PLANNING APPLICATIONS, SEPTEMBER 2026

PL/2026/04175
Hillview Farm, 2b Bradford Road, BA15 2HL
Rear Extensions, Replacement Outbuilding & Widened Driveway & Dropped Kerb

Recommendation: no change to the Parish Council's original objection, on the grounds that the balcony remains overbearing.

The re-presentation of this application was prompted by a slight revision to the length of the balcony (1m away from the neighbouring property) and re-drawing of boundary lines for vehicular access. The Parish Council's initial objection to this development had related to the size and position of the balcony. I suggest the revision of the boundary lines is not germane to the Parish Council.

I disagree with Cllr White's views that the change in design 'will reduce 'overlooking' and 'overbearing' (email 21 Aug 26) and the applicant's view that this new design is equally just as intrusive for both parties as was the initially proposed julienne balcony. I note that the neighbour has not raised any comment about the revised design.

I believe our original comment remain valid. In summary, the positioning of a wide balcony and deep balcony on the southern aspect is overbearing. I do not suggest any revision to our comments on this application.

PL/2025/05347
Land at Winsley Road, Bradford on Avon, BA15 2HL
Change of use to dog walking field and associated works

Recommendation: objection, on the grounds that it jeopardises the safety of those using the active travel scheme path (walkers, cyclists etc.).

This application was first presented for consideration in June 2025. On 7 July 2025, the Parish Council submitted the following comments:

"The Parish Council does not have concerns about the impact of the proposal on the openness of the Green Belt. Councillors felt that the noise management plan puts too much emphasis on neighbours reporting a noise nuisance. The noise management plan should be made more robust and there should be pro-active monitoring of noise by the site operator. It's proposed that the field is open from 7am to 5pm in the winter months (October to March) and from 6am to 9pm in the summer. The summer hours were felt to be excessive and should be reviewed. Proposed alterations to the entrance to improve visibility are welcomed but improvements should be carefully considered to ensure good visibility on both sides of the entrance. There are concerns about vehicles crossing the Active Travel Scheme to enter/exit the site. It was felt that there could be a severe adverse impact on those using the Active Travel Scheme. Right hand access in and out of the site across the Winsley Road might be difficult."

At that time Wiltshire Highways Development Manager, recommended that:

"This application is refused on highway grounds for the following reason:-
The proposal would result in an increase in use of the existing agricultural access which has insufficient visibility splays in both directions, measured along the nearside edge of the adjacent shared-use path, to allow acceptable intervisibility between vehicles associated with the proposed dog walking field emerging from the access and cyclists passing on the shared-use path, based on the visibility guidance provided in 'Cycle Infrastructure Design' LTN1/20 Chapter 5, and would therefore prejudice the safety of users of the shared use path at this point."

It appears that the planning authority did not make and publish a decision on this matter. Rather the applicant has been given opportunity to submit a new proposal under the banner of the original submission with new dates.

The applicant proposes re-positioning the entrance to the site from the road to the south east corner of the site, and rebuilding the walls to improve sight lines for vehicles existing the site. The original gateway would be closed. Altogether this would improve visibility. There is still concern over the impact on an increase in traffic crossing the active traffic scheme, particularly during peak hours when children go to and from school by walking or by cycling. I do not accept the applicant's suggestion that the movement of vehicles onto the dog walking field would be akin to a farmer visiting stock that is pastured on the parcel of land. Despite the re-positioning of the entrance to the dog-walking field, the traffic emerging from the site would still prejudice the safety of the users (walkers, runners and cyclists) of the shared use path.

Although not a primary consideration under planning regulations, the operation of CCTV on site and its potential for an adverse impact on data subjects - users of the dog walking field, residents in adjoining properties and possibly passers by - needs to be described. As a business the operators will need to register the CCTV system with the regulatory authorities.

Moreover, the applicant claims there is a business need due to an absence of any alternative dog-walking facilities. L Oldaker (30 Sep) presents a good argument against this part of the business case. There are several dog walking fields within the vicinity of Bradford on Avon.

Although the applicant has made some changes to the original design for the dog walking field and access to the site, I believe that the traffic using the site would still present a very significant risk to road users, and especially the use of the active travel scheme.

PL/2026/05577
Murhill House, Murhill, BA2 7FQ
Roofing works, together with internal and external repairs and refurbishment to the listed building.

Recommendation: No objection.

The nature of the proposed refurbishment and modernisation of Murhill House are reasonable and would make the property a good family home.

PL/2026/06083
Turleigh Manor Stables, Turleigh, BA15 2HG
T1 Beech Tree – fell

Recommendation: Objection to T1 felling of Beech Tree as it is covered by a TPO.

No objection to proposed pruning of T2 Mulberry tree, T3 Magnolia tree; T4 Magnolia tree.

Note: it was proposed to fell this T1 Beech Tree under PL/2026/05605 . We highlighted to the Planning Officer that PL/2026/05605 did not identify this tree as covered by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). Hence the applicant has submitted a new application covering this tree solely. Albeit the 'new' application form is exactly the same as the earlier form: it still does not declare part of the proposed works is covered by a TPO.

