

MINUTES of the Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council held on Monday 8th April, 2019 at 1 Swift Way, Bowerhill, Melksham at 7.00p.m.

Present: Cllrs. Richard Wood (Council and Committee Chair), Paul Carter (Committee Chair), Alan Baines, Mary Pile and David Pafford.

Officers: Jo Eccleston (Parish Officer) and Marianne Rossi (Assistant Parish Officer)

Housekeeping & Announcements: Cllr. Wood welcomed all to the meeting and as this was a new meeting venue explained in detail the evacuation procedure in the event of a fire.

506/18 **Apologies:** Cllr. John Glover (Council Vice-Chair) was on holiday and Cllr. Terry Chivers was unwell; these reasons for absence were accepted. It was noted that Cllr. Greg Coombes had an approved leave of absence.

507/18 **Declarations of Interest:** None.

508/18 **Dispensation Requests for this Meeting:** None.

509/18 **Standing Dispensation Related to Planning:** It was noted that the Parish Council had a registered dispensation to be able to discuss issues relating to the provision of a play area at the Pathfinder Place Development, Agenda item 9d.

The Council suspended Standing Orders for a period of public participation.

510/18 **Public participation:** There were three members of the public present who wished to discuss agenda item 6b, planning application 19/02499/FUL - proposed garage extension at 103, Top Lane, Whitley.
The applicant explained that his wife had a progressive debilitating disease which affected her balance and visual awareness, and that she had recently had several hospital admissions due to falls. The medical profession had advised that his wife would eventually require 24-hour care, and that she required accommodation where there were no thresholds to trip over, extra wide doorways and turning space for a wheelchair and automatic lighting. The applicant advised that the main dwelling could not provide this and that conversion would be too difficult. This application therefore sought to address his wife's mobility and health needs and also to provide accommodation for a live-in carer.
The neighbours, whilst sympathetic to the health issues of the applicant's wife, objected to this application on the grounds of the height of the proposal. They considered that it would cause a lack of light and overshadowing of their garden and conservatory. They felt that the proposal would be more acceptable if it was all on one level without the mezzanine floor, thus the same height as the existing garage.
Point 4.3 of the Design & Access Statement stated "The works are designed to provide a high-quality appropriate space but still allow for the building to be read as subservient outbuilding in relation to the main dwelling." Members queried this assertion with the applicant, as they did not wish to see this proposal sold as a separate dwelling at any point in the future. The applicant confirmed that he was happy for this to be a condition.

Members also queried a statement made by the neighbour in their online comments to Wiltshire Council, that if planning consent was given this would equate to 4 dwellings on the one site. The applicant responded that extension work to his property was carried out in 1981, when his wife ran a B&B business. This conversion was now two separate annexes connected to the main dwelling, and these are rented out on long term leases to lodgers.

The Council reconvened and brought forward agenda item 6b for discussion.

511/18 **Planning Applications (1):** The Council considered the following application and made the following comment:

a) 19/02499/FUL- 103 Top Lane, Whitley, SN12 8QH: Proposed garage extension. Applicant: Mr & Mrs. Reynolds.

The Chairman read out guidance about what was and what was not a material consideration with regards to loss of light, overshadowing and loss of privacy. It was felt that the material considerations applied to the angle subtended to the windows of a property, rather than the garden. It was therefore felt that the presumed loss of light to the neighbour's garden was not an issue which could be objected to in planning terms.

Comments: *The Parish Council do not object, but they wish to see a condition imposed which ensures that this building remains subservient to the main dwelling and therefore cannot be sold at a future date as a separate dwelling (as per point 4.3 of the Design & Access Statement).*

The Chairman informed both parties that the Parish Council were not a decision maker in this process, merely a consultee. He advised that if either party wished to make further representation then they could ask their Wiltshire Councillor, Phil Alford, if he would be willing to call this application in; this would mean that the application would be considered by committee rather than a delegated officer decision.

The members of the public left the meeting.

