

**MINUTES of the Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council  
held on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2026 at Melksham Without Parish Council  
Offices**

**(First Floor), Melksham Community Campus, Market Place, SN12 6ES  
at 7:00pm**

**Present:** Councillors Richard Wood (Committee Chair), Alan Baines (Committee Vice-Chair), Mark Harris, David Pafford, Martin Franks and Peter Richardson.

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

**In attendance:** Wiltshire Councillor Nick Holder, Councillor Hemmings (as an observer), 2 members of the public (part)

**On Zoom:** Councillor John Glover, Councillor Chris Griffiths and four members of the public joined on Zoom (part)

**495/25 Welcome, Housekeeping and Announcements:**

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. As there were no new members of the public present at the meeting, the housekeeping messages were not read out. Everyone present was reminded that the meeting was being recorded and would be published on YouTube following the meeting and deleted once the minutes were approved.

The Clerk shared that notification had been received that application PL/2024/11426 for Land South of A365 Bath Road and West of Turnpike Garage (Gompels Warehouse) would be considered at Wiltshire Council's Strategic Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> March 2026.

It was noted that amended plans and additional information had been submitted for PL/2026/00489 (172 Littleworth Lane, Whitley). An extension to the consultation timeline to after the next Planning Committee Meeting had been requested but not confirmed. Therefore, the application would be reconsidered as part of agenda item 7 Amended Plans/Additional Information. The member of the public who had previously spoken about the application had been invited to this meeting.

**496/25 Apologies:**

**Resolved:** To accept Councillor Glover's absence due to holiday

**497/25 Declarations of Interest:**

a. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Richardson declared that he held a small number of shares in National Grid (agenda item 6c) but did not think that it constituted a pecuniary interest as below the financial limit for declaration.

Councillor Franks declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 13a (license application from Jarboom) as he is a friend of the applicant and works at similar type events.

b. Dispensation Requests for this Meeting:

None requested.

**498/25 To consider holding items in Closed Session due to confidential nature:**

**Resolved:** Agenda items 15 (Planning Enforcement) to be held in closed session 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 the consideration of the following items of business as publicity would be prejudicial to the public interest because of the confidential nature of the business to be transacted.

Agenda item 15: Planning Enforcement: Start of potential legal action.

**499/25 Public Participation:**

Standing Orders were suspended for public participation.

Wiltshire Councillor Holder

Wiltshire Councillor Holder commented that he had no issues with application PL/2026/01104 for **Loves Farm**, Bowerhill.

With regards to **Land South of Western Way**, Wiltshire Councillor Holder commented that the proposal for construction traffic access is unacceptable as it still makes use of Maitland Place for egress (detailed in PL/2026/01378) and that he is minded to keep the call-in to committee in place for the Highways issues. He also noted that the Technical Report did not contain details of any of the other conditions such as wheel wash, contractor parking etc which have caused problems on other developments. Officers explained that the details Wiltshire Councillor Holder suggested were missing were included in the Construction Method Statement which was separate from the Technical Report in PL/2026/01378.

Wiltshire Councillor Holder explained that he was still representing Wiltshire Councillor Alford on application PL/2026/00489 (**172 Littleworth Lane**). He noted that he had received correspondence from the Planning Officer that the number of consultees had been increased, the consultation deadline extended and the plans significantly modified. Councillor Baines commented that a construction method statement has also been added. Wiltshire Councillor Holder commented that he is minded to withdraw the call-in for the application but would wait to hear the parish council's discussions.

MP1 (present): Land South of Western Way (PL/2026/01378 and PL/2025/07391)

MP1 explained that he is speaking on behalf of the Pathfinder Place Residents Association representing residents of both Maitland Place and the wider Pathfinder Place development. He explained that they understand that the development has outline planning permission (PL/2022/08504) and so his first comments relate specifically to the latest application containing the Construction Method Statement (CMS) and technical note in PL/2026/01378.

He commented that, having reviewed the CMS and technical note, a number of key points appear to be missing. In particular, the documents consider construction traffic only and do not take account of the estimated 250+ vehicle movements already using Maitland Place. He said this would represent a considerable increase in traffic movements on the road.

He also raised existing highway safety concerns, including vehicles already having difficulty passing one another at junctions and the blind corner at the T-

junction on Maitland Place. In his view, any additional traffic would make these issues significantly worse.

Further points he considered to be absent from the technical document included the impact of 16.5m articulated HGV movements. He noted that lorries waiting to turn out of Maitland Place could block access for vehicles turning into the block of flats or the shared driveway near the end of Maitland Place, and this could in turn lead to traffic backing up onto Pathfinder Way.

He also expressed concerns about carriageway width. He stated that, at its narrowest point, the road measures approximately 3.4m at the traffic calming feature, with the remainder of the road varying between 5.4m and 5.9m. He explained that the accepted width of a 16.5m articulated HGV, including mirrors, is around 3.0m to 3.2m, leaving very little clearance between the HGV, parked cars and the pavement, particularly at the traffic calming point.

