred to Eastern Way connectivity without clarifying that no vehicular connection was proposed.

Although the Clerk had raised these concerns with the highway officer, Members considered that the application could prejudice the only feasible eastern bypass corridor identified in Wiltshire Council's Freight Action Plan for the strategically important A350, notwithstanding the reduced weight of the withdrawn draft Local Plan policy.

Resolved: In addition to the Highways Committee's agreed letter to the Secretary of State for Transport, to alert the local MP and National Highways that approval through the eastern corridor could prejudice a strategically important A350 route.

- f. [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

Members noted that investigation works had been undertaken and trenches reinstated. No further comments were agreed.

- g. [PL/2026/03551](#) - **Melksham Library, Lowbourne, Melksham**. Wiltshire Council R3 - 55 extra care flats (C3) with ancillary care facilities, landscaping, access drive and parking, and related works including demolition of existing buildings. Applicant: Wiltshire Council. Note: Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan site allocation 7.2

No new matters were raised.

- h. [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.

The Clerk reported a detailed meeting with the contracted planning officer, Alex Jelley, who was considering this application together with the two Blackmore Farm applications. The update was noted.

- i. [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. Note: Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan site allocation 7.5

Members reviewed the applicant's response to outstanding concerns. Progress had been made on access to the second part of the allocation, affordable housing and other matters, although the Council remained concerned that wording such as "intends" and "anticipates" did not guarantee comprehensive development or an equipped play facility. The applicant had also not addressed the Parish Council's request under JMNP2 Policy 3 for off-site measures to help reduce existing downstream flooding, rather than merely demonstrating that the site itself could be drained.

Members balanced these concerns against the delay to a long-standing JMNP2 allocation and the benefit of an approved scheme contributing to housing delivery.

Resolved: To withdraw the call-in request to avoid further unnecessary delay, subject to written confirmation from Wiltshire Council that any delegated approval will secure 40% affordable housing, the required pedestrian and highway works, Lead Local Flood Authority drainage requirements, the connection necessary for comprehensive development of the remainder of the allocation, and appropriate open space. The Parish Council requested sight of the draft Section 106 agreement. Withdrawal was not to be interpreted as relinquishing the Council's interest in reserved matters or comprehensive development of the wider JMNP2 Policy 7.5 allocation.

202/26 Tree Preservation Orders

Resolved 1: To welcome and support Tree Preservation Order TPO/2026/00018 for Land north of Bath Road.

Resolved 2: To request a Tree Preservation Order for the remaining trees on the verges of Brampton Court, Bowerhill.

Resolved 3: To resubmit the request for protection of trees on the green triangle between Berryfield Lane and Berryfield Park, as Members considered that continuing development pressure demonstrated a credible threat.

The Committee also noted confirmation that the Orders relating to 17 Wellington Drive and groups of trees at Bader Park had been made permanent.

Councillor Pafford left the meeting

203/26 Proposed Energy Installations

a. Lime Down Solar

Planning Inspectorate updates were noted, including the Examining Authority's question about the criteria used to discount Whitley as a location for the battery energy storage system and the applicant's response.

b. PL/2025/05552 Brockleaze Battery Energy Storage System

Members noted that Community Action Whitley and Shaw (CAWS) had submitted Addendum 11, Addendum 11A and Addendum 12, covering further technical matters, the implications of the new NPPF and criticism of the Environment Agency's withdrawal of its objection.

Resolved: To support and endorse Addendum 11, Addendum 11A and Addendum 12 from Community Action Whitley and Shaw (CAWS).

c. Norrington Spring Park and Studley Solar Farm cable routes

Norrington Spring Park works on Corsham Road remained incomplete and other works were ongoing. There was no further update on the Studley Solar Farm cable route.

Councillor Pafford rejoined the meeting.

d. Corsham Future Energy Landscape

The final report and correspondence with CAWS were noted.

e. Battery Energy Storage Systems Explained

Councillor Richardson critiqued the document on 'Battery Energy Storage Systems Explained', which had been shared by the Wiltshire Climate Alliance, and shared six key points (appendix 1).