512/18 **Invited Guest: Mr. James Jenkison, Foresight Group (Sandridge Solar Farm):** Mr. Jenkison explained that Foresight manages 60 solar farms, and where those farms do not have permanent or extended permissions, they seek to extend the planning permissions already granted. He said that a good proportion of their portfolio had permanent or 35/40year permissions. Part of the reason for this was that the solar panels have a long lifespan and Foresight are finding that after 25 years the panels are still functioning at 85% capacity; also, temporary planning permissions made decision making for future investment in sites more difficult. The planning permission for the Sandridge Solar Farm is for 25 years, and Mr. Jenkison is looking to put in a planning application to extend this to 40 years over the next couple of months. He advised that they had already extended the planning permissions for two solar farm sites in Wiltshire, and that the community contributions varied between sites depending on what was agreed with the original developer. In the case of Sandridge Solar Farm the community benefit was for the full 25 years, and therefore if an extension to 40 years was permitted the expectation would be for the community benefit to also continue for that period of time. However, there would be a proviso on the amount of benefit payable post 25 years. At the moment there is a Government subsidy available for Solar Farms, and thus income generated from them can be easily predicted, this results in

companies like the Foresight Group being able to be more generous with the proportion of community benefit offered. In 2038 the Government support scheme falls away, therefore the community contribution per megawatt after that date will not be so generous, but will still be something in the region of £500 per megawatt, index linked. Mr. Jenkison advised that Foresight would need to enter into negotiations with three landowners to extend the leases on the land to also run for 40 years. He stated that he wanted to keep the Parish Council informed with regard to the future plans.

A member queried whether the permission could be extended for more than 40 years, and at what point the replacement of panels and equipment outweighed its efficiency and any profit. Mr. Jenkison advised that within 6 months of Foresight taking ownership of a site that they replaced any damaged panels, and that they continued to monitor the panels replacing them as and when necessary to ensure the efficiency of the site is maintained. He reported that over the last financial year that Sandridge Solar Farm performed to full capacity; it produced the maximum amount of electricity that was possible for the site.

A member queried the qualifying area for the calculation of community benefit. He stated that for the 25-year period this was calculated on the number of dwellings within a 2.75km radius from the centre of the solar farm. The community benefit received by each parish applicable under the agreement was calculated against the number of eligible dwellings in each parish. He asked if the same calculation would be used for the period 25 years to 40 years, as there was a possibility that further development within that radius could happen in these years. Mr. Jenkison advised that although he relied upon Wiltshire Council for this data to be able to calculate the proportion of community benefit due each year, he welcomed any information the Parish Council could give with regard to new development and a change to the number of qualifying dwellings. **Recommended:** *The Parish Council inform the Foresight Group on any change to qualifying housing numbers.*

It was noted that agenda item 6g, was an application for a 50MW battery storage system on land at Snarlton Farm (19/02437/FUL). Members queried if this application was associated with the Solar Farm. Mr. Jenkison had no knowledge of this company or the application and advised that it was not associated with the Foresight Group.

The Council agreed to bring forward item 6g for discussion.

513/18 **Planning Applications (2):** The Council considered the following applications and made the following comments:

a) 19/02437/FUL – Land at Snarlton Farm, Prater’s Lane Bridleway, Melksham, SN12 7QP: Development of a 50MW battery storage system and associated infrastructure. Applicant: Immersa Ltd.

It was presumed that as with other battery storage facilities in the parish this was a grid balancing facility. As Mr. Jenkison was still present, members queried if this application would look to connect to the Solar Farm. Mr. Jenkison advised that currently the Foresight Group did not have any battery storage facilities and were not looking at installing any for the next 2/3 years. However, if they did so then any facilities would be located within their own Solar Farm sites, rather than on adjacent land.

Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections, but wish to seek a community benefit contribution from this application as with other battery storage installations in the parish.*

b) 19/02613/FUL– 26 Shaw Hill, Shaw, SN12 8EU: Two storey extension & detached double garage. Applicant: Mr & Mrs. G Moger.

Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*

c) 19/02155/REM- Hack Farm, Lower Woodrow, Melksham, Wiltshire, SN12 7RB: Reserved matters applicant pursuant of 17/08111.OUT (Erection of an agricultural workers dwelling) relating to access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale (Amendment to 18/07375/REM) Applicant: PW Doel & Sons

Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*

d) 19/02238/OUT- Land North of 486, Semington Road, Melksham, SN12 6DR: Proposed new dwelling with access (Outline application relating to access) Applicant: A Harlow & Son

Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*

e) 19/02828/FUL - Snarlton Farm, Melksham, Wiltshire, SN12 7QP: Erection of Machinery Store. Applicant: BJ Stainer & Son

Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*

f) 19/02968/FUL – 8 Lysander Road, Bowerhill, Melksham, Wiltshire, SN12 6TT: Addition of 3 windows to front and side elevations. Applicant: Cre8tive Interiors Ltd.

Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*

514/18 **Permitted Development Applications:** None.

515/18 **Planning Policy:**

a) Comparison of Melksham Without and Melksham Town Council's Planning Policies (Arising from Min.372/18): Following a joint meeting of the Town and Parish Council on the 12th December to discuss a collegiate response to Wiltshire Council with regard to future growth of Melksham, 2026-2036, it was agreed that if the Parish Council updated their Planning Principles that these could then be considered by the Town Council for their approval and then jointly submitted to Wiltshire Council. The Town Council had revised and adopted their Planning Policies to reflect these discussions. Members reviewed the Town Council's policies, and noted that some were in accordance with the Parish Councils and some were more specific to the Town Centre. However, members did like the Town Council's policy PP02 which stated "Any development should bear in mind the impact of the development with regard to flooding and include any works necessary to alleviate flooding in the area". **Recommended:** *The Parish Council include in their Planning Principles document a principle which addresses flooding concerns, similar to that of the Town Council's Planning Policy PP02. The Planning Principles document to be updated accordingly for review at the next Planning Committee meeting.*

b) Andrea Pellegram – Planning Local Newsletter (March 19): The members noted this document. Whilst they acknowledged that it contained valuable information, they were disappointed that it contained some errors, with

incomplete sentences and headers which stated that it was issue 4, October 2017, when in fact this was issue 11, March 2019, especially as the Parish Council paid a subscription for documents from Andrea Pellegram.

- c) **Andrea Pellegram – Planning Local Toolkit:** The advice in this document was noted.
- d) **Correspondence Regarding Housing Market Area for Melksham:** An article had been noticed in the Wiltshire Times which reported that Melksham was going to be split between Housing Market Areas, with the northern section of Melksham being in the Chippenham Housing Market Area and the southern part being in the Trowbridge Housing Market Area. The Clerk had contacted Carolyn Gibson, Wiltshire Council Spatial Planning Manager, to query this and to express concerns that this proposal would split the parish of Melksham Without in two. Representatives of the Parish Council had attended a briefing at Monkton Park in November 2017 where the Wiltshire Local Plan Review was explained, including the Joint Spatial Framework and the proposal for the Chippenham Housing Market Area. In every document associated with this review, including the consultation paper, it was identified that Melksham would be in the Chippenham Housing Market Area; in none of the documents does it mention splitting Melksham into two areas. Additionally, the Parish Council had subsequently discussed this at length and had sent two pages of very comprehensive responses to the consultation, and thus felt that they fully understood what was being proposed. The response from Carolyn Gibson was that there was a map included within this consultation which showed which parishes would be included in which Housing Market Area, and that the intention was to split the Melksham Community Area, not Melksham or Melksham Without. She stated that those parishes on the southern fringes of the Melksham Community Area boundary had been identified as being part of the Trowbridge Housing Market Area; parishes such as Steeple Ashton and Great Hinton. She also advised that the previous briefings had been generic and that as part of the next steps in the Local Plan Review, Wiltshire Council would be contacting Town and Parish Councils for more focussed discussions relevant to each community towards the end of May. The Clerk had responded to say that the Parish Council welcomed a meeting and the opportunity to discuss issues in greater depth and relevant to the Melksham Neighbourhood Plan area and Melksham Without parish with regard to housing delivery post 2026. She had added that she felt Wiltshire Council had not been transparent in the delivery of their information as the shaded map to which Carolyn Gibson referred to was not very clear or detailed and had no key; it was therefore not clear this was the intention for these parishes.