He further noted that the swept path analysis in the technical report appears to show only limited locations where a car could pass an HGV. He also referred to the driver's view when entering Maitland Place and commented that a driver would not see an approaching HGV until they had reached the narrowest point of the road. He felt that it would be unlikely that the HGV would reverse resulting in the other driver having to reverse back around the bend in the road.

MP1 also commented that the modelling assumes that no vehicles are parked outside marked bays, which he considered to be unrealistic. He argued that if vehicles are parked on the kerbs, a 16.5m articulated vehicle would not be able to pass along the road.

MP1 commented, with regard to the access and egress routes for construction traffic set out in Technical Note 1 (Construction Access Evidence Note), that he disagreed with the conclusions reached. In his view, the most appropriate option would be a left-turn-only access into the site from the A365, with a corresponding left-turn-only exit back onto the A365.

He noted that the report raises concerns regarding visibility and insufficient visibility splays for this option. However, he stated that, based on photographic evidence he presented, there appears to be clear visibility in both directions along the A365 from the proposed access/egress point. He expressed the opinion that the real reason this option has not been pursued is due to the cost associated with altering the culvert to make it suitable.

He further questioned the consistency of the report's position, noting that the same A365 access point is proposed for use by emergency vehicles serving the Care Home once construction is complete. He queried whether the identified issues relating to visibility and the culvert would therefore need to be resolved in any case to accommodate emergency access.

He also referenced other developments, including Elizabeth Way in Trowbridge, where roadworks have extended onto major routes such as the A361. He noted that, over time, similar works have involved traffic management measures, including signals, and suggested that comparable arrangements could be implemented on the A365 to facilitate this development.

In addition, he raised concerns about the lack of detail within the Construction Method Statement. While some aspects, such as contractor parking and delivery routing, are mentioned, he considered the information to be limited and unclear. Specifically, he noted the absence of defined locations for contractor parking, a

lack of clarity on delivery routes, and no detail on how construction traffic would be coordinated. He also questioned how the plan would be enforced in practice.

He further highlighted the absence of sufficient detail on measures to prevent mud and debris being tracked onto surrounding roads, beyond brief references to wheel washing. He also considered that there was limited mitigation proposed in relation to noise impacts and noted that the proposed construction hours do not align with those previously requested by residents.

In summary, he concluded that while the submission demonstrates, in theory, how vehicles could navigate the proposed routes, it provides insufficient detail on construction traffic management, day-to-day site operations, and mitigation measures. He therefore considered the document to be not fit for purpose and lacking in necessary detail.

MP1 also commented on the amended plans for application PL/2025/07391 (Reserved Matters for Land South of Western Way).

He stated that a number of issues do not appear to have been fully considered. In particular, he raised concerns regarding the noise and acoustic impact assessment relating to the adjacent commercial site. He noted that the assessment only considered limited time periods and relied on a number of assumptions. In his view, a more comprehensive assessment of noise impacts, together with appropriate mitigation measures, is required.

He also highlighted that the impact of construction traffic has not been addressed within the Reserved Matters application. He expressed concern that the effect of construction activity on early residents of the development has not been considered. He explained that, based on the indicative construction phasing, development is expected to commence with properties adjacent to Maitland Place. As a result, future occupants of these dwellings would likely experience prolonged disruption from construction traffic exiting the site over several years as the remainder of the development is built out.

MP1 further commented that the separation of the construction-related details into a separate application (PL/2026/01378) creates a disconnect between that submission and the Reserved Matters application (PL/2025/07391).

The Clerk advised that the Construction Method Statement is secured by condition on the outline planning permission (granted at appeal) and would not normally be submitted at this stage. It was noted, however, that the Parish Council has been seeking earlier submission of this information. Discharge of conditions is typically dealt with through separate applications.

MP1 also noted that there appear to be no significant amendments to address previously raised concerns regarding flood risk.

Members additionally noted that application PL/2025/07391 currently has a holding objection from Drainage.

Further concerns were raised in relation to:

- Ecology and habitat protection, including how fencing would be installed through existing hedgerows without disturbing the existing habitats; and
- The potential impact of lighting on existing habitats.

MP2 (on Zoom): Land East of Blackmore Farm Consultation

MP2 noted that the application has not yet been submitted to the planning authority but wished to raise early concerns. She highlighted that, when combined with the existing approved development of approximately 500 dwellings, the proposed additional 275 homes would result in around 775 new dwellings in total. She estimated this could equate to approximately 1,500 additional vehicles and a significant increase in the number of residents.

She expressed concerns regarding the capacity of local infrastructure, particularly schools and GP services. She stated that local GP practices are already not fully staffed and questioned how they would accommodate further demand arising from additional housing.

She also raised policy concerns, noting that the site lies outside the current development boundary and is not allocated within the Neighbourhood Plan.

