

**REPORT OUTLINE FOR AREA PLANNING COMMITTEES****Report No.**

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	3 <sup>rd</sup> February 2022
<b>Application Number</b>	20/00337/FUL
<b>Site Address</b>	Land to the east of Odstock Road and to the south of Rowbarrow, Salisbury, Wiltshire.
<b>Proposal</b>	Erect 95 dwellings together with garages, car barns, and refuse/cycle stores. Lay out gardens and erect means of enclosure. Creation of new vehicular access to Odstock Road. Lay out internal roads, including drives and pavements. Provision of associated public open space, play areas and landscape planting.
<b>Applicant</b>	Savills
<b>Town/Parish Council</b>	Salisbury City Council
<b>Electoral Division</b>	Harnham East
<b>Grid Ref</b>	
<b>Type of application</b>	Full Planning
<b>Case Officer</b>	Richard Hughes

**Reason for the application being considered by Committee**

The application has been called-in by Cllr Hocking if officers are minded to approve due to the lack of community facilities, highway and visual impacts, relationship with adjacent area.

**1. Purpose of Report**

The purpose of the report is to assess the merits of the proposal against the policies of the development plan and other material considerations and to consider the recommendation that the application be approved for the reason(s) set out below.

**2. Report Summary**

The issues in this case are:

- Principle of development, policy and planning history;
- Design, scale and impact to the amenity of the area/Landscape Impacts
- Heritage impacts/archaeology
- Parking/Highways Impact;
- Ecological Impact/River Avon Catchment Area
- Drainage
- S106 matters

**3. Site Description**

The site is an agricultural field located on the southern outskirts of the city of Salisbury. The site is elevated, and the site itself slopes up from north to south. Along the southern boundary is a belt of mature trees, and a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Woodbury). To the immediate north of the site is the community of Rowbarrow, and beyond that, Harnham. To the west runs the Odstock Road, and off to the south adjacent fields is Salisbury District Hospital. To the north of the Rowbarrow developments is the Downton Road. To the east is a field system and the Park and Ride site and a storage business (an old dairy site), with the small settlement and Britford and its primary school beyond. The Salisbury City is some distance to the north. The Rowbarrow housing to the north of the site contains a convenience store and car park, and therefore is a petrol station and store close by. The surrounding roads are on main bus routes.

#### **4. Planning History**

The site itself has no planning history, being an agricultural field. However, the land to the north has been developed over many years into the Rowbarrow community, and subject of the following recent applications:

Adopted Rowbarrow/Downton Road Development Brief 2005

S/2005/0980 – Outline consent at Rowbarrow Phase 2

S/2008/2077 – Reserved matters

S/2009/0970 – Phase 2a

S/2011/205 - Phase 3

#### **5. The Proposal**

The proposal as originally submitted indicated 108 dwellings. Following archaeological related issues, and consideration of the various consultee responses and third party concerns, the scheme as amended related to the creation of 101 dwellings, and a further revision has reduced the scheme to 95 dwellings. A new vehicular access would be created off the Odstock Road. The remainder of the site would be provided as public open space, and landscaping.

#### **6. Local Planning Policy**

National Planning Policy Framework 2021  
National Design Guide

Policy H3.4 - Adopted Wiltshire Housing Site Allocation Plan 2020

Wiltshire Core Strategy

Core Policy 1 Settlement Strategy

Core Policy 2 Delivery Strategy  
Core Policy 3 Infrastructure requirements  
Core Policy 20 Salisbury spatial strategy  
Core policy 41 & 42 Sustainable design and renewable energy  
Core Policy 43 Affordable Housing  
Core Policy 50 & 52 Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure  
Core Policy 51 Landscaping  
Core Policy 55 Air Quality  
Core Policy 57 Ensuring high quality design and place shaping  
Core Policy 58 Heritage assets  
Core Policy 61 Transport and New Development  
Core Policy 67 - 69 Water resources/flooding/Protection of the River Avon SAC

Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2015-2026: Car Parking Strategy

Creating Places SPD

AONB Management Plan

Saved Salisbury District Local Plan

Policy C6 Special Landscape Area

Policy R2 Open spaces

Policy D8 Public Art

## **7. Summary of consultation responses**

WC Highways – No objection subject to S106 contributions and conditions

WC Rights of Way – No objection to adjusted plans subject to improvement works to BRIT8 right of way

WC Public protection – WC Public protection have indicated that it has no objections to the proposals subject to a number of conditions.