Resolved: To send the detailed critique of the document 'Battery Energy Storage Systems Explained' back to the Wiltshire Climate Alliance.

f. Wiltshire Council response to the Council's recommendations

No response had been received to the Parish Council's 12 recommendations on battery storage and renewable-energy development.

Resolved: To write again to Wiltshire Council, enclosing the original recommendations and robustly requesting a response.

204/26 Appeals

- a. No new appeal decisions were reported.
- b. The Secretary of State's decision to allow the Snarlton Farm appeal was noted, together with the letter sent by Brian Mathew MP expressing concern about the decision.
- c. Members welcomed the dismissal of the appeal for 52E Chapel Lane (PL/2023/05883).
- d. The start of the written representations appeal for 554 Canal Bridge, Semington (PL/2026/02084), was noted. The Parish Council's previous comments had been submitted under delegated powers.
- e. The Whistle Mead Solar Farm hearing would begin at County Hall on 22nd September. Councillor Richardson would attend and speak on behalf of CAWS (Community Action: Whitley and Shaw). Concern remained about the development above a principal aquifer, cumulative impacts and the absence of a defined cable route.

205/26 Planning Enforcement

Held in closed session at the end of the meeting

Members were advised on feedback received from Wiltshire Council about the New Inn planning enforcement enquiry.

Resolved: To write to Building Control, referring to the enforcement officer's correspondence and site photographs, and request confirmation that the relevant works at the property comply with building regulations and fire-safety requirements.

206/26 S106 Agreements and Developer Meetings

a. Ongoing Agreements

i. Pathfinder Place, Bowerhill

No further update had been received on the Section 278 and Section 38 works at Pathfinder Place.

Members also reported dead trees around the attenuation basin. The residents' representative had completed a walkabout with the management company using the adoption and landscaping plans supplied by the Council and was pursuing maintenance issues.

Three trees removed from Pathfinder Way were expected to be replaced during the next planting season; officers would confirm that all three were included. These were thought to be related to Highways intervention and not related to the new adjacent development.

ii. Buckley Gardens, Berryfield

A new concern had been raised about construction of a traffic-calming feature at the entrance to Buckley Gardens, close to a resident's driveway. As the works were underway, the Clerk had sought an urgent explanation from Wiltshire Council Highways.

b. Contact with developers

i. Living Space development behind Townsend Farm

Resolved: To approve the notes of the meeting held with Living Space on 14th July (Appendix 2)

ii. Folly Lane and First lane Shaw/Whitley

Resolved: To approve the notes of the meeting held with the developer on 12th August concerning Folly Lane and First Lane, Shaw and Whitley (Appendix 3).

iii. Gompels Warehouse

The meeting with Gompels ahead of a reserved matters application was confirmed for 4.00pm on 22nd September 2026.

iv. Wales and West Gas Main replacement

Formal notes of the Wales and West Utilities meeting on 10th September were not yet available.

A further site meeting had been requested for 23rd September to discuss impacts at Shaw and Whitley; the Clerk would attend and raise the Council's concerns.

c. Transparency and content of draft Section 106 agreements

The Clerk had asked Wiltshire Council to explain what evidence the Parish Council needed to provide to secure its requests for highways, cemetery, community-building and wider mitigation contributions before the forthcoming major applications were determined. Members reiterated concern that requests were sometimes disregarded without adequate explanation and that responses were supplied too late for effective scrutiny. The correspondence was noted and would be pursued.

Meeting closed at 9.41 pm.

