

SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2015 AT ALAMEIN SUITE - CITY HALL, MALTHOUSE LANE, SALISBURY, SP2 7TU.

Present:

Cllr Fred Westmoreland (Chairman), Cllr Christopher Devine (Vice Chairman), Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Richard Clewer, Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr Jose Green, Cllr Mike Hewitt, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr Ian McLennan, Cllr Ian Tomes and Cllr Ian West

Also Present:

Cllr Bridget Wayman

67 **Apologies for Absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

68 **Minutes**

Resolved:

To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes of the meeting held on 21 May 2015.

69 **Declarations of Interest**

A declaration of interest was made in respect of item 7a 15/01047/OUT by Cllr Jeans as he had traded with the business, he would participate in debate and vote with an open mind.

70 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

71 **Public Participation and Councillors' Questions**

The Committee noted the rules on public participation.

72 **Planning Appeals**

The committee received updates on planning appeals as detailed in the agenda.

Resolved:

To note the update.

73 **Planning Applications**

73a **15/01047/OUT - Farmer Giles Farmstead, Teffont, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP3 5QY**

Richard Hawkins and Callie Troup spoke in objection to the application.

Angus Corrie-Deane, speaking on behalf of the applicant, and Andrew Bracey spoke in support of the application.

Cllr David Wood, Teffont Parish Council, supported the application on balance but expressed some concerns and commented that the Parish Council would have liked to receive a full planning application to consider.

The planning officer introduced the report which recommended to grant planning permission subject to conditions, attention was drawn to the late items. It was explained the application had been brought to Committee due to significant material considerations and differed to a previous application in that it was accompanied by a landscape impact report which demonstrated no detrimental impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); determination had been deferred to allow members to attend a site visit. Photographs, illustrative plans and curtilage of the proposed dwelling were shown and it was confirmed the area to be demolished would be 2175 square metres, with a dwelling of 600 square metres to be built in a different location on the site. The Planning Officer verified that buildings attached to those to be demolished would be retained and repaired as required. The Committee was reminded the application sought outline permission for access and scale only.

The Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions and it was confirmed this was a Brownfield site and included holiday homes.

Members of the public then addressed the Committee as detailed above.

The local member, Cllr Bridget Wayman, declared herself a member of the AONB panel and spoke in objection to the application, also highlighting that the application's demolition plan had not been published online. The local member felt the outline application did not address concerns identified by the

Committee in the original application. A key concern was that great weight was to be given to enhancing the landscape in an AONB, however the dwelling would be in an isolated and elevated position therefore causing an intrusion upon the landscape of the AONB. The Councillor commented the new dwelling would be much larger than suggested since plans included a basement, and argued the exceptional circumstances permitting development like this in the open countryside had not been met. Further points were that the business had already closed and so there would be no benefit to the AONB of reduced traffic visiting the site. Finally the use of the land for holiday homes, equine use or liveries had not been addressed.

The planning officer confirmed the location of buildings to be demolished.

In the debate that followed the Committee agreed it would have been desirable to have a full planning application to consider. Some members commented the development should not be permitted in an AONB since the scale of the building was excessively large and highly intrusive on the sensitive landscape due to its elevated position. If the new dwelling was to be located in place of current buildings, this would have been more acceptable. Members felt the limited circumstances that permitted development in the open countryside were not applicable in this case, it was noted in particular that the application did not comply with any 'rural life' exceptions in Core Policy 48 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Other members of the Committee argued the application could be a marginal improvement to the AONB by removing buildings, reducing pollution from traffic not visiting the business and that commercial development of the land by another company, instead of the proposed dwelling, would have more impact on the AONB. Some Councillors felt it would be unfortunate to demolish buildings that could be used to provide rural employment. The Chairman noted that the statement from the applicant indicated she would continue the use of holiday lets on site however this was not permitted under the original condition. The Committee concluded that reasons for refusal provided when the original application was determined had not been addressed and the status of holiday lets had not been resolved.

Resolved:

To refuse planning permission for the following reason:

1.The application site lies in open countryside and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Within the countryside there is effectively a presumption against new residential development except in limited circumstances not relevant in this case. This presumption is in the interests of sustainability and amenity. It follows that as a matter of principle the proposal comprises unacceptable development.