WC Archaeology – No objections to amended plans

WC Housing – Affordable housing welcomed, S106 required to secure.

WC Open Space and Public Art – No objections subject a S106 to secure play space and play area and public art contribution towards a scheme required via S106

WC Drainage – No objections other than concern over soakaways in the highway

WC Tree Officer – No Objection to the amended plan subject to tree protection measures during construction due to proximity of housing to belt of trees

WC Ecology – No objections subject to various conditions and S106 contribution

WC Landscape – No objections in general but a number of issues need to be clarified. Amended plan awaited.

WC Urban Design – Maintains concerns regards the layout being too road and parking dominated, resulting in poor street scene and amenity for some dwellings in part of the layout, and suggested that additional dwellings perhaps need to be removed near the tree belt.

Historic England – No objections, subject to the scheduled monument and archaeological features being protected and enhanced during works.

Wessex Water – No objections. General comments regards foul water and drainage.  
Natural England – no objections. Scheme will need HRA screening

## **8.Publicity**

The original application scheme for 108 dwellings resulted in 56 third party responses, and the revised publicity for the revised scheme of 101 dwellings resulted in a further 11 third party comments. The further adjustment to 95 dwellings resulted in a further 7 comments.

The various comments relating to the following matters:

- Development would remove an area of much used open land
- Keep footpaths and protect the trees
- Development would have too many highway impacts
- Too many homes together with the Netherhampton Development
- Harnham Gyratory and other junction will be overwhelmed
- Traffic will affect hospital route
- Where will all these people work/affect existing infrastructure
- Amenity of adjacent dwellings would be adversely affected
- Noise and dust from construction will affect existing residents
- Landscape character will be affected as will the ecology balance
- Archaeology will be affected
- Need a more spacious layout
- Provide much needed affordable and private housing
- Bring investment into the city
- Provide housing for nurses

Salisbury City Council - objects to this application for the following reasons:

*Not being compliant with SCC's climate change objectives and asks for the following planning conditions to be considered:*

- 1. Full Fibre Broadband to be installed in all houses.*
- 2. All houses with driveways to have Electric Vehicle charging points installed.*
- 3. All houses to have solar panels installed*
- 4. All houses to be air/heat pumps retro fitable.*
- 5. S106 monies to include amount for schooling.*
- 6. Space for Community facilities.*

*SCC also objects to this application for the following reasons:*

- 7. Bland design, lack of character.*
- 8. Drainage concerns.*
- 9. Ecological impact.*
- 10. Lack of and the need to create more space for community facilities.*
- 11. A gap along the treeline is required to protect the orchids.*
- 12. Failing to adequately protect the connecting the green spaces*
- 13. Protect the views on higher ground*
- 14. Objects to the planting scheme and asks for the expert comments on appropriate*

*planting to be taken into consideration.*

*15. Lack of housing for Swifts, Bats and Hedgehogs*

*16. Adverse additional traffic impact on Harnham with no strategy to address this issue. This includes having the entrance into the development from Rowbarrow Road as opposed to Odstock Road which will better benefit pedestrians, cyclists and emergency response vehicles travelling along Odstock Road.*

*17. Furthermore, SCC fully supports Salisbury Area Greenspace Partnership's comments which are noted on WC's website and asks that Wiltshire Council Ecologists comments are fully adhered too in full.*

*18. Site entrance onto Rowbarrow would be preferable.*

Salisbury Area Greenspace Partnership –

*Apart from a strong objection to development south of the spine road, the location of a NEAP close to the Beech tree belt and the urbanisation of Odstock Road due to the proposed revised layout, SAGP is (largely) reinforcing points that have already been made in earlier comments but have not been addressed in either the revised landscape plans or the revised transport plan. Please note that SAGP's previous comments remain relevant and are included in this document.*

*Whilst it is acknowledged that the developer has unexpectedly had to take into account the archaeology on this site, SAGP consider that this is not sufficient reason to justify the loss of valuable landscape setting and character, and local amenity green infrastructure, or the adverse impact on local ecology, on local cultural and heritage features and in particular on the TPO Beech tree belt. Furthermore, introducing a teenage play facility (or NEAP) close to protected trees which are already under pressure is not considered appropriate.*