516/18 **S106 Agreements and Developer Meetings:**

- a) **Ongoing and New S106 Agreements:** None
- b) **New S106 Queries:** None.
- c) **S106 Decisions made under Delegated Powers:** None.
- d) **Contact with developers:**
 - (i) **Meeting with Gleeson and Origin 3, 3rd April, 2019:** It was noted that the Clerk and members of the Planning Committee had met with representatives of Gleeson and Origin 3. Gleeson are a developer who are representing the interests of a landowner and Origin 3 are a planning and urban design consultancy who have been employed by Gleeson. They wished to discuss a site in the parish to the north east of Melksham and stated that they had no preconceived ideas about the site. They had already

met with the Spatial Planning Manager at Wiltshire Council on this project and are following the Local Plan review work closely, with regard to the numbers of housing and where they will be assigned. They had been advised by Wiltshire Council to engage with parish and town councils and therefore welcomed this opportunity to introduce themselves and present their site opportunity. The developers stated that they did not know what the required number of houses for Melksham would be for the period 2026-2036, but that they were not looking to forge ahead with their project without being part of the Plan review. Gleeson stated that they wished to work with communities in their approach to planning applications, rather than force development on communities.

The Parish Council explained that the Neighbourhood Plan is well advanced and hoping to go out to Regulation 14 in the Spring. The Clerk advised that the Neighbourhood Plan goes up to 2026 and that the Melksham Community Area had already “done” the housing numbers for up to 2026 and in the Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations plan that is shortly going to Hearing with the Planning Inspector, there is no housing allocated to the Melksham Community Area as the housing numbers to 2026 are met; with 1,000 dwellings currently in the pipeline being built.

The site allocation calls for sites part of the Neighbourhood Plan work was conducted at the end of 2017 and those sites have been independently assessed by AECOM and already gone out to public consultation with an indication of the additional community benefit offered by the developers per site. The site allocation work for the Plan is closed, and will not be re-opened at this late stage of the Plan. It was acknowledged that by time that the Plan is eventually adopted, hopefully by the end of 2019, that a review may be triggered by the advanced stage of Wiltshire Council’s Local Plan Review which goes up to 2036.

Therefore, the Parish Council suggested that they met with Origin 3 and Gleeson to listen to a presentation about a potential housing site for 2026 to 2036, regardless of any housing number information that may come from Wiltshire Council at the end of April.

Origin 3 stated that there is a long-term interest in looking at the future development of the site, and they have engaged consultants to look at flooding, historic, landscape, transport and ecology themes. Their presentation listed some of the main constraints of the land and where it sits in relation to the town and other planned development. They stated that for strategic large sites they have the financial back up to deliver the community benefits required. They were flexible over what this could be, schools, community buildings, healthcare facilities or community centre land. There was woodland on the site and the developers would look to retain and include this in the design to create a green corridor and would look to groups such as the Woodland Trust to run this. They would look to link this to other green corridors with pedestrian and cycle connectivity. There could also be the opportunity to provide some land for employment purposes. They stated that the site was flexible and their plans were indicative to show the type and numbers of housing involved, and that they

would look to planning policy (Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan) to respond accordingly.

The Parish Council advised that they and the Town Council were in agreement that post 2026 any housing development in the north east must be in conjunction with an eastern bypass, which currently does not have a designated route. In other developments, there has been a requirement for developers to provide a connection from the new development to the existing development abutting it; this scheme does not abut to anything, just another landowner's piece of land.