Chairman, 12th October 2026

Appendix 1

Electricity Storage Network slides

1. **We do not oppose battery storage in principle; we oppose the assumption that national need justifies every scheme.** Each proposal must still be necessary, appropriately located and acceptable when assessed against local planning policies and environmental constraints.
2. **The document ignores the extraordinary concentration around Melksham Substation.** Brockleaze, Whistle Mead, Lime Down and dozens of other schemes create cumulative landscape, heritage, ecological, traffic, water and community effects that cannot be dismissed by assessing each site in isolation.
3. **Proximity to a substation does not make a location environmentally suitable.** Brockleaze lies within a sensitive water environment connected to the South Brook, while Lime Down's extensive cable corridor demonstrates that grid-led development can transfer impacts across many kilometres of countryside.
4. **The safety assurances run ahead of the regulatory evidence.** National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) guidance is guidance rather than a statutory approval regime; site-specific emergency plans are commonly deferred, and no clear acceptance by Dorset and Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service (DWFRS) has been demonstrated for Brockleaze.
5. **Fire containment cannot simply be assumed.** It depends on the particular battery design, spacing and credible UL 9540A propagation evidence. Even a "controlled burn" requires boundary cooling and may produce contaminated firewater, toxic emissions and risks to soil, groundwater and watercourses.
6. **The industry's national averages conceal the local burden.** Small percentages of UK farmland and claims of generally limited visual or traffic effects say nothing about several very large developments concentrated around two villages, involving industrial infrastructure, major transformers, abnormal loads, cable works and the progressive loss of rural character.

Appendix 2

NOTES OF MEETING WITH LIVING SPACES ON MONDAY 14th July 2026 AT 12.30PM RE: LAND AT SEMINGTON ROAD (REAR OF TOWNSEND FARM) (PL/2023/008098 Ph1 and PL/2024/11665 Ph2)

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

Teresa Strange (Clerk to Melksham Without)
Fiona Dey (Parish Officer, Melksham Without)

Andy Thompson (Highways Technician, Wiltshire Council)

Luke Webb, Planning Director, Living Spaces

Site access and programme

Living Space provided an update on the new site access. The necessary Section 38 technical approval had now been received, following unexpected delays involving both sides. The contractor was now awaiting an available road-space booking before the access works could be undertaken.

The works were likely to require a road closure during October. It was noted that other works were scheduled in the area between 10 August and 11 September, which could affect the timing.

Access to the site was expected to be available by the end of October or during November, with occupation of the first properties anticipated by December. Living Space advised that there were already people who had been waiting to move into the development for approximately 12 months.

Construction programme

The development was being delivered in two phases. Play equipment would be installed towards the end of Phase 1. Phase 2 had not yet commenced but was expected to begin in October, using the new site access.

Living Space would provide a copy of the current construction and servicing schedule.

Traffic management and local roads

Andy Thompson continued to have concerns regarding the depth of the existing cables.

A second closure of Semington Road was expected during September or October to form the bellmouth access.

Members raised the continuing use of Townsend Farm for site access and concerns regarding the impact on the privately maintained road. It was noted that compensation may need to be considered for any damage caused.

Plans were discussed for restricting the existing entrance onto Berryfield Lane once the new access was operational. The intention was to reinstate the hedgerow and install bollards and fencing, while retaining a pedestrian access. Living Space would investigate whether the boundary treatment could be made more substantial and whether improved access could be provided to the south for the allotments and public right of way.

Drainage and landscaping

Concern was raised regarding water pooling outside the mobile homes. Living Space would investigate this issue.

Members also raised the condition of the reinstated verge near the roundabout, where weeds had grown rather than grass. It was noted that the roundabout works had been undertaken as part of a Melksham Town Council-sponsored scheme.

Bus stop

Members queried why the developer had said that the proposed bus stop near the mobile home park could not be provided when the Highways consultant had considered it acceptable.

Living Space agreed to share the relevant details and plans with the Parish Council and to provide the bus-stop information to Andy Thompson.

Communication with residents

Living Space had appointed a new resident liaison team, which would contact residents of Townsend Farm.

It was agreed that matters relating to street works should be directed through Melksham Without Parish Council.

Site name

The development would be known as **Berryfield Meadow**. It was noted that this name had previously been suggested and was considered acceptable.

Actions

- Living Space to provide the current construction and servicing schedule.
- Living Space to confirm the timing and arrangements for the anticipated road closure.
- Investigate water pooling outside the mobile homes.
- Consider compensation for any damage caused to the privately maintained road serving Townsend Farm.
- Review the proposed boundary treatment and retained access at Berryfield Lane.
- Provide details of the proposed bus stop to the Parish Council and Andy Thompson.
- Resident liaison team to contact Townsend Farm residents.
- Investigate the poor reinstatement and weed growth near the roundabout.