In terms of local impact, she highlighted that the development would directly affect properties on Lopes Close, including her own. She explained that her property has side-facing windows that would face towards the proposed development and raised concerns about overlooking. She considered that new dwellings could directly overlook both habitable rooms and private residential amenity spaces. She further stated that proposed mitigation, such as boundary planting or hedging, would not be sufficient to prevent loss of privacy.

While acknowledging that the proposal has not yet formally come before the Council, she emphasised the need to begin considering the cumulative impact of development in the area, including effects on existing residents, local infrastructure, the natural environment, and the character of the town.

MP3 (on Zoom): 172 Littleworth Lane, Whitley (PL2026/00489)

MP3 commented that the revised proposals for 172 Littleworth Lane appear less overbearing in relation to the adjacent cottages within the terrace. However, she raised ongoing concerns regarding the proposed materials, specifically the use of reconstituted stone combined with timber cladding.

She expressed concern that future occupants may choose to remove the timber cladding, which could result in exposed reconstituted stone sitting alongside the natural stone of the original cottages, potentially harming the visual consistency and character of the terrace.

She also noted positively that a Construction Management Statement has now been included as part of the submission.

MP4 (on Zoom): Premises license for Wiltshire Throwback Festival 2026

As the applicant for the premises license, MP4 commented that he was present to listen to the discussion and to answer any questions about the application. He also noted that he had received confirmation from Wiltshire Council that the event would need to submit a planning application in addition to the license application.

The meeting reconvened. Agenda items 7c (172 Littleworth Lane), 13 (Premises license for Wiltshire Throwback Festival 2026), 9a (East of Blackmore Farm consultation) and 7a (Land South of Western Way) were brought forward.

## 500/25 Agenda Items Brought Forward

- a. [PL/2026/00489](#) - 172 Littleworth Lane, Whitley, Melksham, SN12 8RF. Householder planning permission - 2 storey extension and associated external works.

### Comments: OBJECT

Members noted that revised plans and a construction method statement had been submitted by the applicant. Members welcomed the construction method statement but maintain their objection based on:

- Scale and Relationship to the Host Dwelling

The proposed extension is still considered to be out of scale with the host dwelling.

- Use of Materials

Members still consider that dressed natural stone, rather than timber cladding, should be specified to ensure the development reflects the character and appearance of the area and integrates satisfactorily with the existing dwelling and neighbouring properties.

Members confirmed that the call-in should remain.

One member of the public on Zoom left the meeting.

- b. Premises Licenses application: [PR202602-597116](#) Oakfield Stadium (for Wiltshire Throwback Festival 2026)

**Resolved:** To approve notes of meeting held with the applicant, Jarboom, on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2026 (Appendix 1)

**Comments:** Members **SUPPORT** the license application

One member of the public on Zoom left the meeting.

- c. Public Consultations: East of Blackmore Farm  
<https://www.blackmorefarmconsultation.co.uk/>

**Resolved 1:** To approve notes of meeting held with the applicant, Gleesons, on 5<sup>th</sup> March 2026 (Appendix 2), with a correction to the spelling of Praters Lane.

**Resolved 2:** Members agreed to submit the notes from the meeting with the developer on 5<sup>th</sup> March 2026, together with a covering letter, to the consultation.

Standing Orders were suspended to allow Councillor Glover (on Zoom) to contribute to a discussion on the proposed route of the Melksham bypass. Members discussed the proposed route, including where it is documented, how it has been considered within other planning applications, and the mechanisms in place to safeguard it from development. The meeting reconvened.

**Resolved 3:** To write to the Secretary of State to ask about the impact of approval for housing to be built on the East of Blackmore Farm site on the Strategic Route from the M4 to the South Coast (which shows the proposed route of the Melksham bypass).

One member of the public on Zoom left the meeting.

d. Land South of Western Way

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

**Comments: OBJECT**

Members do not agree with the proposed construction traffic routing (access via a left turn from Western Way (A365) and exit via Maitland Place). They reiterate that Maitland Place is not suitable or safe for construction traffic and especially large HGVs. They support the comments made by the resident representative.

Traffic and Highway Concerns

- Construction Method Statement only considers construction traffic, not existing ~250+ daily vehicle movements
- Significant increase in traffic expected on Maitland Place
- Existing issues: narrow road, difficult passing at junctions, blind T-junction
- Additional traffic likely to worsen safety issues

HGV and Road Width Issues

- No adequate consideration of 16.5m articulated HGV movements
- Risk of HGVs blocking access to flats/shared driveway → potential queuing onto Pathfinder Way
- Narrowest road width ~3.4m; HGV width ~3.0–3.2m → minimal clearance
- Swept path analysis shows very limited passing opportunities
- Drivers may not see oncoming HGVs until reaching narrow section
- Unlikely HGVs would reverse → other vehicles forced to reverse unsafely
- Assumption of no on-street parking unrealistic; parked cars would prevent HGV passage

Construction Method Statement Issues

- Lacks detail and clarity overall
- No defined contractor parking locations
- No clear delivery routing strategy
- No detail on construction traffic coordination
- Unclear how the plan will be enforced

Members noted that four options were considered in Technical Note 1 - Construction Access Evidence Note and believe that option B2 (left turn egress onto Western Way A365) would be the ideal solution. Members expressed concern that the option appears to have been rejected by the developer for reasons of cost and convenience, resulting in adverse impacts on residents of Maitland Place.