*SAGP would like to see a much more generous greenspace buffer to help protect the Beech trees and their associated orchid population, and to provide a setting for this important asset, and that public access to and enjoyment of the views from the high ground is maintained.*

*SAGP is also concerned that the harsh urban edge proposed along the western boundary of the site will cause the loss of the rural character of this area and approach to the city.*

*SAGP maintains its strong objection to the proposal to site 15 dwellings on the south side of the spine road as shown on the revised plans. The design and layout of the scheme is not considered to be sufficiently sensitive for this particular site as required by the inspector but is overdevelopment which will lead to unacceptable harm.*

*To expand further:*

- i) Loss of landscape setting, local GI and increasingly rare chalk downland habitat and ecology*

*The current NPPF, July 2021 and the Government's Model Design Guide lay great emphasis on the need for the design & layout of new development to respect the qualities which make each place special. In addition, Wiltshire Council's draft Green and Blue Infrastructure (GBI) and Climate Change Strategies highlight the importance of GBI including trees and species rich grassland for mitigating the impact of climate change, the significant loss of biodiversity and for benefits to public health and wellbeing.*

*At Rowbarrow the existing species rich downland which supports skylark and a wide range of typical chalk downland plants, the TPO protected belt of Beech trees at the top of the hill and the rare White Helleborine which associates with*

*Beech, as well as the views to and from the site are all important parts of Salisbury's unique landscape setting, ecology and green infrastructure network and need to be safeguarded with a generous buffer zone.*

*ii) Impact on cultural and heritage features*

*The trees are a cultural feature, planted to mark the Queen's coronation in 1953. Part of the tree belt at its south-eastern end is located within the extensive designated area of Little Woodbury Scheduled Monument. The setting of the Little Woodbury Scheduled Monument is also a material consideration. For information, part of Salisbury Conservation Area as well as Britford Conservation Area is missing from the Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal prepared by Savills Landscape.*

*iii) Impact on protected trees*

*The Beech trees are already under pressure and there are signs of misuse. The revised plans now indicate the location of a NEAP rather than a LEAP close to the protected tree belt. A NEAP is a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play with equipment shelter for meeting and socialising to serve young teenagers from a wider area. A LEAP is play provision for young children. The presence of a NEAP is likely to exacerbate the problems with regard to the trees and should be relocated away from them towards the northeast corner of the site in line with the comments of the County Ecologist.*

*Furthermore, a hedgerow shown on the revised landscape plan alongside the mown grass path at the edge of the tree canopy at the western end of the tree belt close to the proposed housing could exacerbate the problem by reducing general surveillance and increasing the possibility of antisocial behaviour in this part of the tree belt itself.*

*iv) Loss of rural character*

*The revised plans not only indicate development to the south of the spine road but development which presents a much more urban frontage to Odstock Road on the north side of the spine road. The proposed revised layout shows dwellings sited much closer to the road which significantly reduces the opportunity for native screen planting along this boundary. Only 4 street trees are shown on the revised landscape masterplan with no underplanting along this part of the site frontage. This is at odds with the comments by Wiltshire Council's landscape architect in relation to the previous plan. The landscape architect does not appear to have commented on the current revised plan.*

*Odstock Road is currently largely rural in character and should remain so particularly as the location of Little Woodbury Scheduled Monument means that the Rowbarrow site will form the limit of urban development in this area.*

*v) SAGP agree with the inspector and Wiltshire Council landscape architect that 'a strong landscape framework' is needed. The inspector states that such a framework should enhance the existing woodland belts and provide a 'a green corridor extending along the southern boundary of the site' where trees can be planted as 'copses, groups of trees and individual specimen trees'. However, the revised landscape plan indicates more of a scatter of trees in the central area & towards the eastern end of the site and the proposed development up the hill towards the Beech tree belt on the south side of the spine road leaves very little space for tree planting. Furthermore, there is now limited space for tree planting along Odstock Road north of the spine road.*

*As mentioned in iv) above, the native landscape buffer along Odstock Road frontage required by Wiltshire Council landscape architect (in comments are dated 2 March 2020) to provide connectivity for wildlife and 'break up the harsh urban edge as illustrated in the planning layout (Bellway P1597.01 and the*

*proposed site access drawing (043.0017.001A)', has disappeared. Furthermore, the revised landscape plan does not show any enhancement tree planting within the buffer strip of land between the existing housing and the proposed development as required by the inspector. This land is currently managed by Wiltshire Council.*