Meeting closed at 1:30pm

Appendix 3

NOTES OF MEETING WITH PEGASUS ON WEDNESDAY 12TH AUGUST 2026 AT 10.30AM

RE: Land between Folly Lane and First Lane, Shaw/Whitley

Present: Councillor Richard Wood (Chair of Planning)
Councillor Alan Baines (Vice Chair of Planning)
Councillor David Pafford (Vice Chair of Council)
Councillor Mark Harris (Planning Committee Member)
Councillor Peter Richardson (Planning Committee Member)
Wiltshire Councillor Phil Alford
Teresa Strange (Clerk, Melksham Without)
Fiona Dey (Parish Officer, Melksham Without)

Kate Holden, Pegasus Group
Simon Steele-Perkins, Waddesdon Park Ltd

1. Introduction and proposals

Kate Holden and Simon Steele-Perkins presented an early, indicative scheme on behalf of Pegasus Group and Waddesdon Park Ltd. Waddesdon Park was described as a land promoter, not a housebuilder. A pre-application enquiry had been submitted to Wiltshire Council, but no decision had been made to submit a planning application. The site would also be promoted through the emerging Local Plan/call-for-sites process.

The indicative scheme comprised up to approximately 100 dwellings: around 70 on the Folly Lane parcel and 30 on the First Lane parcel. Separate vehicular accesses were proposed, with no vehicular link between the parcels. A pedestrian and cycle connection would run through central public open space containing biodiversity and drainage features. The layout showed a LEAP to the north and two LAPs to the south.

The promoter confirmed that the proposals and presentation were not confidential, provided they were clearly identified as indicative pre-application material.

2. Neighbourhood Plan, housing numbers and settlement separation

Members emphasised that JMNP2 was the current development plan and that the site had been assessed but not allocated. They asked that it should not be described as the 'next best site', as this could imply an endorsement which had not been given. The promoter accepted this distinction.

Members' principal concern was that development on both parcels would conflict with the plan-led approach and erode the physical and perceptual separation between the distinct villages of Shaw and Whitley. They challenged the claim that the scheme would 'extend the green gap', as housing would be introduced at both ends of presently open land, and referred to the dismissal of the Corsham Road appeal on coalescence grounds.

The promoter stated that the central valley would remain open, become publicly accessible and be protected from future development. Members acknowledged the benefit of public access but remained concerned that both villages would extend towards one another.

Members also rejected any assumption that further Wiltshire-wide housing requirements should automatically be met in Melksham. They highlighted the

substantial housing already allocated or permitted locally, including recent appeal decisions, and strongly supported plan-led rather than piecemeal speculative development.

3. Scale, density and housing mix

The promoter said the housing numbers and layout remained flexible. Members asked that any scheme reflect the low-density character of Shaw and Whitley, with adequate gardens, and be informed by the Shaw and Whitley Housing Needs Assessment and the Melksham Design Guide/Design Code.

Members requested a mix meeting identified local needs rather than predominantly larger executive homes, including:

- smaller two- and three-bedroom homes and genuinely affordable housing for local people;
- open-market bungalows; and
- accessible and adaptable homes enabling older residents or those with mobility needs to downsize while remaining in the villages.

No housing mix or affordable housing percentage had yet been fixed.

4. Highways and access

Members raised significant concerns about both proposed accesses:

Folly Lane/A365 - vehicles frequently travelled at speed from Atworth and Shaw Hill; the bend could limit awareness of turning or queuing vehicles; and the route carried increased HGV traffic. Members considered that a right-turn ghost-island lane might be required to reduce the risk of rear-end collisions.

First Lane - the lane was narrow and rural, and a formal estate access and additional traffic could urbanise its character. The area was also affected by parking associated with Shaw Primary School.

Members stressed that local experience should inform the technical assessment. The promoter advised that discussions with Wiltshire Highways might include road markings and moving the 30/40 mph speed-limit change. The First Lane access could potentially move a limited distance, subject to visibility and hedgerow constraints.