Concerns were expressed that the presentation had discussed the provision of primary school places, but that secondary school places will at some point dictate the requirement for a second secondary school for the town and perhaps a school to the north east would work rather than trying to find a safe way for hundreds of children to get to a secondary school in the south. The consultants stated that this was being done on another site that they were currently working on. The Parish Council also raised concerns about the impact of traffic on the single-track New Road and the through route to the A350 and M4 via the medieval single-track bridge at Lacock via a national cycle way and a road used by regularly by horses. This brought the discussion back to the potential bypass. The Parish Council have been unable to find out much information about a bypass, but have been informed it would be a centrally funded project with Highways England and the SWLEP (South West Local Enterprise Partnership) working with Wiltshire Council.

(ii) Meeting with Taylor Wimpey and Proludic Play, 3rd April, 2019 – Re: Play Area, Public Open Space and Public Art at Pathfinder Place: The members noted the notes from this meeting as follows:

Present:

Cllr Richard Wood	Melksham Without Parish Council
Cllr Alan Baines	Melksham Without Parish Council
Cllr Paul Carter	Melksham Without Parish Council
Cllr David Pafford	Melksham Without Parish Council
Teresa Strange, Clerk	Melksham Without Parish Council (<i>until 3.35pm</i>)
Jo Eccleston, Parish Officer	Melksham Without Parish Council (<i>from 3.40pm</i>)
Ben Jones	Proludic Play Equipment
Steve Baker	Taylor Wimpey

The Clerk explained that as the main item for discussion at the meeting was the LEAP (Local Equipped Area of Play) play area at the Pathfinder Place development, she had invited Ben Jones from Proludic to join the meeting. Proludic provide the play equipment at the majority of Taylor Wimpey developments, and Ben had made contact further to the parish council's concerns raised with Taylor Wimpey that they were providing wooden play equipment. The parish council were adopting the LEAP play area as per the S106 agreement (16/01123/OUT).

The parish council discussed the pros and cons of the use and future maintenance of wooden play equipment and the parish council representatives were all in agreement that metal equipment would have a much longer life and be easier to

refurbish. Ben explained that wooden equipment had a life of 10 years, and metal equipment had a life of 25 years. Wooden equipment could also split on natural features such as knots in the wood, and cause entrapment issues or splinters, and when replacing a damaged item the replacement piece of wood was a natural product and was often not the precise size and dimension of the original.

Steve confirmed that Taylor Wimpey were happy to provide metal equipment rather than wood and Proludic were happy that the scheme originally designed by the landscape architect could easily be replicated in metal.

The same discussion was held regarding the fence surrounding the play area, and again, it was agreed that the fence should be bow topped metal fence, and not wooden as proposed by the Landscape Architect, and in a dark green paint colour if possible, to match the others in the ownership of the parish council. The Council requested that the access gates were painted bright red, in line with ROSPA best practice, to highlight to users for quick access in terms of children needing an escape route, and for those who were partially sighted. The Council also raised concern that only one access gate was shown on the drawing, as good practice required two access gates, so if one was blocked by someone, a child had an alternative escape route. Ben and Steve agreed that this would be incorporated and was common practice. The bench should not be so close to the fence that a child can use the bench to gain access to climb over the fence, this too would be addressed.

Much discussion was had over the pros and cons of the differing surfaces to the play area. A standard LEAP (Local Equipped Area of Play) is defined by Fields in Trust and dictates the S106 in terms of size and play equipment to be provided. It has to be 400sqm and Ben showed the layout drawing from the Landscape Architect which showed a lot of "dead space" with no play value but with costly rubber safety surfacing. They could provide more play value if cheaper grass matting was provided, and this had a 10-year life, whereas the rubber/wet pour had only a 5-year life. Ben had recently met with Melksham Town Council who were only using grass matting and not wet pour or rubber mulch surfacing in the future.

