

# South Marston Parish Council

1 Brind Close, Swindon, SN3 5EJ

Tel: 01793 686150

Email: [clerksmpc@southmarston.org.uk](mailto:clerksmpc@southmarston.org.uk)

## South Marston Parish Council

### Draft Minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on Tuesday 7th June at 7:00pm in South Marston Village Hall

Council Members present	
Mr C McEwen – Chair (CM)	Mrs S Brown – Vice Chair (SB)
Mr K Millard (KM)	Mr T Leathart (TL)
Mr D Roberts (DR)	
Clerk & Responsible Officer:	Mrs C Penny (Clerk)
Members of the public present:	Approximately 9 members of the public in attendance

Acronyms used in these minutes:

SBC – Swindon Borough Council, PC – Parish Council, NP – Neighbourhood Plan, NPC – Neighbourhood Planning Committee, SMRA – South Marston Recreation Association, OPWG – Open Spaces Working Group, SM website – [www.SouthMarston.org.uk](http://www.SouthMarston.org.uk), SuDS – Sustainable urban drainage systems

#### Minutes:

Agenda item & minute number	Summary	Action	Supporting information
1. Open 10 minutes 82/16	<p>Mrs Anne Featherstone (AF) queried that usually when a new school is built the old school is closed down. It's quite unusual that it appears that this is not happening here - Is that the case? CM confirmed that the anticipation is that the school expands to meet the new demand but if that can't happen then the developers are saying that they would build a new 1 form entry school if the school on current site could not be expanded.</p> <p>AF stated that the developers wouldn't care about where the school is located and queried under what circumstances would the school not expand on the current site? CM confirmed its an unknown. CM corrected that the proposal is not an alternate school and shouldn't be referred to as such. The developers are committed to financing a one form entry – either by expanding the existing school or by building an additional new school. AF queried why a new large school couldn't be built at the new location and close the existing school. CM reminded Mrs Mary Cooper (MC) and AF that they were on the committee for discussing the range of</p>	None	None

<p>options and in particular had attended the meetings with the Borough and Governors. MC stated that it was never allowed to be discussed. CM clarified the history of the discussions and the decisions that were made.</p> <p>AF stated that they feel that the existing school is on a dangerous road and asked why the PC can't get together with people and get a new school built. CM stated that the discussions were had and that had been assessed and an outcome decided by SBC, the Local Education Authority and the school Governors.</p> <p>DR asked AF why she is opposed to the school remaining on existing site. AF stated that application is ignoring the location issues, the school is dangerous where it is. CM reminded the PC that AF had to declare an interest due to proximity of her home whilst a Councillor with the PC. AF confirmed but her issue is not personal but about the dangerous location of the school due to road issues and access issues. She wishes to see how we decided not to explore this option. CM &amp; SB reminded her that MC and TL had been on a sub-group that investigated the option and presented their findings to a meeting with developers HHT and the Borough's planning and education officers. The idea was not taken up by HHT, but the Borough commissioned a report from Colliers at a cost of £17,000 that confirmed the Borough's proposals for the school to be expanded on its present site. The developers have been invited to come up with a viable new site option on a number of occasions but neither they nor anyone else has progressed the idea. AF stated that she wishes that when she arrived that it had been made clear.</p> <p>Mrs Verity Davidson (VD) raised an issue about the two new roads: Old vicarage road one and the one from the back of manor farm. The junction of these roads with the existing road squash the access to the Manor Farm area and makes South Marston farm inaccessible. She doesn't see how it can be made to work. CM stated that the PC opposes this road arrangement. Our proposal for roads would resolve this and reduce pressure on Pound Corner.</p> <p>Mr Simon Olive (SO) raises that the proposed road cuts across the iron age drainage system and that the proposed allotments will not be suitable for growing vegetables. SB stated that the work done on the drainage by the applicant has large gaps and that they forgot that although the rules say that they must not increase the outflow to someone</p>		
--	--	--

