

Design Meeting Record –Summary of meeting

Compound and Car Park Project – Phase 2 Detailed Design Discussion

Meeting focus: Initial detailed design discussion for the Compound and Car Park project, including layout, surfacing, drainage, access, lighting, parking arrangements, container/compound requirements, flood risk, and planning application requirements.

The meeting was not a formal decision-making meeting and was used to identify design issues, technical requirements, options, constraints and next steps before the matter returns to Full Council.

Summary

1.1 Planning application scope

The group discussed the planning application requirements and the need to include the relevant existing and proposed structures within the application package. The key point recorded was that the lean-to, the two existing containers, and the two proposed new containers should be included, including any retrospective element required for structures already in place as advised by Wiltshire Council.

The rationale for this approach is that the Council has been advised that the two existing containers did not have planning permission, meaning the planning submission should cover the wider site position properly rather than progressing a narrower application that could leave existing planning issues unresolved.

It was noted that the planning application may also reference the wildflower / biodiversity element, although the precise location, timing and management arrangements remain to be finalised.

1.2 Compound requirements and container arrangements

The group discussed whether the compound should be extended and whether additional storage capacity may be needed in the future. It was noted that the earlier rationale for compound extension had partly related to cricket covers, but those covers had subsequently been resolved separately, creating uncertainty over whether extension was still required at this stage.

There was no final agreement recorded on the compound extension. The discussion identified that if the group is minded to pursue compound extension, this would be the appropriate stage to incorporate it into the next design recommendation, but this remains subject to checking previous Council resolutions and reporting back through the correct approval route

The possibility of a fifth container was raised in the context of the life expectancy of the lean-to and future storage needs, but the discussion was moved offline and not progressed.

The group also discussed container bases and the risk of creating unnecessary impermeable areas through repeated concrete bases. The meeting therefore identified the need to think proportionately about container pads or bases, rather than automatically assuming large areas of new concrete.

1.3 Car park layout and parking capacity

The car park layout was discussed in detail, including the number of spaces, vehicle circulation, turning arrangements, access, parking near the Pavilion and Men's Shed, and the need to future-proof the site for current and anticipated users.

A sketch layout prepared by [Cllr Gary Blandford-Hull](#) was used as a discussion aid only. It was made clear during the discussion that the sketch was not a final design, not a formal Council proposal, not for wider circulation, and not to be treated as a planning submission document.

The group discussed that the design should not simply reflect current use, but should take account of sports clubs, Pavilion bookings, the Men's Shed, occasional peak usage, deliveries, maintenance vehicles, emergency access and future growth in site use.

There was support for creating clearer delineation between running aisles and parking areas, but not necessarily through formal white lining. The discussion pointed toward a softer, less urbanised approach, potentially using surfacing changes, buffers, small markers, or natural layout cues rather than conventional car park marking throughout.

1.4 Turning area, access and service vehicles

The meeting discussed whether a turning circle or similar manoeuvring space would be required. The contractor advice was that planning is likely to consider how emergency vehicles, service vehicles, deliveries and general vehicle movements can operate safely within the site.

The rationale for retaining a suitable turning / manoeuvring area is that high-use vehicle areas, delivery movements, emergency access and compound servicing need to be designed into the scheme rather than left unresolved.

The gate width and access for lorries, builders' merchants, tractor movements and any future compound servicing were also discussed, including the possible need for a double gate.

1.5 Surfacing strategy

The group discussed surfacing options including hard surfacing, semi-permeable surfacing, geogrids / geo-tracks, membranes, parking bay construction, sub-base depth, surface dressing and the need for a specification that is fit for the use of the site.

The contractor advice was that heavy-use areas such as access routes, running aisles and turning areas are likely to require a harder-wearing surface, while parking areas could potentially use a more permeable / softer treatment if designed properly.

The meeting also considered the impact of modern vehicle weights, including heavier vehicles and electric vehicles, on the specification. The implication is that the car park should not be designed to a lightweight domestic standard, but to a specification suitable for its public/community use and likely loading.

A correction was identified in relation to the sub-base depth shown in the work plan. A figure of 700mm was queried and confirmed as incorrect, with the corrected working assumption being approximately 200mm of Type 1 or Type 3 material, subject to trial hole findings and final specification.