- ii. [PL/2025/07391](#) - 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.

**Resolved:** Members agreed to submit the notes from their meeting with the developer on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2026\*, together with a covering letter and a comment about the construction phasing as their comments on the revised application.

\*Appendix to Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2026

**501/25 New Planning Applications:** The Council considered the following applications and made the following comments:

- a. [PL/2026/00931](#) - **Plastic Engineering Solutions Ltd, Unit 4, Hercules Way, Melksham, Wiltshire, SN12 6TS**. Prior approval Part 14 Class J: Installation or alteration etc of solar equipment on non-domestic premises: Installation of Solar PV on roofs of Plastic Engineering Solutions Limited. Applicant name: Plastic Engineering Solutions Limited.

**Comment: No objection**

- b. [PL/2026/01104](#) - **LOVES FARM, BOWERHILL, MELKSHAM, SN12 6RB**. Householder planning permission: Demolition of Existing Side Conservatory, New Door Openings and Single Storey Rear Extension. Applicant name: Mr & Mrs Oehlers.

**Comment: No objection**

Two members of the public and Wiltshire Councillor Holder left the meeting.

- c. [PL/2026/01249](#) - **Land at Westlands Lane, to the North of Melksham Substation, Melksham, Wiltshire, SN12 7QF**. Full planning permission: Construction of Bellmouth Access to Melksham Substation from Westlands Lane. Applicant name: National Grid.

Standing Orders were suspended to allow Councillor Hemmings to comment, as a resident of Westlands Lane, that the entrance area is prone to flooding. The meeting reconvened.

The Clerk highlighted that the Neighbourhood Plan includes Policy 3 which requires that developments in locations with known flooding issues should include, where appropriate, contributions towards wider catchment projects.

**Comments:** Members have **NO OBJECTION** subject to:

- Provision of up-to-date information, including recent speed survey data (more recent than 2024) and a finalised version of the planning statement (not including review comments)
- A commitment to co-ordinate works with other contractors to minimise the impact on local residents
- Reduction of the construction timescale (6 months is excessive for the scope of the work)
- Agreement to contribute to wider remedial work on Westlands Lane road surface

- Agreement to flooding mitigation at the access point as per Policy 3: Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 “Development proposals in locations with known flooding issues should include appropriate mitigation and construction methods, and, where appropriate, contributions towards wider catchment projects”.

**502/25 Amended Plans/Additional Information:** The Council considered the following amended applications and made the following comments:

- [PL/2025/07044](#) - Former Countrywide Site, Bradford Road, Melksham.**  
Full planning permission: The construction of a new discount foodstore, car parking, access and landscaping on land at Bradford Road, Melksham.  
Applicant name: Anthony Best Dynamics Limited and Aldi Stores Ltd - C/O Agent.

**Comments:** Members welcome the provision of the alternative emergency exit

**503/25 Current planning application:** standing item for issues/queries arising during period of applications awaiting decision.

- [PL/2024/10345 \(FULL\)](#) & [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

No comments.

- [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 comments.

- [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

No comments

- [PL/2024/11426](#): Land to the South of A365 Bath Road and West of Turnpike Garage, Melksham, Wilts (Gompels):** Outline planning permission: All matters reserved. Construction of warehouse with office space, parking and associated landscaping including site access.

Members discussed the Planning Officer’s report provided for the Strategic Planning committee meeting. It was noted that the report recommended that the application be refused. Members agreed to submit no additional comments.

- e. [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).

**Comments:** Members noted that Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Addendum No. 3 had been submitted, which includes the surface water sewer routes to Berryfield Brook. Members make the following comments about the proposals in line with the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 Policy 3 : Flood Risk and Natural Flood Management of the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 “Development proposals in locations with known flooding issues should include appropriate mitigation and construction methods, and, where appropriate, contributions towards wider catchment projects”.:

- Berryfield Park, one of the surface water sewer routes, is a concrete road (built by the MOD in the 1940’s). Based on the works done on Wellington Drive (a similar type of roadway) excavating the road and repairing the surface will be difficult and time consuming.
- The junction of Semington Road and Berryfield Park is prone to flooding/collection of water. Members would like this addressed when the road is excavated to lay the surface water sewer.
- The stretch of Berryfield Lane adjacent to the New Inn Pub is prone to flooding. Members would like this addressed when the road is excavated to lay the surface water sewer.
- The surface water sewer crosses both land owned by Selwood and by Melksham Without Parish Council. Members are disappointed that the developer has not been in contact with regards to routing a sewer across their land.
- Members noted that the large tree behind the New Inn Pub has a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) and advised caution should be taken when excavating to lay the surface water sewer so that the tree roots are not disturbed.

