

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

22ND 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

20th 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 14th 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
17th 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 22nd 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