1.6 Drainage, flood risk and ground conditions

Drainage and flood risk were significant issues throughout the discussion. The site was noted as being in a flood area, with historical watercourse / infill considerations and unknown ground conditions.

The contractor advised that a trial hole / test pit would be useful to understand ground conditions, permeability and what is beneath the existing surface, particularly given the site's history and the uncertainty about whether different parts of the site behave differently.

The meeting identified that drainage design needs to avoid solving one issue while **not** creating another. In particular, additional impermeable or semi-impermeable surfacing may increase the need for formal drainage, attenuation or other water-management measures.

It was also noted that drainage should be considered alongside long-term maintenance. For example, French drains or similar systems can fail if fines, silt or surface material enter them and are not maintained.

Flood risk assessment work remains outstanding. [Pete Blackman](#) (Chair of the Flood Advisory Committee) was identified as the main contact for local flood knowledge once the flood risk assessor is appointed, and Environment Agency flood risk data and statistics are ready to be passed to the assessor.

1.7 Wildflower meadow, biodiversity and landscaping

The wildflower / biodiversity element was discussed in connection with the wider car park design, landscaping and planning submission. The location was not finalised, and the meeting recorded this as an open question.

There was discussion about whether the wildflower area should be positioned in the north-west / weir end area, as linked to ecological recommendations, but the meeting did not settle the layout.

The group also discussed that the current grounds maintenance contract with ID Verde ends next year, and that a new contractor with wildflower / biodiversity expertise may be better placed to advise on establishment and long-term management.

The rationale for not fixing the wildflower detail at this meeting is that the biodiversity element should be informed by proper ecological / grounds maintenance input and should not be designed in isolation from the car park layout, planning requirements, maintenance regime and long-term site management.

1.8 Lighting

Lighting was discussed as a matter that needs to be included in the final design and planning application. The group considered the need for lighting around parking, pedestrian movement, the Pavilion, the Men's Shed and the general site.

Low-level lighting was discussed as a possible approach, with attention to planning requirements, neighbouring amenity, lighting height, controls, timing, sensors and whether lighting should switch off after a set time.

The meeting also recognised that lighting can have both safety benefits and unintended consequences if it illuminates areas in a way that encourages congregation or misuse.

The practical next step is to obtain / share the existing lighting design information already quoted for by [Rob Mayberry](#) so that it can be added to the site plan and considered as part of the planning package.

1.9 Accessibility and priority / disabled parking

The group discussed whether designated disabled spaces, blue badge spaces or more flexible "priority" spaces would be most appropriate.

The discussion considered the need for spaces to be close to the Pavilion ramp and accessible routes, but also noted practical issues around enforcement, use by different hirers, and how members of the public may interpret parking designations.

The group also discussed pedestrian access around the gates and whether an informal route should be formalised into a path linking to hard surfacing, particularly where wheelchair accessibility had been raised as an issue.

The rationale for leaving this unresolved is that accessibility provision must be designed properly alongside the wider layout, rather than added as an afterthought or placed where it creates conflict with access to the compound, gates, service vehicles or pedestrian movement.

2. Agreed / Emerging Positions

Ref	Matter	Agreed / Emerging Position	Notes
D1	Planning application scope	The planning application should include the lean-to, the two existing containers and the two proposed new containers, including the retrospective element.	This avoids leaving known planning matters unresolved and supports a more complete submission package.
D2	Use of sketch plans	Sketches used in the meeting were discussion aids only and should not be treated as final designs or planning documents.	This is important to avoid informal working drawings being misrepresented as Council-approved proposals.
D3	Trial holes / site investigation	Trial holes / permeability checks should be undertaken to inform the specification and drainage design.	Ground conditions are uncertain due to site history, water issues and possible varying sub-surface conditions.
D4	Flood risk assessor	The contractor / project team should be linked with the flood risk assessor once appointed, with Pete Blackman acting as the main local flood knowledge contact.	Environment Agency flood data and statistics are ready to be passed on once the assessor is engaged.
D5	Updated layout plan	Cllr Gary Blandford-Hull is to update the site plan, circulate it for comments and then pass it to Dave Marsh for specification work.	This keeps the plan at indicative design stage before technical specification and any Full Council decision.
D6	Lighting	Lighting needs to be included in the design and planning application process.	Low-level, controlled lighting was discussed, but final details remain to be developed.
D7	Sub-base correction	The 700mm sub-base figure was identified as incorrect, with 200mm noted as the corrected working assumption subject to technical review.	Trial hole findings may reduce or increase the final specification requirement.