In terms of harm, the proposal would introduce a house and its curtilage with inevitable domestic paraphernalia, and these would be visually intrusive and alien in such an isolated rural location, distant from other residential properties or any settlement. By reason of their visibility and alien appearance, the house and its curtilage would detract from the wider appearance of the landscape, neither conserving nor enhancing its status as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There are no exceptional circumstances which outweigh the harm to the countryside.

The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Core Policies 1 and 2 (the settlement and delivery strategies) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, Core Policy 51 (Landscape) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework - paragraphs 109 and 115.

2.The application site supports three holiday lodges. These lodges were given planning permission subject to conditions requiring their removal in the event of Farmer Giles Farmstead Ltd ceasing to trade or operate from the land and/or ceasing to be open to the public.

The description of development set out on the application forms is "Demolition of some existing buildings and cessation of business and erection of a dwelling all matters reserved save for access, scale and siting". The supporting Design and Access Statement further states that "the 'tourist' use cabins [the lodges] would remain on site".

Having regard to the conditions on the earlier permissions relating to the lodges it is considered to be unclear from the current application how the lodges can remain. Notwithstanding the statement in the Design and Access Statement about their retention, the application (and the description of development in particular) makes no further allowance for the planning conditions. This lack of clarity amounts to a further reason to object to the development.

73b 15 03272/OUT- Land adjacent 1 Longhedge Cottages, Longhedge, Salisbury. SP4 6BP

Richard Greenwood spoke in support of the application.

The planning officer introduced the report which recommended to delegate authority to Director of Development Services to approve planning permission subject to a s106 legal agreement and conditions. Attention was drawn to the late items and photographs and plans for the site and existing access arrangement were shown. It was explained the development was to be on a narrow site next to, but not part of , the Longhedge development. Details of the neighbouring development were provided alongside the retention of landscaping to screen dwellings. The Officer advised that since

the application was last considered by Committee the site had now been identified as a potential site for future development in the Council 'potential site options' document. The Wiltshire Core Strategy had also been adopted and so policy details were updated.

The Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical and it was verified that the land was a potential development site. The Planning Officer explained that a footpath on the plan aimed to link to the Longhedge development could not stretch the entire length as the land between was owned by a third party. As part of the Longhedge development, landscaping would partly screen the houses from the road but houses would still be in close proximity to the road.

The local member, Cllr Ian McLennan, spoke in objection to the application and moved that it be refused for the same reasons given by Committee at determination of the original application: namely that uncertainty remained about the layout of the Longhedge development and the permission constituted development in the open countryside. The councillor suggested the site should go through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process. Other key concerns were that the site could suffer from overdevelopment and that the residential amenity of occupants of the dwellings could be reduced by neighbouring commercial development, moreover permission on this site could restrict the development of commercial units in a major strategic site. Other members commented that commercial units were already located near dwellings as part of the Longhedge development and so did not consider this application to be a concern.

Further observations included that the proposed condition 6 could address highways safety but that permission could not be conditioned on the final agreement of the Longhedge development. Additional points were that shrubbery should be used for screening where possible and the proposed pathway was not useful until linked to the other development. Some councillors argued the development could tie in well with the Longhedge site and was low-density however the Committee agreed the application was premature.

Resolved:

To REFUSE planning permission for the following reason:

The proposed dwellings would be located on a site which is currently located in the open countryside, and is not specifically allocated for housing development in the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy. The adjacent A345 road onto to which the dwellings would have a vehicular access is a very busy arterial road between Salisbury and Amesbury, where traffic speeds are very high.

A large area of land immediately adjacent the site has been allocated for a significant mixed development within the development plan, and planning permission has been granted. A new highway arrangement has been proposed as part of the adjacent development, which will help improve highway safety and reduce traffic speeds.

However, this adjacent permission is in outline form and development has yet to commence. Consequently, at the current time, the surrounding land remains of a rural character, and it may be some time before the land is actually developed, including the provision of a roundabout. As a result, there is no certainty that the final development will resemble the layout currently envisaged or that the future developments would not conflict.

Consequently, due to the lack of certainty that the development of the area would occur as currently envisaged, it is considered that the scheme would be likely to result in housing development within the open countryside also result in additional traffic generation onto a busy arterial road to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to policies CP1, CP2, CP45, CP48, CP51 & CP57 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy.

74 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items

(Duration of meeting: 6.00 - 8.30 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Libby Beale, of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 718214, e-mail elizabeth.beale@wiltshire.gov.uk

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