5. Flooding, drainage and sewerage

Members described significant surface-water flows from higher land across First Lane and towards Shaw School, Corsham Road and nearby properties. They referred to water entering drives, existing gullies and openings in boundary walls, and a drainage pipe near the proposed First Lane access.

Members directed the promoter to JMNP2 Policy 3 and asked that any scheme actively help mitigate wider flooding, rather than merely avoid increasing runoff. The Shaw and Whitley flood wardens should be consulted because of their detailed local knowledge.

Concern was also raised about foul drainage capacity and historic combined-drainage problems. The promoter indicated that a mains sewer connection and pumping station in the northern parcel were envisaged, subject to further engagement with Wessex Water.

6. Open space, play, connectivity and community benefits

Members asked that the Parish Council be given the first opportunity to consider taking ownership of the equipped play area, with suitable funding arrangements secured at outline stage.

Members stressed that Local Areas for Play (LAPs) should provide meaningful activity rather than incidental grassed areas. The scheme should also include provision for teenagers and informal recreation, such as space to kick a ball. Possible trim-trail provision should be explored.

Members welcomed pedestrian and cycle connectivity without a vehicular link and asked whether the brook crossing could be improved, potentially through a new bridge and diversion of the public right of way. If the scheme progressed, early discussion should also cover safe park-and-stride provision for the school and improvements to Shaw Village Hall and Whitley Reading Room.

Members requested solar panels, domestic battery storage and properly designed low-carbon heating. The promoter agreed to consider relevant technologies.

7. Community engagement and next steps

Members asked for any future consultation to be held in Shaw and/or Whitley, at convenient times, with sufficient notice and clear large-format plans. Engagement should not rely solely on online participation. The Parish Council offered to assist through noticeboards, social media and local contacts, and suggested use of the village magazine, community shop/café and local halls.

The promoter would continue the pre-application and Local Plan processes, keep the Parish Council informed and consider the issues raised before deciding whether to submit an application.

The notes would be submitted to a future Planning Committee meeting for approval. No formal view on the merits of the proposal was taken because this was not a formal council meeting.

Meeting closed at 11:49am

Appendix 4

Comments submitted and actions completed under Delegated Powers in August 2026 (Full Council 7th September 2026: Min 186/26 d)

PL/2026/03357 Home Farm, Shaw Hill, Shaw

Response to amended plan

Stance: Object

The Parish Council notes the applicant's acknowledgement of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan and Design Guide, but considers that key design and heritage concerns remain unresolved, including the relationship with Shaw Hill House, the former farmstead character, scale, massing, landscaping and detailing. The Parish Council therefore maintains its objection as substantive design concerns remain.

PL/2024/09725 – Land off Corsham Road, Whitley, Melksham

Response to amended plans and additional information

Melksham Without Parish Council has considered the amended plans and additional information submitted in relation to the above application.

The Parish Council acknowledges that the additional documents provide greater clarity on some matters, particularly the proposed continuation of the estate road towards the adjoining allocated land, the pedestrian connection to Corsham Road and the intention to provide a pedestrian crossing. However, several important matters remain unresolved.

1. Flood risk and mitigation beyond the application site

The Parish Council remains concerned that the submitted information does not adequately address the known flooding problems affecting land and properties to the south of the site.

The Council's concern is not limited to ensuring that the proposed development itself is protected from flooding. The development must not increase flood risk elsewhere, and the opportunity should be taken to consider whether the drainage strategy can provide wider mitigation or betterment within the surrounding catchment as per policy 3 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2. These matters should be resolved in consultation with Wiltshire Council's drainage officers and secured through appropriately worded planning conditions and/or legal obligations. Drainage officer Richard Williams has visited site and made recommendations on more than one occasion, and the site flooding to the south is also well known to Principle Drainage Engineer Daniel Everett.

2. Inconsistent affordable-housing figures

There is a clear inconsistency between the submitted documents.