3. Action Log

Ref	Action	Owner	Status / Timescale	Rationale / Notes
A1	Update the site plan to reflect discussion points on layout, parking, access, disabled / priority space location, surfacing and compound interface.	Cllr Gary Blandford-Hull	To progress following meeting.	The plan needs to move from discussion sketch to an indicative layout that can be reviewed and then specified.
A2	Circulate the updated plan to the project group for comments before passing it to the contractor.	Wilton TC / Cllr Gary Blandford-Hull	After plan update.	Circulation allows member comments to be captured before technical specification is developed.
A3	Pass the updated plan to Dave Marsh so that he can begin specification work.	Wilton TC	After project group comment stage.	The contractor needs an indicative layout before producing more detailed specification information.
A4	Send the original compound plan to Cllr Gary Blandford-Hull for integration into the updated site layout.	Wilton TC	To progress.	The original compound plan is needed to understand the proposed container layout, gate position and compound footprint.
A5	Check previous Council resolutions relating to the compound extension and cricket covers.	Wilton TC	Required before any recommendation.	The meeting identified uncertainty over whether the Council had resolved not to extend the compound or whether flexibility remains.
A6	Undertake trial holes / test pits and permeability checks.	Dave Marsh / contractor team	To be arranged.	Trial holes will inform ground condition assumptions, drainage design, sub-base specification and cost risk.
A7	Correct the sub-base depth assumption in the work plan from 700mm to the correct working assumption, noted as approximately 200mm subject to technical confirmation.	Cllr Gary Blandford-Hull / contractor team	Required before further design circulation.	The 700mm figure was identified as a typo / incorrect figure during the meeting.
A8	Link the contractor / project team with the flood risk assessor once appointed.	Wilton TC	Once assessor appointed.	Flood risk assessment is required to inform planning and technical design.
A9	Provide Environment Agency flood risk data and statistics to the flood risk assessor.	Wilton TC	Once assessor appointed.	The data is ready to be passed on and will support the formal FRA process.
A10	Confirm Pete Blackman as the local flood knowledge contact for the assessor.	Wilton TC	With FRA instruction.	Pete Blackman has site-specific knowledge through the flood advisory work.

Ref	Action	Owner	Status / Timescale	Rationale / Notes
A11	Obtain / send the lighting design information already quoted for by Rob Mayberry and add it to the developing plan.	Wilton TC	To progress.	Lighting must be considered as part of the planning and layout package.
A12	Develop the lighting requirements, including low-level lighting, timing, sensor controls and planning constraints.	Dave Marsh / contractor team with Wilton TC	During specification stage.	Lighting must balance safety, access, planning, neighbour amenity and potential misuse of the site.
A13	Consider whether a formalised pedestrian / accessible route is needed around the gate and through to hard surfacing.	Project group / contractor team	During revised layout review.	Wheelchair accessibility and pedestrian use were raised but need to be integrated into the wider site design.
A14	Clarify disabled / blue badge / priority parking approach as part of the revised design.	Project group / contractor team	Before planning submission.	The meeting agreed formal disabled bays are most appropriate.
A15	Consider wildflower / biodiversity location and management with appropriate grounds / ecological input.	Wilton TC / project group	Before final planning package.	The location and management approach remain unresolved, and professional input may be needed to ensure deliverability.
A16	Ensure any matters affecting scope, cost or planning submission are brought back to Full Council before implementation.	Wilton TC	Ongoing governance requirement.	The meeting invitation confirmed this was not a decision-making meeting and that scope/cost/planning matters must return to Full Council.

4. Issues Log and Rationale for Items Not Progressed / Discounted

This section is deliberately framed to help withstand challenge. It records why matters were not progressed, rather than simply saying “rejected”.