*vi) Inappropriate approach to planting plans and species selection*

*The landscape master plan needs to reflect the fact that the existing site is species rich chalk grassland habitat which needs careful protection during construction rather than being disturbed and reseeded. It is helpful that the County Ecologist and County Landscape Architect take the same view and the need for a landscape clerk of works has been specified.*

*As mentioned in previous comments, SAGP question the use of non-native hedging such as Griselinia and consider a mix of chalk tolerant native species would be far more beneficial for wildlife on this rural fringe of the city; also tree species such as Oak on this dry chalk hilltop site is considered inappropriate site as well as the use of a seed mix for damp conditions in the ditches where for most of the year conditions are dry.*

*There appears to be no evidence of confirmation that the developers will be undertaking ecological enhancements suggested by their Ecology Consultant in relation to bats, birds, bees and other insects or small mammals such as hedgehogs. These enhancements should be made conditional requirements of any planning consent. Swifts have very recently been added to the Red Data list of endangered species and it is important to specify the use of integral swift bricks to support the declining local population of these birds.*

*vii) SuDS*

*SAGP question the location of the large SuDS infiltration crate area close to the Beech belt and which area this is draining as it is located at almost the highest point on the site.*

*viii) Cycling and walking infrastructure improvements*

*These were required by the inspector but do not appear to have been addressed in the revised Transport Plan. All footpath links are only shown to the boundary of the site but should be required to link with existing walking and cycling infrastructure in the adjacent housing development. Improvements should also be required to the existing PRow BRIT8 route to the A338 Bournemouth Road as it is an important link to Longford Primary School, to the bus routes on the A338 and the nearby Park and Ride facility.*

*Finally, it is concerning that there appears to be no comments from either Wiltshire Council's Landscape Architect or Urban Designer about the revised layout and landscape plans.*

*Salisbury Civic Society – In February 2020, and again in July 2021, the Civic Society put in comments on planning application No 20/00337, which now seeks permission for 95 dwellings east of the Odstock Road in Salisbury, south of Rowbarrow. The aim of the comments was to express the Society's support for the very thorough and well-considered points put in by the Salisbury Area Greenspace Partnership on the proposals.*

*The Society would now like to support, to an equal extent, the further comments sent on*



December 8th 2021 by the SAGP, resulting from its thorough analysis of the amendments to the scheme recently submitted by the applicants, and reiterating earlier points which remain valid.

*In particular, as it stated in its last letter, the Society strongly supports the SAGP's objection to the proposal to now build houses right up to part of the very fine belt of trees, on the SW boundary of the site. If further archaeological investigation has shown that it would not be appropriate to build on the SE end of the site, the answer is quite clearly not to shift development to alongside the trees, which are a very important landscape feature. It now seems clear that the site cannot in fact take the number of houses proposed for it, and the scheme needs to be amended accordingly.*

*The cogent and painstaking analysis of the proposals carried out by the SAGP's landscape architects is a valuable resource, which the Council should be making full use of, particularly given that there appears to be no evidence of any input by the Council's own architect or landscape architect, since their comments when the proposals were first submitted early in 2020. The Society hopes that full regard will be paid to the SAGP analysis, before the application is determined.*

Salisbury and Wilton Swifts - (Summary) - we would like to see swift bricks numbers quoted (ratio of 1 per dwelling as per RIBA guidelines) and also marked on the Master Site Plans in order to avoid confusion and omission during the building process. Bellway has installed bricks into other sites eg Harnham Park and has kindly indicated they are willing to do so in this development.

Cycling Opportunities Group for Salisbury COG - Object unless the Travel Plan issues are resolved and secured as part of the application.

Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Society - objection to this proposal as it stands due to the loss and destruction of part of a scheduled monument.

