

WESTBURY TOWN COUNCIL

At a MEETING of the HIGHWAYS, PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
held at THE LAVERTON, BRATTON ROAD, WESTBURY, on THURSDAY 4th
SEPTEMBER 2014 at 2.00 pm.

PRESENT: Cllr R Hawker (Chairman)
Cllrs: I Cunningham, Mrs S Ezra, F Morland and W D Tout
Mr K Harvey, Town Clerk and Mrs A McCann

P.3868 PUBLIC FORUM: Nil

P.3869 APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE:
Cllr D Bradshaw - Personal
Cllr Mrs C Mitchell - Personal
Cllr P Wakeman - Business

P.3870 DISPENSATIONS: Nil.

P.3871 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (if any) AND REASONS. (Members must be diligent regarding their interests.)

Cllr I Cunningham - Related to the Associate Director of Strategic Planning, Wiltshire Council.

P.3872 DISCUSS THE REVISION OF SETTLEMENT BOUNDARIES AND COMPLETE THE QUESTIONS OF THE INFORMAL CONSULTATION

The questions and agreed responses are listed below:

Question 1:

Do you consider the criterion for defining the proposed draft settlement boundaries to be the correct ones?

We wish the current West Wiltshire District Plan format of identifying a settlement boundary in relation to residential development to continue and to have a different boundary for employment and other land uses (such as Northacre Park).

Dealing with specific criteria:

Areas which have been included are:

- *both built and extant planning permissions for residential and employment uses for areas which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.*

We do not agree that residential and employment uses should share the same boundary.

- *existing and extant planning permissions for community facilities, such as religious buildings, schools and community halls which are considered to be physically/functionally related to the settlement.*

We see no useful purpose in this bullet point. We wish the settlement boundary relating to residential land use to be separate.

- *site allocations identified in the development plan for both residential, community and employment uses which are physically/functionally related to the settlement.*

We disagree with this bullet point because including site allocations in the general settlement boundaries may allow challenges to the specific requirements of each allocation policy, such as specific requirements for provision of infrastructure. We believe it is safer that allocation sites are not included within the settlement boundary.

Areas which have been excluded are:

- *curtilages of properties which have the capacity to extend the built form of the settlement. This includes large residential gardens.*
- *recreational or amenity space at the edge of settlements which primarily relate to the countryside (in form or nature).*
- *isolated development which is physically or visually detached from the settlement (including farm buildings or agricultural buildings, renewable energy installations).*

We agree with the exclusion criteria in the above three bullet points.

Question 2:

Do you consider that the proposed draft settlement boundaries are drawn in accordance with the criterion?

You have not followed your own criteria at:

- ***Map Grid Reference: G7- The lake south west of Frogmore Lane and the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and the land north east of Frogmore Lane.***
There are no extant planning permissions on this land and it is not allocated for any built development.
- ***Map Grid Reference: F14/15 - Courtleigh extension – an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.***
- ***Map Grid Reference: H15 – Fourways extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.***
- ***Map Grid Reference: H14 – Chalford Gardens extension - an isolated dwelling per Exclusion bullet point three.***

Question 3:

Are there any areas of the proposed draft settlement boundaries that should be

modified?

Yes. See table below:

Grid Ref:	Proposed Changes:
F3	<i>Hawkeridge Business Park allocation area. We do not agree that it should have a settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</i>
C4/D4	<i>West Wilts Trading Estate. This is not currently in residential use and to protect it from inappropriate changes of use it should have a different boundary from the residential settlement boundary as per our answer to Question 1.</i>
C6/C7etc	<i>This is not currently in residential use and to protect it from inappropriate changes of use it should have a different boundary from the residential settlement boundary as per our answer to Question 1.</i>
C8	<i>Northacre Park allocation area: We do not agree that it should have a settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</i>
E6/E7	<i>We wish the blue line running along Storridge Road retained with the housing limit solely around this residential area.</i>
E9/D10	<i>We do not wish allocation sites to be included in the settlement boundary as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</i>
F8	<i>We agree that the five houses on Station Road opposite the Railway Inn should be brought within the settlement boundary.</i>
G6	<i>We consider that the area of open space within the triangle of railway lines should be excluded in accordance with your criterion.</i>
G7	<i>We consider that the fishing lake south west of Frogmore Lane and all the adjoining land north east of Primmers Place and all the land north east of Frogmore Lane should be excluded from the settlement boundary because there are no extant planning permissions on these pieces of land and they are contrary to your criteria.</i>
F7	<i>We agree that all the residential development under construction north west of Slag Lane (but not the Network Rail signalling building) should be brought within the settlement boundary.</i>
I12/J12	<i>The allocation site adjacent to Westbury Hospital does not have planning permission. It should be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</i>
I13	<i>Leighton Sports Centre should be entirely excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 1.</i>
H14	<i>We wish the extension to the settlement boundary at Chalford Gardens to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 2.</i>
H15	<i>We wish the house that has been added south of Wellhead Drove (Fourways) to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to question 2.</i>
F14/F15	<i>We wish the premises known as Courtleigh to be excluded as per the reasons given in our answer to Question 2.</i>

<i>Note:</i>	<i>Whilst discussing the land in grid reference D15 Cllr Cunningham left the room.</i>
<i>D13/D14</i>	<i>Westbury Leigh Primary School should be excluded for the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</i>
<i>D13</i>	<i>The White Horse Health Centre should be excluded for the reasons given in our answer to question 1.</i>

Question 4:

Are you looking at reviewing your settlement boundary through a neighbourhood plan? If yes what is your anticipated timetable for this work?
Possibly. Timetable uncertain.

Question 5:

Do you have any additional comments relevant to the boundary review?
In order to determine whether your criterion has been correctly applied it would have been helpful to colour code proposed changes to indicate which criteria had been used.

5.01 pm

**Signed on behalf of the Meeting
this fifteenth day of September 2014**

.....
Chairman