Ref	Issue / Proposal	Outcome	Clear Rationale
I1	Treating the sketch plan as an agreed Council design.	Not progressed.	The sketch was explicitly used as a discussion aid only. It was not a formal design, not a Council-approved plan, and not suitable for external circulation or planning submission at this stage.
I2	Taking / circulating photographs of the sketch plan during the meeting.	Not progressed / discouraged.	The plan was not final and there was concern that it could be shared externally or misrepresented as an agreed proposal. This protects the integrity of the design process and avoids confusion.
I3	Submitting a narrow planning application that excludes existing containers / lean-to.	Discounted.	The meeting recorded that the existing containers and lean-to need to be included, including retrospective elements, because the Council had been advised that the existing containers did not have planning permission.

Ref	Issue / Proposal	Outcome	Clear Rationale
I4	Deciding the compound extension at the meeting.	Deferred.	There was uncertainty over the earlier Council resolution and whether compound extension remains within scope. This needs to be checked before any recommendation is made.
I5	Assuming compound extension is unnecessary solely because cricket covers are no longer being retained.	Not accepted as settled.	Although the cricket cover rationale had changed, the meeting identified possible future storage and operational needs. The matter therefore requires clarification rather than being dismissed outright.
I6	Adding a fifth container immediately.	Deferred / not progressed at this stage.	The fifth container was raised as an option linked to the life of the lean-to and future storage, but no decision was made and the discussion was moved offline.
I7	Using large areas of concrete for container bases without further consideration.	Not progressed as default approach.	The meeting noted that additional concrete reduces permeable area and may worsen drainage / planning considerations, so any base design must be proportionate and technically justified. [
I8	Relying on informal / existing surfacing and layout without clearer delineation.	Not progressed.	The existing open layout creates uncertainty between running aisles and parking areas. A clearer design is needed to guide parking behaviour and improve use of the site.
I9	Fully formal white-lined urban car park treatment.	Not confirmed / potentially not preferred.	The discussion leaned toward softer delineation through surfacing, buffers, markers or natural cues, to avoid an overly formal or visually harsh layout.
I10	Removing the need for a turning / manoeuvring area.	Not supported at this stage.	The contractor advised that planning is likely to consider emergency access, site use, servicing and manoeuvring. A suitable turning / access arrangement therefore remains important.
I11	Treating the “turning circle” option as a final agreed design.	Not progressed.	The meeting clarified that the turning area was discussed as an option / likely requirement, not an approved final design.
I12	Using lightweight surfacing in high-wear vehicle areas.	Discounted.	High-use areas are subject to turning, manoeuvring and heavier vehicle loads. The contractor indicated these areas require a more robust specification.
I13	Relying on geogrid alone as the “solution”.	Rejected as incomplete.	The meeting recorded that geogrid is part of a system, not the whole system. It needs correct sub-base, membrane, surface dressing and maintenance to work properly.
I14	Assuming permeable / semi-permeable surfacing removes drainage concerns.	Rejected.	Even permeable systems require correct design and maintenance, and the site’s ground conditions and flood context mean drainage must be properly assessed.
I15	Installing drainage without considering maintenance.	Rejected.	French drains and similar systems can block with fines, silt and surface dressing material; long-term maintenance must therefore be designed and budgeted for.

Ref	Issue / Proposal	Outcome	Clear Rationale
I16	Using the 700mm sub-base figure in future documents.	Rejected / corrected.	The 700mm figure was identified as incorrect, with 200mm noted as the corrected working assumption, subject to technical confirmation and trial hole findings.
I17	Finalising the wildflower meadow location during the meeting.	Deferred.	The location remains unresolved and should be informed by ecology, biodiversity, grounds maintenance and wider layout considerations.
I18	Requiring ID Verde to establish the wildflower area as the preferred route.	Not agreed.	The meeting noted that the ID Verde contract ends next year and that future grounds contractor expertise may better support the Council's biodiversity aims.
I19	Finalising disabled / blue badge / priority parking designation at the meeting.	Deferred.	The discussion identified practical, access and enforcement issues. The matter needs to be resolved through the layout and planning process.
I20	Locating accessible spaces where they conflict with compound access.	Not supported without redesign.	A concern was raised that a disabled space in front of compound gates could obstruct compound access. The layout therefore needs review before any designation is confirmed.
I21	Treating informal pedestrian routes as sufficient without review.	Not accepted as final.	The meeting identified concerns around pedestrian movement, wheelchair accessibility, lighting and the route around gates. Further review is needed.
I22	Excluding lighting from the planning/design package.	Discounted.	The meeting confirmed that lighting needs to be included in the final application and design discussion.
I23	Installing stronger lighting without controls.	Not supported as a default.	The discussion identified the need to balance safety, planning, amenity, vandalism/misuse risk and timing controls. Low-level, controlled lighting may be more appropriate.
I24	Progressing without flood risk input.	Rejected.	Flood risk assessment and local site knowledge are required due to the site's flood context, unknown ground conditions and drainage implications.
I25	Assuming current parking demand is sufficient basis for design.	Rejected as too narrow.	The meeting considered future bookings, sports use, club overlap, delivery access and heavier vehicle use, so the design should be future-proofed rather than based only on current informal use.