Councillors Glover and Griffiths on Zoom left the meeting.

- f. [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.

As per Min 476/25h, the Clerk asked the Wiltshire Council planning officer and the developer to confirm the following principles of the development

- Access to the land for the second phase of the development (Plot B) is guaranteed.
- The second phase of the development will be delivered, to provide a total of about 55 dwellings as per Policy 7.5 of Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan (Plot A and Plot B).
- Details of the draft S106 and conditions will be shared in good time to allow the parish council to object/comment.
- Confirmation that the S106 requirements reflect the whole site (Plot A and Plot B).

Correspondence received from the developer and the planning officer was noted but members felt that the responses did not clearly provide the assurances that they were seeking.

**Resolved:** The Clerk to seek clarity from the Planning Officer on the responses and to request a Yes or No answer to each point.

A member of the public on Zoom left the meeting.

#### **504/25 To consider response to Public Consultations:**

- a. Lidl [melksham.newsite.lidl.co.uk](http://melksham.newsite.lidl.co.uk)

Members commented that they felt that the representatives they met from Lidl were encouraging, open, knowledgeable and had good local knowledge. Officers shared a summary of the planned crossings on Eastern Way near the planned Lidl store and highlighted that there might be a disconnect between delivery of the store (earlier) and delivery of the crossings (later).

**Resolved 1:** To approve notes of meeting held with the applicant, Lidl, on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2026 (Appendix 3).

**Resolved 2:** Members agreed to submit the notes from the meeting with the developer on 11<sup>th</sup> March 2026, together with a covering letter and concerns about the timings of the crossings on Eastern Way, to the consultation.

#### **505/25 Proposed Developments in Bowerhill and East Melksham**

- a. It was noted that Wiltshire Councillor Holder had requested a meeting with the Wiltshire Council Cabinet Member for Planning to discuss the cumulative impact of developments around Blackmore Farm/New Road Farm/Lidl and developments on the A365 in Bowerhill. It will be agreed which member of the Planning Committee will attend the meeting once the time and date have been agreed.
- b. The Clerk noted that a planning application had been submitted by a business wanting to move from Bowerhill Industrial Estate to a location north of Chippenham close to the M4 due to lack of room for expansion. Members commented that they feel that Wiltshire Council was actively encouraging development of employment land close to the M4 but not supporting the creation of new employment land and retention of existing employers at Bowerhill or within the parish.

**Resolved:** The Clerk to arrange a meeting with the Inward Investment Manager at Wiltshire Council to discuss the concerns and opportunities for Melksham. To be attended by the parish council, Melksham Town Council and relevant Wiltshire Councillors.

#### **506/25 Proposed Energy Installations**

- a. Lime Down Solar

It was noted that no response had yet been received on the request to Wiltshire Council to submit a Local Impact Report including assessment of impacts within the Melksham Without Parish area - in particular the proposed cable route and the connection to Melksham Substation.

Members noted that Lime Down Solar has now submitted its formal response to the Relevant Representations including those of Community Action Shaw and Whitley (CAWS) and the parish council. Councillor Richardson commented that

in most cases the responses just referred back to existing Environmental Statement chapters and outline management plans rather than introducing new analysis or explanation. He found the responses therefore very defensive and not very helpful. It was also highlighted that Wiltshire Council have submitted responses to hundreds of Relevant Representations but not those of either CAWS or the parish council.

It was also noted that the public hearings and examination start on 26<sup>th</sup> April 2026 and will last for a number of months.

**Resolved:** The Clerk to chase for a response on the request to Wiltshire Council to submit a Local Impact Report

- b. Cable Route for Norrington Spring Park Project (Aureos for SSEN Distribution) and Studley Solar Farm (DNOC for Verdant Energy)

Members noted the Aureos had notified the parish council and residents the previous Friday/Saturday (13<sup>th</sup>/14<sup>th</sup> March 2026) about work starting on Shaw Hill today (Monday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2026).

Councillor Richardson provided an update and photos of a visit he had made to Westlands Lane. He noted that it appears that most work has been completed but that the lane has been left in a dreadful and potentially dangerous state.

**Resolved:** The Clerk to respond to David Thomas, Head of Highways Asset Management and Commissioning at Wiltshire Council, to share the photos of Westlands Lane from Councillor Richardson and ask for confirmation that Wiltshire Council (and ultimately tax-payers) are not having to pay for remediation of the road caused by contractors.

- c. [PL/2025/05552](#) Land South of Brockleaze, Neston, Corsham, SN13 9TE. Full planning permission: Battery Energy Storage System with associated infrastructure.

**Resolved 1:** To support and submit the comments submitted by Community Action Whitley and Shaw (CAWS) Brockleaze Addendum 7 (submitted 11<sup>th</sup> March 2026) and Addendum 8 (submitted 12<sup>th</sup> March 2026).