The Council had chosen complete surface wet pour for Hornchurch Road play area as it had a patchwork of rubber surfacing, concrete, tarmac, grass and then insets in the rubber surfacing that all had expansion gaps that were trip hazards filled with weeds, and there were worn patches that had caused the play area to be closed by Wiltshire Council. The Council had chosen bound rubber mulch for under equipment in larger play areas that also had grassed areas abutting. The proposal at present by the Landscape Architect had black wet pour with green insets of harder wearing wet pour under pieces of equipment. The Council had experienced problems at Beanacre play area where rubber had contracted to less than the BS standard for clearance of safety surfacing, meaning that there was an area exposed in the fall zone. So, they would like to see a margin larger than the BS standard for the fall area around equipment. Ben explained that grass matting was very easy and cheap to replace a section, and met the required standards for a child falling onto it as a surface. The Clerk explained that when she undertook her practical exams for her ROSPA qualification in the summer, the grass matting may have passed in terms of children falling on it, but it proved to be a huge trip hazard where the grass had disappeared as had died in the hot weather and the ground underneath had cracked, and children running from one piece of equipment to another could easily trip and were then at danger of hitting their head on the equipment in front of them. The expansion gaps on the rubber surfacing also cause a trip hazard, and this was much less concern at the edge of the play

area as could be filled by soil/sand and grass seed, it's in the play area zone it's an issue. Ben said that over the last 5 years the industry had been pushing the use of bound rubber mulch but that there had been some concerns over the longevity of this now. The Clerk concurred that the parish council had one small area of concern with this type of surface that they had used to refurbish play areas quite recently with one patch well-worn already under a junior swing set. This led back to the higher density insets shown on the drawing by the Landscape Architect. Ben showed an alternative layout which had a grassed area and footpath in the play area, still 400sqm with the same amount of play equipment but less safety surfacing area, which made it easier to maintain/replace in the future whatever the surface. It showed two pedestrian entrance gates, either side of the footpath, and had room for the picnic tables inside the fence play area. The parish council representatives liked this design much better for the reasons listed. There would be an element of grass to maintain but Taylor Wimpey were happy to add this element to their contract for the maintenance company. The alternative design helped to address off-setting the increase of cost of providing more expensive metal equipment and metal fencing.

It was agreed that the Clerk would contact ROSPA to see if they had a view on the safety and maintenance of the differing surfaces and the parish council would discuss when they met on Monday evening at the Planning Committee.

The picnic tables the parish council would prefer to be of a recycled plastic material, as they have standardised on, rather than wood, which is easier for maintenance, has a longer life and cannot be set light to.

Two recycled bins were shown on the scheme, the parish council representatives agreed that only one bin, for multi-use, was required.

The Clerk left the meeting and the Parish Officer joined the meeting to take notes.

The Parish Council representatives reviewed the grass cutting and bin emptying maintenance regime proposed by Remus, Taylor Wimpey's contractor, with Steve. He stated that he would add the emptying of the bin in the play area to this contract. He said that he would send the Remus maintenance proposal to the Parish Council so that they could review it, as any changes to this needed to be made at this early stage before the agreement was legally agreed.

The Parish Officer queried with Steve the situation with regard to the "mown footpath" around the public open space and attenuation pond. She explained that the Parish Council had retrospectively installed a tarmac footpath on another public open space in the parish and that this had been explained to Steve's colleagues at previous meetings with Taylor Wimpey. The Parish Council were under the impression that it had been agreed that an all-weather footpath would be installed here rather than a mown path, due to the concerns that it would become too wet and muddy and therefore unusable in the winter months. The Parish Officer said that she would send the notes and minutes of these discussions to Steve, but he felt that he would be able to accommodate this.

Steve also queried the situation with regard to the Parish Council's wishes for public art for the development. The Parish Officer advised that she had just spoken to a local gentleman who had seen an article about the development in the RAF news and that he had lots of artwork from an aviation technical artist, Frank Wootton, who was stationed at RAF Melksham. Mr. Wootton's job was to illustrate workshop manuals with exploded diagrams of aircraft instruments. It was felt that if the Parish Council explored their previous idea of having several information boards around the development that this would be good for one of them. Another

idea was the installation of some form of totem pole with a sculpture attached, perhaps a skeleton of an aircraft. The Parish Council representatives explained that the issue of public art had not progressed as the S106 Agreement had not specified the amount that could be spent, and the Parish Council were therefore waiting for Taylor Wimpey to advise on this. Steve said that he thought that there was a budget of £20,000 for public art, but that he would confirm this. The Parish Council representatives felt that they could now engage with stakeholders as they had an indicative figure and that they should invite the gentleman with information on Frank Wootton to attend any public engagement meeting. Steve advised that Taylor Wimpey worked on the principle of selling 50 properties a year from a site, and that by September 2019 there should also be residents of the new development who could give comments on public art.

