

## SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

---

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON 22 MAY 2014 AT ALAMEIN SUITE - CITY HALL, MALTHOUSE LANE,  
SALISBURY, SP2 7TU.**

**Present:**

Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Richard Clewer, Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr Tony Deane (Substitute), Cllr Christopher Devine (Vice-Chair), Cllr George Jeans, Cllr John Smale (Substitute), Cllr Ian Tomes, Cllr John Walsh (Substitute), Cllr Fred Westmoreland (Chairman) and Cllr Ian West

**Also Present:**

Cllr Mary Douglas, Cllr Leo Randall and Cllr Bridget Wayman

---

**56 Membership Change**

The Committee noted that Cllr Russell Hawker had been removed from the list of substitutes and Cllr Ricky Rogers had been added as agreed at Annual Council on 11 May 2014.

**57 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jose Green, Ian McLennan and Mike Hewitt.

Councillor John Smale substituted for Councillor Jose Green.

Councillor Tony Deane substituted for Councillor Mike Hewitt.

Councillor John Walsh substituted for Councillor Ian McLennan.

**58 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 May 2014 were presented.

**Resolved:**

**To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes with one amendment; Cllr Brian Dalton's declaration of interest was edited to more accurately reflect his declaration on 1 May 2014 and now reads:**

'Cllr Brian Dalton declared a non-pecuniary interest in the Kings Arms, High Street, Downton, by virtue of being a member of CAMRA (Campaign for Real Ale). He stated that he would consider the application with an open mind and on its merits'.

**59 Declarations of Interest**

Cllr Christopher Devine declared a non-pecuniary interest in application 14/02238/FUL – Land at Paddock View, The Street, Teffont as a result of knowing the Chairman of Teffont Parish Council. However, this was only on a level of a casual acquaintance and he would therefore be able to consider the application on its merits and vote on the application.

During the course of debate on application 14/01021/FUL – South Wilts Grammar School, Stratford Road, Salisbury – as it was clarified that the proposed development would impact the school sooner than previously thought - Cllr Richard Clewer declared a non-pecuniary interest as his daughter would be sitting the '11-plus' examination this year and could potentially attend the school. Due to the nature of the application, the approval of the Committee would result in increased entries from next year. Cllr Clewer took no further part in the debate on application 14/01021/FUL and did not vote on the application.

**60 Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman explained the meeting procedure to the members of the public.

Item 8A was moved to the end of the running order to allow all those who wished to speak on the issue to attend.

**61 Public Participation and Councillors' Questions**

The committee noted the rules on public participation.

**62 Planning Appeals**

The committee received details of the appeal decisions as detailed in the agenda.

## 63 Planning Applications

### **A LATE LIST OF OBSERVATIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS WAS RECEIVED, AS ATTACHED TO THESE MINUTES/INCLUDED AS AN AGENDA SUPPLEMENT**

#### 2a **14/02238/FUL - Land at Paddock View, The Street, Teffont, Salisbury, SP3 5QP**

##### Public Participation

Mr Nicholson objected to the application.

Cllr David Wood (Teffont Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Richard Greenwood (agent) spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Officer presented his report to the Committee which recommended that permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Members raised concern at the visibility at the point of access.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views to the Committee, as detailed above. The village design statement was discussed and clarification sought by the Committee from the Chairman of the Parish Council on this issue.

An item of late correspondence was circulated at the meeting.

The Local Member, Cllr Bridget Wayman, spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Wayman stated that this was not an infill development and raised concern at the impact on the neighbouring bungalow. Cllr Wayman stated that the development would encroach into the open countryside. Concern was also raised at the access to the B839 with the aid of photographs within the additional correspondence. The development would also go beyond the well defined settlement edge into the sensitive landscape of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

##### **Resolved:**

**To REFUSE planning permission for the following reasons:**

- 1) The area in the vicinity of the site derives much of its character from the generous spacing between buildings, including large gardens, with open 'green' spaces and trees in between, and views of the**

rural landscape beyond. The site and wider settlement have been designated as a Housing Restraint Area in order to preserve this special character. The site, which partly comprises an open paddock with trees to its site boundary, forms the termination of a private residential road, which creates a strong sense of being the settlement edge and the beginning of open countryside beyond. The site is particularly prominent due to its position at the end, and highest point, of this road. Furthermore the road also comprises a public footpath, which continues northwards directly past the site, onto higher ground still, where prominent views of the site exist most notably from the adjoining field to the north.

By virtue of its scale, siting and layout, the proposed dwelling and its associated residential curtilage would harmfully erode the open and rural quality of the area, and would have the effect of visually encroaching into the surrounding countryside, to the detriment of the character of the area. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Local Plan policies G1(iii), G2(iv & v), D1, H19, C4 and C5 (as saved within the adopted South Wiltshire Core Strategy) and guidance contained within the Teffont Village Design Statement.