**Resolved 2:** The Clerk to highlight the CAWS Addendum 7 and their comments on Wiltshire Council's Drainage Consultation to Danny Everett Principal Drainage Engineer at Wiltshire Council

Councillor Hemmings left the meeting.

- d. Wiltshire Council Engagement about Cumulative Impact.

No response has been received yet from Wiltshire Council on the 12 recommendations from the parish council.

- e. Future Energy Landscapes

Members noted the change of date and venue for the community energy workshop for Staverton, Hilperton, Semington and Great Hinton to Staverton Social Club on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2026 from 6 pm to 8:30 pm.

## 507/25 Planning Policy:

- a. **Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan (NHP):**

Standing item to reflect on responses to planning applications and recent appeal for future review of the Neighbourhood Plan

**Resolved:** To add the following to the list of items for a future review of the Neighbourhood Plan:

- New employment land
- Support for schemes to retrofit existing buildings with solar panels or other measures to improve the energy performance of the buildings

Members noted that the Joint Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 had been submitted for a Royal Town Planning Institute (RTPI) Plan making award.

b. **Wiltshire Council's Draft Local Plan Examination:** To consider any updates <https://www.localplanservices.co.uk/wiltshirepexamination>

It was noted that Wiltshire Council's response to the Inspectors' direction and the Inspectors' acknowledgement had been published that day. The Inspectors had written to the council with two options - to either withdraw the Local Plan from examination or request that the Inspectors draft a final report, which would recommend non-adoption. In response, the council expressed its disappointment at the Inspectors' conclusions and the limited options presented for the future of the Plan. The decision on the Inspectors' two options for the Local Plan will be considered by Wiltshire Council Cabinet on 6 May 2026 and then Wiltshire Council Full Council on 19 May 2026.

Members commented that the Local Plan had been in development for nine years and just took too long. They were frustrated by the waste of time and money by Wiltshire Council. Members expressed concern about the impact, especially on the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan, and whether it leaves the parish open to more speculative development.

c. **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

The responses submitted to consultation on changes to NPPF were noted.

## **508/25 Appeals**

It was noted that a letter had been sent to the Secretary of State from the Mayor of Melksham, Chair of Melksham Without Parish Council and Chair of Joint Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group regarding the Snarlton Farm appeal.

## **509/25 Planning Enforcement:**

Held in Closed Session at the end of the meeting.

a. Berryfield Lane

The Clerk provided an update. She explained that Wiltshire Councillor Griffin had been able to facilitate some progress. An Enforcement Officer has visited the site and will return along with the Environment Agency.

Members acknowledged the progress made and agreed to defer contacting the MP Brain Mathew (to see if he can speed up the formal proceedings), provided that progress continues to be made.

b. New Inn

Members reviewed the Premise License, and it was confirmed that a Temporary Event Notice had been issued for the New Year's Eve event.

It was noted that Enforcement had been asked whether the new buildings being constructed in the garden require planning permission. Members were concerned about safety and fire evacuation plans given the number of structures in the garden.

**Resolved:** to request a copy of the Temporary Event Notice for the New Year's Eve event and to question whether the fire risk assessment reflects the current layout at the New Inn.

c. Westlands Lane

It was noted that works on Westlands Lane appear to have started prior to the Planning Application being approved. Enforcement have been asked whether the works were started correctly.

**510/25 S106 Agreements and Developer meetings: (Standing Item)**

a. Updates on ongoing and new S106 Agreements

i. Pathfinder Place

No new updates.

ii. Bus stop opposite the Townsend Farm development

**Resolved:** To add identification of the best location for the bus stop nominally opposite the Townsend Farm development into the scope of the holistic review of Semington Road being undertaken by the Walk Wheel Cycle Trust.

iii. To note any S106 decisions made under delegated powers

The Clerk noted that a meeting had taken place with a contractor to discuss options for the bridge between Buckley Gardens and Bowood View, and that the Council is awaiting quotations.

The occupation trigger points for opening the Public Open Space and the Play Areas at Buckley Gardens had been identified. It was noted that Councillor Wood had counted the number of occupied dwellings and that the trigger points had not yet been reached but were getting close.

b. Contact with developers:

i. To receive feedback from the meeting held on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2026 with the developer for the former Library site and to approve meeting notes (if available)

The Clerk provide an update from the meeting held with the developers of the former Library site held on 24<sup>th</sup> February 2026.

Consultation Feedback

The developer advised that, overall, feedback from the consultation had been positive, with many respondents expressing support for the proposed development and some indicating an interest in moving in. Concerns were raised regarding the loss of Lowbourne Car Park; however, the Clerk noted that the site is allocated for development within Melksham Neighbourhood Plan 2 following a

Parking survey and assessment on the town's parking options. It was also noted that on-site parking would be provided for residents. Additional concerns related to the proposed three-storey height of the development and potential overlooking.