The draft Section 106 heads of terms refer to **40% affordable housing**, whereas the illustrative masterplan and accommodation schedule identify only **six affordable dwellings, equivalent to 27% of the proposed 22 dwellings**.

The applicant must correct or explain this discrepancy. The final affordable-housing provision, tenure mix, distribution and delivery arrangements should be

stated consistently across all documents and secured through the Section 106 agreement.

The Parish Council would expect the application to provide the policy-compliant level of affordable housing (30% in the Core Strategy) and in line with the Housing Needs Assessment undertaken for the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 which had a specific assessment undertaken for the “Large Village” of Shaw and Whitley.

3. Pedestrian crossing on Corsham Road

The Parish Council welcomes the inclusion of a pedestrian crossing in principle. However, the current wording does not provide sufficient certainty regarding its form, location, cost or delivery.

4. Development of Plot B and comprehensive delivery of the allocation

The description of the current application as a “first phase” is noted. However, there remains no firm commitment or indicative timetable for bringing forward the remainder of the allocated site.

The submitted illustrative masterplan is limited principally to the current 22-dwelling proposal. It does not demonstrate how the complete allocation of approximately 55 dwellings would be comprehensively delivered, including housing, drainage, landscaping, public open space, pedestrian and cycle connections and any additional community infrastructure. The current development must not prejudice or constrain the satisfactory planning of the remaining allocated land in Policy 7.5 of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2.

The Parish Council requests confirmation from Wiltshire Council Highways that the access from Corsham Road is suitable to serve the full allocation.

5. Play provision

The Parish Council notes that the draft heads of terms refer to an **unequipped area of play**, while the illustrative masterplan labels an area as a “play area”.

The Council recognises that an equipped play area may not be an express requirement of NHP2 Policy 7.5, although it was in the previous iteration of NHP1 for c18 dwellings. Nevertheless, the current wording provides little certainty that the identified area would offer a meaningful, usable or accessible recreational facility.

The Parish Council would welcome a commitment to an equipped or natural-play facility. However, should Wiltshire Council conclude that this cannot reasonably be required as part of the present 22-dwelling application, the Council requests that the current scheme safeguards sufficient appropriately located land and connections so that enhanced play provision can be delivered as part of Phase 2.

There should be a clear commitment that the recreational needs generated by the complete 55-dwelling allocation will be assessed comprehensively when Plot B is brought forward. The layout of Phase 1 must not prevent the delivery of an appropriately sized and equipped facility in Phase 2.

6. Call-in request

The Parish Council's call-in request remains in place at this stage.

However, the Parish Council would be prepared to reconsider its position if the applicant and Wiltshire Council provide satisfactory and enforceable arrangements addressing the concerns raised:

1. correction of the affordable-housing discrepancy;
2. a defined and fully funded pedestrian-crossing obligation;
3. safeguarding of the remainder of the allocation;
4. clear arrangements for recreational and play provision, including a commitment to consider enhanced provision as part of Phase 2; and
5. precise delivery triggers and enforceable wording within the conditions and Section 106 agreement.

Until these matters have been satisfactorily resolved, the Parish Council maintains its call-in request

PL/2026/01787 Cricket Ground, Land North West Of St Barnabas Church

Response to amended plan

Melksham Without Parish Council continues to support this application and has no objection to the amended plans.

Note - The parish council has requested that Wiltshire Councillor Phil Alford call-in the application in the event that the Planning Officer recommendation is refusal

TPO/2026/00016 for 17 WELLINGTON DRIVE, BOWERHILL, MELKSHAM

The Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council have agreed to SUPPORT Tree Preservation Order TPO/2026/00016 for 17 WELLINGTON DRIVE, BOWERHILL, MELKSHAM, SN12 6QW.

PL/2025/07391 Land South of Western Way, Melksham

Melksham Without Parish Council has no comment to make on the amended documentation related to the repositioning of the substation

PL/2026/01378 (Discharge of Condition 18 (Construction Management Statement) of PL/2022/08504)

Melksham Without Parish Council is unclear why they have been reconsulted on this Discharge of Condition. They maintain their objection to the application and support the comments submitted by Highways.