- 2) The site access has limited visibility to the north and the applicant has not satisfactorily demonstrated that the necessary improvements to visibility in this direction can be satisfactorily implemented and thereafter maintained. As such the proposed development would be contrary to Local Plan policy G2(i) as saved within the adopted South Wiltshire Core Strategy.
- 3) The development has not made adequate provision towards public open space, and would therefore be contrary to Local Plan policy R2 (as saved within the adopted South Wiltshire Core Strategy).

**INFORMATIVE:**

It should be noted that the reason given above relating to policy R2 could be overcome if all the relevant parties complete a Section 106 legal agreement.

2b **14/01573/FUL - Ridgeside, The Ridge Woodfalls, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP5 2LD**

Public Participation

Mr Andy Stuchbury spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Andy James spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Nigel Harris spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Robin Henderson (agent) spoke in support of the application.

Cllr Ian Youdan (Woodfalls Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application.

The planning officer presented his report to the Committee which recommended that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to a s106 legal agreement and subject to suitable conditions.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Clarification was sought in regards to waste collection and storage. Members also requested clarification of the size of the overall plot of the development which was stated to be 0.25 hectares.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views to the Committee, as detailed above.

An item of late correspondence was circulated at the meeting.

A debate followed that discussed the suitability of the site for two dwellings and also the impact on local residential amenities and the character of the area, as well as the reduction of scale from previous applications.

The Local Member, Cllr Leo Randall, raised concern at potential Highways issues and also the impact on the neighbouring garden.

**Resolved:**

**To delegate the application to the Area Development Manager and to Grant Permission, Subject to all Parties entering into a revised S.106 legal agreement which:**

- a) **Provides a financial contribution towards public open space.**

**Subject to conditions**

**RECOMMENDATION: THAT THE MATTER BE DELEGATED TO THE DIRECTOR OF DEVELOPMENT SERVICES TO GRANT PERMISSION, SUBJECT TO ALL PARTIES ENTERING INTO A REVISED S106 LEGAL AGREEMENT WHICH:**

**a) Provides a financial contribution towards public open space  
Then Planning Permission be GRANTED, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission**

**REASON:** To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

**2. No development shall commence on site until details and samples of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

**REASON:** In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

**3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending those Orders with or without modification), no development within Part 1, Classes A-E (extensions and outbuildings) shall take place on the dwellinghouse(s) hereby permitted or within their curtilage.**

**REASON:** In the interests of the amenity of the area and to enable the Local Planning Authority to consider individually whether planning permission should be granted for additions, extensions or enlargements.

**4. The dwellings shall be single storey only, with no windows or other rooflights inserted in the roof, and no habitable rooms created in the first floor roofspace.**

**REASON:** In order to protect residential amenity in terms of loss of privacy.

**5. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:**

**Proposed block plan – DRG No. ST452-23b 11/02/2014  
Vehicle manoeuvring – DRG No. ST452-24b 11/02/2014  
Proposed site layout – DRG No. ST452 -25 11/02/2014  
Proposed Elevations – DRG No. ST452-26 11/02/2014  
Proposed Elevations – DRG No. ST452-27 11/02/2014**

**Arboricultural plan – DRG No. 2864/2014 11/02/2014  
Abbas Ecology survey and recommendations Feb 2014 14/02/2014**

**REASON: For the avoidance of doubt**

**6.No dwellings shall be occupied until all car parking and associated turning and access arrangements shown on the approved plans has been be provided and made available for use.**

**REASON: In order that sufficient parking is available for occupiers of the dwellings and visitors**

**7. No construction deliveries, demolition, or other building activity shall take place on Sundays or public holidays or outside the hours of 07:30 to 18:00 on weekdays and 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturdays.**

**REASON: In order to reduce the impact of construction works on surrounding residential amenity**

**8. Before development commences, full details of the treatment and protection of the boundary with “Sunmount” (adjacent the proposed access driveway) during construction works and once the scheme is built out, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.**

**REASON: In order to reduce the impact of the development on adjacent residential amenity.**

**REASON: In order to reduce the impact of the development on adjacent residential amenity.**

**9. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), the garages hereby permitted shall not be converted to habitable accommodation.**

**REASON: To secure the retention of adequate parking provision, in the interests of highway safety.**

**10. Before development commences all works in relation to great crested newts, including but not limited to removing the existing pond, providing a new pond and providing 2 newt hibernacula, will be undertaken in strict accordance with Habitat Creation as Ecological Mitigation for Reptiles and Potential Great Crested Newt Population (Abbas Ecology, amended February 2014) and a professional ecologist**

will be present on site during these works and will supervise all aspects of these works. A report will be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate that the above report has been fully implemented and to confirm whether great crested newts were found.