	<p>else's land, it will do so. We are planning to ask for a condition on the application to ensure that the drainage is improved before work begins. CM stated that the NEV drainage strategy is not out yet.</p> <p>Another resident queried if the school increases where will the traffic will be coming from? CM confirmed that they are no details in the application for changes to the road around the school. CM stated that the aim in the NP is to get parents and children walking to school and those from outside the village should be using the new link road. CM confirmed that the hotel development will have an impact but can't be seen yet.</p> <p>SO queried the Rowborough development and the trigger point of 500. Why does the trigger point have to be so high? CM confirmed that we can't put in a stipulation that will make it economically unviable – one of the rules of the National Planning Policy Framework. SO also said that he was flummoxed by the traffic light system down by the Carpenters. CM stated that we had been having discussions about a super junction but have been told that it's not economically viable. SO says that it means that developers can therefore continue to build and create an unsustainable environment for existing residents.</p> <p>Discussion re roads within the application and issues with the northern road. CM confirmed that we aim to object to the road proposal. SB confirmed that the bulk of the technical work since 2010/11 and that they looked at a number of the different options. The reports concluded that the southern link road would be a rat run. The developers have been working on their own, more recent reports and have been working to get it accepted by the Borough. This supports their application. We cannot undo the relationship between SBC and the developers and we have to rely on what the Borough say is viable. CM confirmed that we are questioning the basis of their figures which is the most we can do.</p> <p>VD queried if there will be any screening. CM confirmed it's been picked up there is very little and will be raised within the PC's response.</p> <p>TL raised that the points raised by the residents so far have been flagged within the PC's draft response.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p>Another resident queried the contents of a leaflet delivered the residents. CM confirmed that the leaflet is not to do with the PC and not written by us and that there were a few factual inaccuracies within it. AF confirmed that she had written it and confirmed that in future she would make it clear that any similar documents were not sanctioned by the PC.</p> <p>Another resident queried the number of residencies within the Parish at the moment and how big will it get. CM confirmed around 300 and going to about 1000.</p> <p>SO asked if there was a timescale and CM confirmed that it has not been given. SO queried the order. SB stated it's an outline planning application and that the map is a guideline and the question of what is fixed and can't be changed. This is the road access and the reserved matters such as landscaping, urban drainage, travel plans etc. The next thing that happens is that those plots will be subject to separate developments and therefore applications. CM stated that we are trying to drive the standards of the reserved matters at this outline stage to ensure we don't end up with separate estates.</p> <p>CM asked about the lack of mention of sewage. SB confirmed that it is taken as matter of course that Thames Water have to provide the water infrastructure. SB to ensure that are added to the response.</p> <p>VD queried what happens to those residents whose homes do not currently have access to this. CM confirmed that we have added a NP addition that states that the developers should offer access DR worth noting that you can also pass your concerns onto your three ward Councillors as well as the Parish Councillors.</p>		
2. Apologies 83/16	Mr B Thunder (BT), Mr S Young (SY)		
3. Declarations of interest 84/16	<p>Members are reminded that any conflict of interest should be declared at the start of the meeting or item or, if not previously foreseeable, during any discussion of the matter concerned.</p> <p>CM confirmed that it's in the nature of these issues in that every villager is effected by what's coming forward. Having taken the advice in relation to the Neighbourhood Plan and having noted that the implications of this application are universal in a similar way to the NP and that the responses proposed are in line with NP policies he does not anticipate that any Councillor will need to declare a formal interest. No interests declared.</p>		The Councils declaration of interests as recorded in the June & July 2014 minutes.
4. To discuss the Council's	PC worked through the draft response to the application:		

<p>comments to the amendments to the HHT application for 2,380 houses in the Parish Ref: S/OUT/13/1555 85/16</p>	<p>Discussion about the school: CM stated that what troubled the developers is that the expansion of the existing school requires the co-operation of a third party. If they build a new one, they are in control and will build one to match the number of children that will arrive without regard to the existing population.</p> <p>SB confirmed that we are not in the position to negotiate or push for anything as we are not a participating group. It's the school, LEA, developer and Swindon. CM – its additional complicated by the school becoming an academy so the LEA will not be involved. CM confirmed that is has been agreed in principle that the Borough has money to compliment the expansion of the existing school and the developers will be paying for the 2/3. PC discussed that there are a number of players dealing with the school and that it is beyond our control.</p> <p>Discussion about SUDS: TL requested the amendment as raised by Mr Olive. Agreed by PC</p> <p>Discussion about landscaping: SB confirmed that they are likely to be reserved matters and that often the PC doesn't get to be involved in the decision of these. Will be adding a request to add a condition to allow us to contribute. Will insert word "appropriate" into the landscaping screening</p> <p>Discussion about the use of management companies to manage green spaces at the new development and the risks for the PC and its residents: SB highlighted that she has expertise in the area due to her Trustee position on xx. SB &amp; CM will speak to SBC re when this becomes hard wired into the application. SB also raised that there are concerns about the fact that there are no timings on the public land – will it stay public land forever? Can it be sold for houses?</p> <p>DR propose that we adopt the draft response with the amendments: 1) mention sustainable development 2) allotments and SUDS issue 3) sewage &amp; fresh water conditions and 4) stress the NP requirement involvement in the discharge of reserve matters</p> <p>KM second. All in favour.</p>		
<p>5. Matters brought forward by or with the consent of the chair 86/16</p>	<p>CM raised that we have had notification of major works on the bridge at the Carpenters Arms to replace girders. It is a perfect opportunity to insert a public footpath/cycle. Will continue to push.</p> <p>CM stated that the NP remains with the Inspector and the lack of progress has been disappointing.</p>		

Commented [CP1]: SB – didn't catch the name! Sorry!

	<p>Comments should have been up in April but not yet there. HHT have written to the inspector again and we all would welcome an oral hearing.</p> <p>CM &amp; SB both feel that there are elements in the HHT response where their wording is an improvement, where their offering is preferable but also elements where we are at loggerheads with them. Any amendments to the NP now have to go via the inspector and the inspector would prefer all involved parties to come to an agreement. CM stated that this would mean that we enter a dialogue with the developers. CM asked the PC to confirm that they are happy with this. SB stated that we can have the discussions re the amendments direct with SBC and HHT and then approach the inspector.</p> <p>The PC confirmed they are happy with the process and that all amendments will be presented to them for approval.</p>		
Meeting closure:	8:30pm		