The meeting closed at 4.00pm.

POST MEETING NOTES:

1. **Maintenance Contributions:** A query was raised at the beginning of the meeting by a Councillor about why the parish council were adopting the play area as there was no maintenance contribution. The S106 Agreement (16/01123/OUT) was checked and there is in fact a maintenance contribution. *“The sum of £58,540 index linked as a contribution towards the future management and maintenance of the Play Area by the parish council”.* (Page 14)

The S106 for the development at Land to the East of Semington Road (17/10416/VAR) has a Play Area to be adopted by the Parish Council but with no maintenance agreement.

The only discussion and agreement to date about not taking on play areas in new developments has been related to the developments at the North of Sandridge Common, which provided a SLAP (Super Local Area of Play) rather than a LEAP, and Land to the East of Spa Road, which has no specific maintenance sum as it forms part of the maintenance of all the public open space. The council has previously agreed that they felt that all residents should have the same level of service and all play areas be therefore looked after and maintained by the parish council.

This triggered a change in the parish council’s planning policy to consider taking on play areas in new housing developments rather than automatically asking to take them over.

2. **Grass matting vs Rubber surfacing:**

The Caretaker who undertook the same ROSPA training and qualification as the Clerk, and of course regularly inspects the play areas, had concerns about grass matting.

The Parish Officer advised that the Clerk had sought advice from ROSPA about which surfacing they felt was the safest between grass matting, wet-pour or rubber mulch. They had responded to say that there were pros and cons for all types of surfacing. In their opinion if grass matting is professionally installed then there should be little or no maintenance required. They stated that hot weather could affect wet-pour, matting and tiles, but that if good quality matting is purchased then any problems should be minimal. Members noted that concerns had been expressed over grass matting in hot weather, but queried whether in very wet weather the grass

between the matting became waterlogged and then became muddy. After much discussion they concluded that wet pour was a better option.

Recommended:

1. *To request Taylor Wimpey to provide metal, and not wood, play equipment.*
2. *To request Taylor Wimpey to provide metal, bow topped, dark green fence to the play area, and not a wooden fence.*
3. *To request Taylor Wimpey to provide two pedestrian access gates to the fenced play area, both to be painted in a contrasting red colour.*
4. *To request Taylor Wimpey to provide the play area in the alternative design provided by Proludic, which included a grassed area, footpath and two pedestrian access gates.*
5. *To request Taylor Wimpey to provide the two picnic tables within the fenced in play area, on the grass area, with concrete plinth under to prevent muddy well from wear, sunk into the grass for ease of grass cutting and no trip hazard. The picnic tables to be of recycled plastic material (as parish council standard) and not wooden.*
6. *To request Taylor Wimpey to include the grass cutting within the play area on the management company schedule of works.*
7. *To request Taylor Wimpey to include only one multi use bin and to site this in the fenced play area near to the picnic tables and away from the fencing so that dog walkers in the adjacent public open space are not able to reach over the fence and dispose of dog waste in this bin. Taylor Wimpey happy to add the emptying of this bin to the contract of the maintenance company.*
8. *To request Taylor Wimpey to provide wet-pour safety surfacing in the play area.*

(iii) Public Art Installation – Sandridge Place: It was noted that at a recent meeting with the developers, the Parish Council and the Wiltshire Public Art Officer, the public art installation had been agreed. The parish council had always wished for this to be practical art to enhance the play area. The art will reflect the history of this site as a previous dairy farm and will include milk churns of differing heights with African drum slots down the sides so that they provide both stepping stones and an interactive musical element; a large cow bench which would provide seating as well as a climbing element, and next to it an oversized milking stool and a calf so that children could use these to climb up onto the cow bench.

Meeting closed at 8.44 pm

Chairman, 15th April, 2019