Wiltshire Council Where everybody matters

AGENDA SUPPLEMENT (1)

Meeting:	Southern Area Planning Committee
Place:	Alamein Suite - City Hall, Malthouse Lane, Salisbury, SP2 7TU
Date:	Thursday 6 February 2014
Time:	<u>6.00 pm</u>

The Agenda for the above meeting was published on 29 January 2014. Below displays a late correspondence in relation to 13/02939/FUL – Change of Use from Police Divisional HQ to education (University Technical College).

Please direct any enquiries on this Agenda to David Parkes, of Democratic Services, County Hall, Bythesea Road, Trowbridge, direct line (01225) 718220 or email <u>david.parkes@wiltshire.gov.uk</u>

Press enquiries to Communications on direct lines (01225)713114/713115.

This Agenda and all the documents referred to within it are available on the Council's website at <u>www.wiltshire.gov.uk</u>

7 **Planning Applications** (Pages 1 - 6)

• One additional letter of objection received raising concerns regarding increased traffic and parking problems.

DATE OF PUBLICATION: 11 March 2014

SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 06th FEBRUARY 2014 SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

Agenda Item 7a

Plan List Item 1 13/02939/FUL – Change of Use from Police Divisional HQ to education (University Technical College). Demolition of custody suite, refurbishment and remodeling of retained buildings, new extensions and associated external works.

At Salisbury Divisional Police HQ, Wilton, Salisbury, Wiltshire. SP2 7HR

1 additional letter of objection received raising concerns regarding increased traffic and parking problems

Agenda Item 7b

Plan List Item 213/07359/FUL – Proposed detached home office / yoga roomAt 88 Ridge, Chilmark, Salisbury, Wiltshrie. SP3 5BS

Change of "Reason" for condition 3

(3) The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling, known as 88 Ridge and it shall remain within the same planning unit as the main dwelling.

REASON: To comply with the terms of the planning application and to enable the local planning authority to retain control over the use of the development having regard to its location within a sensitive landscape and close to other residential properties.

Letter from CIIr Bridget Wayman

Mr Chairman, my apologies for not being able to attend the Planning Committee meeting on 6th February, but I am at another meeting that has already been deferred because of another conflict in my diary. I am grateful to be allowed to send in my written objection.

As the Officer's report states, this is a resubmission of the previous application (13/03367/FUL) which was refused by the planning committee in November 2013.

At that November meeting I emphasized that the entire hamlet of Ridge lies within the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in paragraph 115 says that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.

The South Wiltshire Core Strategy also refers to the AONB in **protecting** and **enhancing** high quality environments, and **particular** attention will be placed on the **preservation** of the character and scenic quality of the environment. "Where proposals come forward emphasis will be placed on their scale, location, siting, design, materials and landscaping. Where possible proposals should aid the delivery of the AONB Management Plan."

Although the resubmission is smaller than that originally proposed, it is still in the same location and I consider, as before, the siting of the proposal to be detrimental to the protection of the AONB.

From my photographs that have been re-circulated, the siting of the yoga room is proposed on the south-western corner of the site, away from the building line of the existing row of cottages and in the corner that is standing over the field immediately below and around it. The applicant and the officer's report states that the building is shielded from the main building by the dense hedge behind it, but that will not shield it from being an intrusion into the AONB landscape, nor from the footpath that runs immediately below the southern boundary of the site.

You may recall the 2 appeals that were recently reported to you in respect of two applications at Sandhills House in Dinton. The first appeal was in respect of a single storey lean-to garage (of similar size to this application) where the Inspector considered that the building would be a relatively substantial and unattractive feature within the protected landscape. The Inspector cited paragraph 115 on the NPPF and stated that, "Regardless of whether or not the building could be seen from any public viewpoints, it would harm the character of the landscape". The appeal was dismissed (as was the appeal for a larger 2 storey holiday accommodation), on the grounds "that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the AONB contrary to policy C2, which strictly limits development in the countryside unless it would benefit the economy and maintain or enhance the environment; Policy C5 which only permits small scale development where the siting and scale of development would be sympathetic within the landscape of the AONB; and contrary to policy in the NPPF".

This application will similarly harm the character of the landscape.

