

## **Malmesbury Town Council**

Minutes of the **Planning & Environment Committee Meeting**  
Held in Malmesbury Town Hall on **Tuesday 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021** at 7.00pm.

---

**Present:** Cllrs P Exton (Chair), W Jones, R Sanderson & C Ritchie

**Also present:** Claire Mann (Acting Town Clerk)

**P&E/21/83 To receive Declarations of Interest in accordance with the Council's Code of Conduct**

None received

**P&E/21/84 To receive apologies for absence**

Apologies received from Cllrs J Exton, RP Jones & E Whatton

**P&E/21/85 To receive Public Questions in respect of items on this agenda**

None received.

**P&E/21/86 To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on the 13<sup>th</sup> July**

The Minutes were approved & signed as a correct record. Cllr P Exton reported that he had since received an email from Steve Hind of the CATG group, Cllr Exton will clarify points raised by members and will back to future meeting.

**P&E/21/87 Planning issues – to consider the following;  
a. Planning Applications received since previous meeting**

PL/2021/06957 & PL/2021/05938 – The Old Bell

It was resolved that the P&E Committee has **no objection** to the application.

PL/2021/06186 – The Smoking Dog

It was agreed that MTC has concerns about the long-term sustainability of structure and potential light pollution for neighbours. MTC would like to see these issues addressed and be assured that materials used are in keeping with the Conservation Area that the property is within.

PL/2021/07140 – 3 Gastons Rd

It was agreed that MTC has no objection to the application but is disappointed with the poor quality of documents uploaded onto WC website.

PL/2021/06975 – 3 Bartons Close

It was resolved that the P&E Committee has **no objection** to the application

PL/2021/06723 – 6 Park Close

It was resolved that the P&E Committee has **no objection** to the application

PL/2021/06680 – 3 Jubilee Gardens

It was resolved to **object** to the application. The reasons are as follows; the location plan is not indicative of the existing plan. The scale of development is disproportionate to what

would remain of the garden. Additional car parking would be required as current provision falls outside of the Wiltshire Council Minimum Parking Standards and that neighbours would be severely impacted by the size of the proposed development.

PL/2021/07409 – Bath House

It was agreed that MTC has no objection to the application but is disappointed with the poor quality of documents uploaded onto WC website.

PL/2021/06714 & PL/2021/07419 – 5 Burnivale

It was resolved that the P&E Committee has **no objection** to the application.

PL/2021/07339 – Eastgate Lodge

It was resolved that the P&E Committee has **no objection** to the application.

**b. Unresolved planning issues/updates**

Cllr Ritchie reported that there will be a meeting on Thursday of the WALPA group at which Wiltshire Council will provide an update on the legal advice they have received & updates to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

**P&E/21/88 To confirm intention to continue Car Parking Subsidy at £6149.00 for the two-hour element & £1769.00 for the Bank Holiday element (as confirmed by Joanna Pattison 28/07/21) for 2022/23**

It was resolved that the Clerk would contact WC to request a refund of the Parking Subsidy paid by MTC as WC had received Central government funding to cover loss of income due to Covid19 regulations and to request usage figures of the car parks during lock down.

**P&E/21/89 To consider MTC response to Parliamentary Boundary Commission Review**

Following discussion it was agreed that the committee would submit comments as follows;

*Malmesbury Town Council discussed the proposals for the new Parliamentary constituency boundaries in the South West Region on the 3<sup>rd</sup> August 2021. The Council does not feel qualified to comment on the proposed boundary changes but having noted that Malmesbury would come under the proposed 'Cirencester & North Wiltshire' constituency, members do not want the new constituency to be named as such. Malmesbury is reputed to be the oldest borough in England and therefore holds its own identity, naming Cirencester would imply the deference of our historic Town and others. The Town Council suggested two alternative names;*

***North Wiltshire & South Cotswolds or North Wiltshire & South Gloucestershire.*** *The preferred alternative would be North Wiltshire & South Cotswolds as the majority of constituents would be in North Wiltshire. Malmesbury itself lies only meters away from the Cotswolds AONB, vis-à-vis the name would be in keeping with the geographical area of proposed changes. The second option would be a true reflection of the area represented but to use the term 'Gloucestershire' instead of 'Cotswolds' might remove the perception that Malmesbury is in the Cotswolds*

**P&E/21/90 To consider MTC response to Bus Back Better update – informal bus survey <https://surveys.wiltshire.gov.uk/snapwebhost/s.asp?k=162679536235>**

It was agreed that the acting Town Clerk would respond to the consultation as the Town Council being an employer and that the link would be published on the Town Council Facebook page and website for residents to also complete.

**P&E/21/91 To review footpath status reports prepared by members of the Committee**

It was agreed to defer this item to the next P&E meeting

**P&E/21/92 To note request from Wiltshire Council to respond to Climate Strategy Consultation – goes live on 1st September for six weeks [www.wiltshire.gov.uk/green-economy](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/green-economy)**

It was agreed that this item would be forwarded to Full Council for consideration at its meeting on the 14<sup>th</sup> September.

Meeting Closed at 8.55pm