**REASON: In the interest of Protected Species**

**INFORMATIVE**

Wessex water has indicated that its records show a public sewer crossing the site. It is recommended that the applicant/developer contacts Wessex Water Sewer protection team for advice.

2c **14/01021/FUL - South Wilts Grammar School, Stratford Road, Salisbury, SP1 3JJ**

Public Participation

Mr Davison spoke in objection to the application.

Dr Chris Nettle spoke in objection to the application.

Mrs Michele Chilcott spoke in support of the application.

Mr Simon Lock spoke in support of the application.

Mr Richard Greenwood (agent) spoke in support of the application.

The planning officer presented his report to the Committee which recommended that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Members requested clarification over the height of the proposed development and if there was to be any additional parking. The legal status of the existing building was also raised.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views to the Committee, as detailed above.

An item of late correspondence was circulated at the meeting.

The Local Member, Cllr Mary Douglas, agreed with the Planning Officer's recommendation to approve and called for timber cladding to be included in the planning conditions to mitigate the impact on neighbouring amenity.

A debate followed that that discussed the height and location of the building in regards to surrounding properties. The location of drainage in relation to the proposed development was also discussed.

Concern was raised about the height and style of the development. And the presence of the land being designated under the R5 policy was also raised



and it was stated that the purpose of the policy was to protect playing fields, which would be unaffected by the proposed development, and that it was not necessary to refer the matter to the secretary of state under the policy for this development.

The need to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties was discussed. The need for more school places in Salisbury was also discussed and the potential future development of another secondary school in the city. The distance between the proposed development and the neighbouring properties was discussed. The landscaping in the neighbouring garden was raised in regards to the shielding it provides in view of the proposed development.

Cllr Brian Dalton requested that his vote against approval be recorded in regards to developing on R5 policy land.

**Resolved:**

**To GRANT planning permission subject to the following conditions:**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

**REASON:**

To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), no window, dormer window or rooflight, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted in the rear elevation or roofslope(s) of the development hereby permitted.

**REASON:** In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: parking layout, site location plan, design and access statement, DRG No. design and access statement, 771-20-04, 771-20-02 received 29/1/14, 771-20-03A received on 27/3/14, 771-20-04A received on 4/4/14.

**REASON:** For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

**4.**Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved drawings or the restrictions imposed by condition 2 & 3 of this consent, before development commences in relation to the external appearance of the two storey building, full large scale details of the external appearance, materials, and finishes of the building (including and in particular the rear elevation) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

**REASON:** In order to ensure that the visual appearance of the approved building enhances the character of the area and adjacent amenity.

#### **INFORMATIVE**

With regards to condition 4 above, the application has been subject of concerns from two adjacent neighbours regards the impact of the proposed building, and particularly the visual impact of the rear wall of the building. Prior to final submission of details in pursuance of this condition, the Local Planning Authority respectfully request that the applicant discusses and reaches an amicable agreement (where practicably possible) with occupiers of adjacent properties situated to the immediate north-east of the site of the two storey building.

#### **64 Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items

(Duration of meeting: 6.00 - 8.15 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is David Parkes, of Democratic Services, direct line (01225) 718220, e-mail [david.parkes@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:david.parkes@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

## ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

22<sup>ND</sup> May 2014 Southern Area Committee

Agenda Item 8

**Plans List Item 8a 14/01021/ful – Alterations and extension of existing technology clock. New Two storey classroom block to replace single storey temporary classrooms, At South Wilts Grammar School, Stratford Road Salisbury**

Members are reminded that the following correspondence was received prior to the last Committee meeting and presented to members as additional correspondence:

### Third party representations

1 email commenting on the amended plans has been received. The main points raised are;

- *The size proposal does not use the same footprint, it is 50% larger*
- *The existing temporary building does have planning permission although a condition is attached that the temporary building should be removed and the land restored to its former condition because permission could be justified only on the basis of a special temporary need*
- *If permission is given for a two storey building, we would far prefer that it had opaque windows on the NE elevation such as have been successfully used for the music school. This would allow the building to be lower and would break up the 'mass effect' of the current design. Both these things would make a big difference to us. – Appendix 2*

1 email of support has been received. The main points raised are;

- *The principle being acceptable*
- *There is a pressing need for the proposal*
- *The design preserves and enhance the local area and protect neighbouring amenity*

Furthermore, it has been brought to officers attention by the applicant that the last paragraph in paragraph 9.4 of the officer report is incorrect as worded. Officers therefore wish to clarify that the application site is covered by the policy R5 designation, although the site itself is not considered to be playing fields. Furthermore, no additional areas of open space are to be created as part of this application.