I also have concerns about the fact that the entrance to the proposed building on this site is on the south facing elevation overlooking the boundary fence and the footpath immediately below in the adjacent field, and that the entrance is a large glass window. This will have a considerable detrimental impact and harm on the character of the landscape, not just during the day, but also at night, as tranquility is a key attribute of the AONB and is measured against 44 'seeing' and 'hearing' factors, including seeing and hearing people, hearing silence, seeing signs of human impact, seeing the stars at night, all of which will be disturbed by the use of this proposed building close to the public footpath. All these factors will be affected by the proposed development.

I request that you dismiss this application on the grounds that it is contrary to policy in the NPPF, the South Wiltshire Core Strategy policies, and the retained policies C2 and C5 in respect of the AONB.

Should you be minded to approve the application, may I request that conditions are imposed that the outbuilding is not to be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the main residential use of the main dwelling and it shall remain within the same planning unit as the main dwelling.

I would also request that a condition is imposed to prevent any installation of water, toilet or shower facility in order to prevent the yoga room from future conversion to separate bedroom/living accommodation.

Thank you, Cllr Bridget Wayman.









Five late representations as follows -

Objection from Mr Robert Molteno of 89 Ridge:

My wife and I own No. 89 Ridge, which is the adjacent property to No. 88 where the proposed building is to be erected.

We, along with other neighbours and the Chilmark Parish Council, objected to the previous application in 2013 for a home office and yoga room on various grounds. The Planning Application was turned down by the Council.

The new application is for a somewhat smaller building. But it is still 7 metres long and 5 metres deep – ie 35 square metres (or 127 square feet) in all. To give a sense of relative proportion, this is a larger footprint than our house located in the middle of the 3 terrace houses (see Proposed Block Plan).

The new building will be visible from the public footpath that runs along and close to the two sides of the property where it is proposed to locate it. If any light is to come through its windows, existing hedges will have to be severely reduced – which will make the building even more visible from across the meadow.

No. 88 is bounded by a large meadow on two sides. The area is located in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

The proposed building is for not for commercial purposes. It will not improve the environment. And its proposed location is not even aligned with the existing row of 3 terraced houses.

We believe that its positioning, size and visibility will be contrary to the policies of the South Wiltshire Local Area Plan, and we object accordingly.

Observation from Mrs Krystyna Kirkpatrick of Knap Farm

I would like to draw attention to the incorrect answer to question 10 in the application form. Contrary to the "no" anwer given to that question, the proposed site will be clearly visible from Knap Lane and also from the public footpath which runs through the adjoining field and very close to the site.

Objection from Dr Linda B Jones of 87 Ridge

I do not consider this planning proposal to be in keeping with an AONB landscape. While it is good to see that this new proposal re-presents a smaller building than the previous application, it will still be prominent, and visible from both the public footpath and neighbouring cottages. As a result, it is my view that this will have a negative effect on the quality of this beautiful rural area.

Objection from Elizabeth Jack of Pheasant Cottage, Ridge

With reference to the above application I would like to make the following points.

This quite large building is contrary to the Policy C2 of the South Wiltshire Local Area Adopted Plan as well as being in a position where it would be very visible from Knap Lane and the houses on that lane, and the Public Footpath below the property. This is also an ANOB.

It has also been stated that no trees or hedging needs to be removed for the construction of the building. This is indeed true. However, if any light is to enter the building through the large glass doors at the front of the building and the side next to the field, mature hedges will have to be cut, as at present they surround that corner of the property.

Objection from Rosemary MacDonald of 86 Ridge

Rosemary Macdonald 86 Ridge, Chilmark, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP3 5B5 24 JAN 2014 LF Janwy 24* 2014. Dew Mr. Guent. Planning Application No. 13/07359/FUL heatmore: 88 Ridge, Chilmanh. Parposed: Detacted Yogaroom/office.

I live at no. 86. Ridge end Look across a field to the Property n question.

I appreciate that this, second, copplication proposes a smaller building, however it is still to be be 7m.x 5m (write a book of 3.23m.) - my and house is any Sm. with. In its proposed position it will appear as a significant new build and will be visible from the foolpatt and the sumondary properties. The applications state that no bedges will be call, thowever, as 8 and of 4 "windows" look out tabo an established hedge it reams likely that there will be some bedge loss to provide sufficial light and 'view'. Oh there grows I feel I must still object to the application. Yow sneedy.