

## Green farm Development

Planning application [19/03199/OUT](#) for 200 houses

This is a resubmission of planning application 17/03292/OUT with slight amendments

L&BPC response to application 17/03292/OUT was

The above planning application was discussed at the Lyneham and Bradenstoke Parish Council meeting. Members concerns were raised about it being a large cul de sac, the overall size of the development, the incomplete nature of the archaeological report, and the location of the commercial area being hidden at the far back of the site. Although it was also pointed out that we need both more affordable homes and business premises. However, the decision was made to object to the application.

Looking at the representation letters. Comments from the members of the public.

For Planning Application 17/03292/OUT There were 81 Representative letters to make comment of this development. All opposed the development.

The Housing Team of Wiltshire Council wrote

“We note that the Planning Statement submitted with this application states that the affordable housing contribution would be secured by planning consultation whereas the council's normal preference would be for it to be secured by S106 Agreement and using the S106 format for AH developed by the council and its RP Partnership. A S106 Agreement would obviously be our preference to ensure that all the definitions/clauses required re the delivery of the affordable housing units are included.”

And the Public Protection Team from Wiltshire Council wrote

“Whilst I am in no doubt that the conditions that prevailed on the day of the unattended 24- hour noise survey, led to the conclusion that very low levels were observed in the vicinity of the MOD training barracks( monitoring position ML1), I am aware that the MOD have approval for multiple training activities, including a firing range(N/13/01522/F). The noise report, therefore, has not assessed the ‘worst-case scenario’ in terms of potential noise impact on the proposed residential receptors. 2. The 2013 consent allows various activities such as Recovery Mechanic area, Operational Airfield Real Working Environment, Deployed Operations Training area, Back door training and a Firing Range, all of which are tied in to an Operational Noise Management Plan(ONMP) via planning conditions. 3. As far as I am aware , the source noise data and resultant noise impacts were based on existing receptors at the time , so if new residential receptors are to be introduced significantly closer, then these receptors will invariably experience higher noise levels.”

This planning application was refused

For Planning application 19/03199/OUT There are 109 Representative letters.

Lyneham Parish objected and wrote

Having viewed the development proposal from Gladman at Green Farm we, the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group, must object to this proposal. It falls down against a number of Core Strategies as published by Wiltshire Council. Specifically core policy 1 that identifies Lyneham as a large village, and then identifies what development is acceptable in large villages. It quotes small developments of

10 units or fewer. The expansion of the footprint of the built up area should be tightly controlled. There is no demonstrable need within the community for 200 new properties and Wiltshire Council have identified that their current strategic requirements for this parish is zero. So any developments should be for the community benefit only.

Of the 109,

107 objection stating it is against Wiltshire core policy and that Lyneham does not have the facilities and infrastructure to deal with this number of houses. Some also mentioned the increase in traffic.

Of the two that support the application, one lives in Bradenstoke and the other states "I have no objections to this proposal as it is, in my opinion, infill within the village boundary's on what is derelict land. My only concern with this proposal is if the infrastructure exists to support the 200 dwellings planned and their 4-600 inhabitants ie, doctors, dental, schools etc."

So out of 109 comments only one is fully supportive and the other has reservations.

This planning application was refused, but has now gone to appeal.