

From:
To: [Developmentmanagement](#)
Subject: Planning Application Ref: 16/07288/OUT.
Date: 13 September 2016 19:53:22
Attachments: [Filands Gleeson development.docx](#)

Dear Sirs

Your planning ref. 16/07288/OUT.

I attach a letter regarding the Gleeson development in Malmesbury for the Planning Portal for North Wilts in Chippenham.

Yours faithfully

Jessica Branton

105 GLOUCESTER ROAD
MALMESBURY
WILTSHIRE SN16 0AJ

FAO: Alex Smith
Planning Department
NWDC
Monkton Park
Chippenham
Wilts SN15 1ER

13 September 2016

Dear Alex Smith

Ref: 16/07288/OUT

I am writing again as a Malmesbury resident of over 16 years to express my deep concern over the proposed development of 71 houses on the north east section of the Filands site.

From reading other correspondence there seems to be a groundswell of anger if not disbelief among people in the town that after three years of debate, discussion and public consultation and eventual ratification by the local people the carefully elaborated Malmesbury Neighborhood Plan (MNP) has been summarily ignored by both developers and planners. This particular development site was way down on the list of viable options. Apart from this Malmesbury is fulfilling its housing quota with current build to include the requirement for 2026 – ten years ahead without the addition of further development. So the Gleeson site is both unnecessary, unwanted by the town as well as being patently unsustainable. This puts it firmly contrary to the National Planning Policy as quoted in the Statement of Community Engagement (“At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking.”).

The developers have admitted that their proposal is not “supported by the adopted development plan”. Indeed the impact of Bloor Homes development to the west needs to be integrated before we can even begin to think of additional unnecessary over build.

Subsequent to this we are looking at increased traffic on the B4014, and again the overburdening of local infrastructure in terms of access to medical support and availability of education at primary and secondary level. I see there is a “proposed school” but who is going to fund this?? It looks very faint on the map! The access does not look very easy either, particularly during rush hour when the 4014 becomes congested with traffic to Dysons (which of course is still expanding!). As a voluntary Flood warden I am also concerned about the water runoff as the entire hillside becomes developed. We have been subject to unprecedented levels of rainfall which may only increase as we are more subject to global warming.

This is a small market town that is suddenly being overwhelmed by development from all sides. That is why we have Core Policies and Neighbourhood Plans. They provide an overview of land availability in terms of national needs and local capacity to absorb such changes. It is a truism that the profit motive rides rough shod over local needs unless firmly kept in check.

I urge those County Councillors who have the responsibility of making a decision on this development to turn it down. This historic town needs phased development, not untrammelled growth. Perhaps this project can be raised again sometime after 2026, but not now.

Yours sincerely

Jessica Branton

Jessica Branton