**Plans List Item 8b 14/02238/ful – Demolition of garage and stables and erection of a 4 bed dwelling, associated works and hard and soft landscaping and improved access to The Street. Land at Paddock View, The Street, Teffont.**

Several photographs of the site and access have been submitted by Cllr Wayman, and these are attached as appendix 1.

Third party rep – Letter from adjacent neighbour attached as appendix 2

**Plans List Item 8c – 14/01573/ful Erect 2 3 bed bungalows and garages to the rear of the existing dwelling. Alterations to existing dwelling including demolition of existing attached garage. Ridgeside, The Ridge Woodfalls**

Third party rep – Letter from adjacent neighbour attached as appendix 3

Members should also note that a S106 Agreement has also be submitted.

9





2

Orchard Cottage  
The Street  
Teffont  
Salisbury  
SP3 5QP



Mr A Guest  
Area Development Manager  
Wiltshire Council Development Services South  
Bourne Hill  
Salisbury  
SP1 3UZ

20<sup>th</sup> May 2014

Dear Mr Guest

Re: Planning Application 14/02238/FUL – Paddock View Garages and Stables

I now reside in Orchard Cottage and my objections to the development of the site remain as those detailed in my letter of the 14<sup>th</sup> with the exception of bullet 9. In addition I would like to make the following points:

1. It would increase both the vehicular and pedestrian traffic up and down the access lane which is also a footpath and is not wide enough to allow walkers and cars to pass safely. This is referred to in the previous refusal of this application.
2. I echo the comments made in relation to the previous application's rejection under the heading of Character and Appearance of the area (first paragraph).
3. It is necessary for me to use the access lane for deliveries of oil and they need to be able to park at the furthest most point of just in front of the existing oil tank and where the proposed underground pipework is planned to be positioned. I need assurance that this will still be possible.
4. The access infrastructure is not sufficient to support another dwelling.
5. Principle of development in Local plan policy H19 subsections (i) through to (iv) and Local plan policy CN10 all apply in this case.
6. Unlike this application I have a building **within** the garden of my property, if this application is accepted should I also assume that the Planning Authority would look favourably on a residential development of this already residential land? I believe other neighbours may be in a similar position. I would not submit such an application for all the reasons that I have objected to this application, but the principle remains.
7. The site of this proposed development is within the Housing Restraint Area, the Conservation Area, and an AONB. What more protection does a site need to prevent a development for pure commercial gain that detracts from the character and amenity of the village and with the objection of the Parish and immediate neighbours?

For the reasons above I cannot see how the development would add to the overall quality of the area over its lifetime and ask that development of this site be refused.

Yours sincerely

Lisa Witcher

Magpies  
Morgan's Vale Road  
Redlynch  
Salisbury  
SP5 2HU  
17<sup>th</sup> May 2014

Dear Sir

Re: Application 14/101573/FUL – Ridge Side, The Ridge, Woodfalls. SP5 2LD

Unfortunately we shall be unable to attend the Planning Committee's meeting on Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup> May because of continuing serious health issues. Although we are unable to be present we should still like you to note our comments as we feel we will be very adversely affected by any building on this site.

As owners of Magpies, the property immediately behind Ridgeside, we are writing to object to this, the third application.

Although we appreciate the efforts made by the developers to attempt to address matters from previous unsuccessful applications for this site, many of the previous objections from both us and our neighbours are still unaddressed – some indeed are 'unaddressable'.

These concern: -

- Access, including road safety
- Overdevelopment
- Increased surface water runoff into Magpies, adjoining properties and down to Morgan's Vale Road. This is already considerable and would be much increased if the lawns of Ridgeside were replaced by buildings and hard landscaping.
- The style of the proposed development is out of keeping with the Parish Council's perception of this part of Woodfalls. Should this application be approved we should like to request permitted development rights be removed
- This latest proposal includes the provision of a large, dense hedge – presumably designed to shield the development from us – thereby cutting out the light, notably morning sunshine from our lounge window, rear patio and vegetable/fruit garden.
- Contrary to the application notes, we have living room, bedrooms, kitchen and bathroom windows all facing Ridgeside's boundary and so our privacy and light in these rooms would be severely affected by this development – lose the trees and we lose our privacy: provide a high hedge/fence and we lose the much valued light we have enjoyed over the years. Either way our property loses.
- Some existing trees, shown on the 'Existing Site and Location plan' as being on or near our boundary are not in good condition. The plan also shows the straight line boundary (in reality a chain link fence) on our side of the substantial hedge. It is not. This is, in fact, a substantial error.

Considering this is the third application for this site it is hard to see how any development in Ridgeside's garden can be viable. The sloping nature of the site, the proximity of proposed buildings to neighbouring properties and the very real road safety dangers caused by the very limited access road cannot be altered.

Yours sincerely,  
Wendy and Ken Balfour