#### Design Changes and Other Points Discussed

- The building layout has been designed around the landscaping, incorporating terraces, benches, and trees for shade.
- Accessible parking bays will be provided.
- The internal layout has been revised to improve natural light.
- Provision has been made for mobility scooter storage.
- There remains no access through to Bank Street due to security concerns.
- Slanted balconies overlooking Union Street gardens have raised concerns and will require screening.
- A decentralised systems of individual air source heat pumps will be used to minimise noise.
- Solar panels will serve communal areas only; battery storage is not considered financially viable.
- Three storeys are required to achieve approximately 50 flats, ensuring viability for a care provider.
- The building has been repositioned slightly towards Lowbourn to allow for increased on-site parking and greater separation from Union Street.
- EV charging will be provided for all parking spaces, except the ambulance bay.
- Existing trees will be retained.
- An on-site carer will be present, with staff sleeping on-site.
- Eligibility is primarily for those aged 55 and over with an assessed care need, although exceptions may be considered.
- The tenure mix is proposed as 80% affordable/social rent and 20% shared ownership, subject to Homes England grant funding.
- All flats will be wheelchair accessible, exceed minimum space standards, and include walk-in showers.
- Health and safety concerns were raised regarding bin storage, particularly for wheelchair users.
- The inclusion of rain gardens is being explored.
- Pedestrian access onto Union Street is proposed; it was suggested that Section 106 contributions could support improved crossing facilities. Representatives from Melksham Town Council noted that highway improvements (including speeding and parking issues) are being considered for Union Street.
- A hatched pedestrian walkway across the car park was suggested. Attendees requested sight of the Construction Management Plan.
- - It was noted that the Car Park assessment undertaken by AECOM for the Neighbourhood Plan 2 site allocation included recommendations of improvements to existing car parks and the NHP2 policy for the site stated that there should be "Town Centre public car parking improvements as identified in the Melksham Parking Study (AECOM 2024) to mitigate the loss of public parking in the allocation site". The Clerk asked the town

council members if the recent changes to the Church Street Car Park disabled bays were sufficient, or if other improvements were still required.

- A public art trail is proposed, including an on-site workshop.
- Submission of the planning application is anticipated between the end of January and mid-March.
- Construction is anticipated to commence towards the end of 2026 or 2027.
- As the application will be submitted by Wiltshire Council, any objections would result in referral to the Strategic Planning Committee.

Meeting closed at 9:44 pm

Chairman, 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2026

## Appendix 1

### NOTES OF MEETING WITH JARBOOM ON WEDNESDAY 11<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2026 AT 1:00PM RE: Wiltshire THROWBACK FESTIVAL 2026

**Present:** Councillor Alan Baines (Vice Chair of Planning)  
Councillor John Glover (Chair of Council)  
Councillor David Pafford (Vice Chair of Council)  
Councillor Mark Harris (Planning Committee Member)  
Councillor Peter Richardson (Planning Committee Member)

Wiltshire Councillor Nick Holder (Bowerhill)  
Wiltshire Councillor Charlie Stokes (Melksham East)

Fiona Dey (Parish Officer, Melksham Without)  
Andrew Meacham (Committees Clerk, Melksham Town Council)

Gary Cooke (Jarboom)  
Nico Menghini (Jarboom)

Gary and Nico commented that they were meeting with members to discuss their temporary event license application for the Wiltshire Throwback Festival 2026, which will be considered by the parish council at their Planning Committee meeting on Monday 16<sup>th</sup> March 2026.

Gary explained that they had incorporated the learnings from the event in 2025 and that the application was largely unchanged. He noted that they had received no written complaints about the event last year. Gary highlighted the two notable changes from the 2025 event:

#### Traffic Management:

In 2025 the traffic management schemes had been designed around significantly higher attendance. This year they have designed schemes for up to 5000 attendees but are hoping for about 3000 attendees. On site parking will remain free and the number of parking spaces have been reduced to about 10% of attendees. In 2025, only 132 cars used the parking over the 2-day event as the majority of attendees walked to the event – they are expecting a similar pattern this year. It was noted that Melksham Oaks Community School will be used again for drop-off and pick-up. This year there will be no road closures or highways restrictions. A plan showing the site, entrance routes and allocated parking was shared.

#### Second Stage:

This year, two stages will be in use on the Saturday. Gary and Nico shared a plan for the festival area showing the site layout including the two stages. He confirmed that the noise management plan and controls will be the same as for last year.

He noted that the arrangements for emergency exit are still being finalised.

It was noted that last year's Planning Application (PL/2025/04158) was refused (after the event) as "the event layout, as implemented, encroached upon ecologically sensitive boundary habitats—hedgerows, scrub, and species-rich

grassland". Gary confirmed that this year they are planning to have both a rope and fence to protect the sensitive habitats.

Gary commented that they were planning on submitting a planning application for the event in about a week following discussions with Melksham Without Parish Council and Melksham Town Council. Members questioned whether a planning application was needed, especially as no highways disruption is planned this year. Wiltshire Councillor Holder suggested that Jarboom contact the planning officer who dealt with their application last year for advice.