5. Open Questions Requiring Resolution

Ref	Open Question	Why It Matters	Proposed Route
OQ1	What is the final target number of parking spaces?	The layout, surfacing, access and landscaping all depend on the parking capacity requirement.	Confirm through revised plan and project group review before Full Council.

Ref	Open Question	Why It Matters	Proposed Route
OQ2	Should the compound be extended?	Extension may affect scope, cost, layout, planning and storage capacity.	Check previous Council resolutions and include as a clear recommendation if required.
OQ3	Where should the wildflower / biodiversity area be located?	The location affects ecology, landscaping, maintenance and car park layout.	Review with ecological / grounds contractor input before final planning submission.
OQ4	Should spaces be marked as disabled, blue badge, or priority spaces?	This affects accessibility, enforcement, public expectation and risk.	Resolve as part of the revised layout and planning review.
OQ5	What lighting specification is appropriate?	Lighting affects safety, planning, amenity, vandalism risk and usability.	Add existing lighting design information to the plan and develop a controlled, low-level lighting approach if appropriate.
OQ6	What are the ground conditions and permeability?	This affects drainage, surfacing depth, construction cost and technical feasibility.	Undertake trial holes / permeability testing.
OQ7	What drainage / attenuation approach is required?	The site is flood-sensitive and additional surfacing may change water behaviour.	Confirm through site investigation and flood risk assessment.
OQ8	What should be included in the final planning submission package?	The package needs to cover planning, retrospective structures, lighting, drainage, access and ecology.	Compile once layout, FRA, lighting and supporting design information are ready.

6. Recommended Wording for Report / Audit Trail

The Project Group met with the appointed contractor to begin working through the Phase 2 detailed design considerations for the Compound and Pavilion Car Park. The meeting was exploratory and technical in nature and did not constitute a decision-making meeting. A number of options and draft layout ideas were discussed to test practical implications around parking capacity, access, surfacing, drainage, lighting, compound arrangements, accessibility, flood risk and biodiversity. Any sketch plans referred to during the meeting were used solely as working discussion aids and are not approved Council designs or planning submission documents. Matters affecting scope, cost or the proposed planning submission package will be reported back to Full Council for formal consideration before submission or implementation.

Where options were not progressed, this was generally because they were either outside the current approval position, insufficiently evidenced, dependent on further technical information, or not yet suitable for inclusion in the planning package. In particular, the group identified the need to avoid treating informal sketches as agreed designs, avoid progressing drainage or surfacing assumptions without site investigation, and avoid finalising accessibility, lighting or biodiversity details before they have been integrated into the full technical design.

7. Key Governance Points to Protect the Council Position

- The meeting was **not decision-making**; any changes to scope, cost or planning submission must return to Full Council.
- Sketches were **working discussion documents only**, not approved plans.
- The retrospective planning elements should be included to avoid leaving existing structures unresolved.
- Drainage, flood risk and ground conditions must be evidence-led, not assumption-led.
- Wildflower / biodiversity matters remain unresolved and should be informed by appropriate ecological / grounds maintenance input.
- Accessibility and priority / disabled parking should be resolved as part of the integrated design, not separately or informally.
- Lighting should be designed with safety, planning, amenity and potential misuse in mind.

The meeting tested options and identified technical matters for further work; it did not approve a final design.