These comments were proposed having considered application PL/2026/05605:
T1 Beech tree – fell; T2 Mulberry tree - prune all round by 1m-2m for light on the garden bed; T3 - Magnolia grandiflora tree - reduce by 1m-2m on the front of the house to previous cut height; T4 - Magnolia tree - prune from the stone tile roof by 2m to stop any damage.

The use of the site address Turleigh Manor Stables is slightly misleading particularly in terms of the proposed felling of T1. The trees numbered T2, T3 & T4 are all located north of the BoA to Winsley road whereas the tree T1 is on land South of Turleigh Manor.
The tree identified as T1 in this application was pruned in summer 2022 with works approved under application 2022/01684. There was reference in the application form to TPO /W/07/00045/IND that according to the map search at the Wiltshire Planning Portal is shown as extant.
In this current application in the section titled, 'Identification of Description(s) and Description of Works' the applicant states that:
'T1 Beech. Client would like to remove it. She says it has caused movement of the boundary wall with the highway, the stone gate posts and the stone footpath. It also obstructs the power cables and overhangs the neighbours property which it's within 10m of the gable end'.

I do not believe that there is sufficient justification for the clear felling of this tree (T1) in this application hence I suggest the following:
The Parish Council objects to this application on the grounds that it proposes the clear felling of a tree (T1) that is subject to a TPO (TPO/W/07/00045/IND).
I suggest the Parish Council does not object to the proposed works on the trees marked T2, T3 and T4.

PL/2026/05996
139 Winsley, BA15 2LB
Trim the Yew tree (T1) in the front garden as hard as possible leaving a nice shape.

Recommendation: No comment.

Pruning of roughly up to 1m, focussing on trimming the tree away from the overhead lines.

PL/2026/05939
270 Turleigh, BA15 2HF
T1 hazel tree fell, T2 hazel tree fell, T3 rowan (dead) fell.

Recommendation: No comment.

These trees are interspersed among mature trees on the west side of Turleigh Hill that are likely fill the canopy space quickly.

PL/2026/05470
School House, 125 Winsley, BA15 2LQ
T1, T2 & T3 - 3 x Beech trees - crown reduction and crown thinning by 25% and crown raise to 6ft

Original recommendation: Objection to works on T1 Beech on the grounds that tree works were undertaken only a year ago.

Updated recommendation in light of Planning Officers proposed changes: no objection.

In May 2025 an application was submitted to work on Beech tree designated T1. The purpose of this application was to reduce the canopy by approximately 2-3m to allow more light into the small garden and to maintain the tree at a smaller height that is more suitable for the garden. Prune back limbs that are encroaching on the BT cable by 1m. The Parish Council raised no objection and the work was authorised on 11 July 2025. It is surmised that work was done that summer / early autumn 2025.

This application, that was submitted just over 13 months after authority for 2025/04516 was granted, is for crown reduction and crown thinning by 25%. Knowing it is less than 13 months since T1 was pruned, I cannot believe the tree has re-grown to last year's height. Especially, noting how little rain and hence ground water there has been this summer.

It is important to note that in 2025, application 2025/04516 was preceded by 2025/03558. 2025/03558 was to reduce T1 by 10m and very severely prune the beech trees T2 and T3. This application was submitted on 7 April 2025 and **refused** by the Planning Authority on 6 May 2025. The Planning Authority placed a TPO - TPO/2025/00007 to protect all of the trees.

This latest application, 2026/05470, appears to be trying to achieve what the applicant set out to achieve under 2025/03558. I disagree with applicants assertions that the trees one year on since their last prune 'look overbearing and unmanaged' and that completion of the proposed works 'would enhance the conservation area'. The only thing that the works might help with is keeping guttering clear, which is an objective of the applicant.

It is recommended that the Parish Council objects to this application: it is too soon after the previous round of pruning. Should the applicant believe that they have a strong counter argument based on structural issues, they should present more information about those issues with an application.

Subsequently, the Planning Officer has visited the site in early September, and has proposed to the applicant (on 10 September) that they make the following changes to the description of the works:

"T1 Beech - Crown Lift to 2 metres above ground level; T2 and T3 Beech - 25% Crown Reduction and Crown Lift to 2 metres above ground level.
Please can you confirm by the 1st October 2026 that you are happy with the changes. I will then be able to determine the application and send a decision notice."

The planning application is as originally presented before. It has not been re-written and represented to reflect the planning officer's suggestion. But noting the Planning Officer's suggested changes and our original comments, I recommend that the Parish Council supports the application on the grounds the applicant has accepted the changes proposed by the planning officer on 10 Sep. *[Note: It's not clear that the applicant has yet accepted these changes].*

PL/2026/06145
Rose Cottage, 38 Winsley, BA15 2LT
Scots Pine - Fell. Silver Birch - Fell.

Recommendation: No comment.

This application seeks approval to manage flora in a smalled walled garden and minimise risk to a boundary wall facing onto a public highways. Both trees are young and are in a congested environment. Felling them would 'thin' the border area that would give other plants space to flourish.