Nico commented that they have applied for a temporary license rather than a multi-year license partly due to uncertainty about the impact of planning applications for housing developments on adjacent sites.

Meeting closed at 1:35pm

## Appendix 2

### **Meeting with representatives of Gleesons regarding land East of Blackmore Farm held on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> 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

## Appendix 3

### NOTES OF MEETING WITH LIDL ON WEDNESDAY 11<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2026 AT 11:30AM RE: MELKSHAM LIDL STORE

**Present:** Councillor Richard Wood (Chair of Planning)  
Councillor Alan Baines (Vice Chair of Planning)  
Councillor John Glover (Chair of Council)  
Councillor Mark Harris (Planning Committee Member)  
Councillor Peter Richardson (Planning Committee Member)

Wiltshire Councillor Nick Holder (Bowerhill)  
Wiltshire Councillor Charlie Stokes (Melksham East)  
Melksham Town Councillor Saffi Rabey (Mayor)

Fiona Dey (Parish Officer, Melksham Without)  
Andrew Meacham (Committees Clerk, Melksham Town Council)

Rosie Meeham (Regional Head of Property, Lidl)  
Matt Teagle (Senior Acquisitions Consultant, Lidl)

Rosie and Matt shared a slide presentation about the proposed new store in the east of Melksham.

The Lidl representatives explained that they were currently in the public consultation phase which would be followed by a planning application, expected to be submitted in the summer. They noted that they had requested a pre-application meeting with Wiltshire Council in November but have not yet had any response. They are hoping to be able to move location early in 2028.

Rosie and Matt explained that the current store in the town centre is no longer fit for purpose and that relocating the store would be beneficial to customers and to their staff. It was noted that about 30 people work at the current store and that they seemed positive about the relocation.

They noted that there is currently no provision of a large supermarket on the eastern side of the town and although it appears to be an out-of-town location it will eventually be surrounded by proposed new housing developments.

The proposed store will be about 35% larger than the current store with about 70% more parking and would include 2 rapid EV chargers (plus passive ducting for future expansion to 20 spaces with chargers). It is expected that the store would receive 2-3 HGV deliveries per day, as per the current store. The new store would be fitted with all new equipment to the newest specifications. It was noted that the solar panels would be used to generate power for EV charging, lighting and refrigeration. It was also explained that all the shop lighting, including advertising signs and carpark lights will be turned off overnight. It was noted that solar storage batteries are not included in the scheme (decision of Lidl head office)

Members questioned why the access cannot come from the roundabout where Eastern Way meets the A3102. The Lidl representatives explained that this had been discussed with Highways but was not feasible. The proposed access was estimated to be about 80m south of the roundabout and will comprise of a turning including a ghost lane.

Members were very concerned about the potential increase in traffic, congestion and the safety of Eastern Way where the store would be located and the cumulative impact of this and other planned developments. Members strongly suggested that Lidl should implement a left turn only into and out of the site for vehicles. Rosie commented that a road safety audit will be conducted and that the concerns will be raised.

It was noted that Lidl are proposing a new footpath on the east side of Eastern Way, north to the roundabout with the A3102 and south to the nearest crossing point.

Members noted that the east side of the town is poorly served by buses and explained that an additional bus service was planned for the new housing developments initially funded by S106 contributions. As the proposed store would probably be delivered prior to the S106 contributions being available to start the service, members questioned whether Lidl would consider a contribution towards establishing the bus service earlier.

Members also asked whether a contribution could be made towards building the Community Centre at Blackmore Farm. Rosie replied that this might be possible but that there had to be a clear link between the proposed new store scheme and the use of the contribution.

Members were also concerned about:

- HGV access: HGVs need to be routed around the by-pass and not through the centre of town
- The location of the air source heat pumps and the associated noise created by them
- Proximity of housing on the land behind the site (Land at Blackmore Farm)
- Timings of deliveries: It was confirmed that deliveries can be scheduled between 6am and 10pm (to give the logistics team flexibility for contingency) but usually arrive during the daytime

It was noted that foul drainage routing is under consideration. With regards to surface water, Rosie explained that attenuation tanks will be built under the carpark to discharge surface water at greenfield rate. The routing for the outflow is under consideration.

Members requested that the EV charging points are moved closer to the store.

Rosie explained that the car park is designed with sufficient space to avoid conflict between cars and delivery lorries parking.

It was explained that the existing site would be sold but that marketing of the site would not start until building of the new store had started. It is expected that the existing store remains open until the day before the new store opens.

Members asked what Lidl can do to avoid conflicts with other construction which may be ongoing in adjacent locations at the same time. Rosie emphasised that they would have construction management plans to abide by and that they work with the council to be 'neighbourly' with the other developments. It was noted that their build time is typically 28-34 weeks.

Meeting closed at 12:40pm