## **9.Planning Considerations**

### **9.1 Principle of development, policy and planning history**

Core Policy 2 of the WCS states there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development at the Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages. This application site is now allocated for housing development as part of the recently adopted Wiltshire Sites Allocation DPD. Policy H3.4 indicates that:

**Land at Rowbarrow, as identified on the Policies Map, is allocated for development comprising the following elements:**


- **approximately 100 dwellings;**
- **vehicular access from the Odstock Road to the west; and**
- **improvements to cycling and walking routes through the site to link into the existing network.**

**Development will be subject to the following requirements:**



- **sensitive design and layout, which ensures the significance of heritage assets and their settings are not subject to unacceptable harm. This shall be informed by appropriate heritage and archaeological assessments;**
- **a strong landscape framework that maintains and enhances the existing woodland belts, including open space provision in the southern part of the site and a green corridor extending along the southern boundary of the site from the existing beech tree shelter belt;**
- **a Flood Risk Assessment (incorporating an assessment of the predicted effects of climate change) and comprehensive drainage strategy to inform site layout and design of the site so that surface water is controlled and does not exacerbate flooding off site; and**
- **provision made for transport network improvements necessary to accommodate the scale of development envisaged, as identified through a comprehensive transport assessment.**

**Development will take place in accordance with a masterplan approved by the Council as part of the planning application process. The design and layout will take account of all policy requirements, including the timely and coordinated provision of necessary infrastructure to achieve a comprehensive development of the site.**



The supporting text of the policy indicates that:

*Land at Rowbarrow is allocated for the development of approximately 100 dwellings on 5.56ha of land as shown on the Policies Map. The development of the site would provide housing in a location with a reasonable level of access to the local services and facilities in Salisbury city centre but not within walking distance. There is however, a frequent bus service within 100m of the site and the Park & Ride is in close*

proximity.

*Development will need to preserve the contribution made by the site to the setting and therefore to the importance of the Woodbury Ancient Villages Scheduled Monument. If necessary land will need to be set aside from development. In line with national policy, detailed design and layout will be guided by an assessment of heritage assets and their significance (including the contribution made by their setting). Scheduled monument consent will be required. The site also has high archaeological potential.*

*This is a sloping and quite prominent site. In combination with a Heritage Impact Assessment, development will need to take place within a strong landscape framework that maintains and enhances the existing woodland belts affecting the site. Containment provided by the beech shelterbelt on the southern boundary should extend as a green corridor from the end of the shelterbelt eastwards towards the existing Rowbarrow housing development and woodland around the Milk & More Salisbury Depot. This green corridor should include copses, groups of trees and individual specimen trees. The arrangement of any proposed development and open space on the site should provide a setting for rights of way in the area and maintain their views of the Salisbury Cathedral spire and this could be achieved through careful street alignment and locating open space in the southern part of the site. The sloping buffer of land on the northern edge of the site should be enhanced with tree planting and the landscape buffer along Rowbarrow (road) retained.*

*In order to facilitate development, appropriate contributions would be likely to be sought to help fund additional local school capacity. A new primary school on land south of Netherhampton Road would contribute to the new school places needed to serve the area. Funding contributions may also contribute to improving the existing primary schools at Harnham. Appropriate contributions may also be sought where needed to increase capacity at local GP surgeries in the city, in accordance with Core Policies of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.*

The following sections of the report assess the application against the above policy and the various material considerations. Members should however be mindful that as the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, the provisions of the NPPF (paragraph 11) is relevant. This states that applications for sustainable housing that accord with the development plan should be approved, unless there is significant harm to “assets of particular importance”, such as heritage assets or AONB landscape.

The Council recently lost an appeal in Calne on the basis of the sole issue of the housing land supply. Unlike the Rowbarrow site, the site subject of the appeal was not an allocated housing site. The housing was allowed on the basis of their being no significant harm which outweighed the provision of housing. The key paras from the Inspectors report for the land supply state that (abridged):

- 70. The Council's housing land supply position is dated, and the most recent position is now 2.5 years old. Therefore, it is unclear what the housing land supply position is now, except, that at a minimum, there is a significant shortfall of 928 homes. The Council is in the process of preparing the eLP. However, despite the information on the Council's website.., I heard evidence.. that the timetable for adoption has slipped, with a pause on consultation of between 3-15 months. This means that it may not be adopted until 2024.*
- 71. Therefore, notwithstanding existing site allocation plans, there appears to be no other practical plan led solution to remedy the shortfall, such that the housing land supply*

*shortage is now patently persistent.. and is expected to continue for at least 2 years. There is also a shortage of affordable housing, with a recent undisputed Decision.. detailing substantial shortfalls.*

As a result of such decisions, unless the Council can demonstrate that there are significant harms resulting from the proposal which outweigh the requirement for housing, a refusal of permission for significant housing development may be difficult to defend at appeal.

## 9.2 Heritage Impacts/Archaeology

Policy CP58 of the WCS deals with heritage impacts, and the NPPF indicates that proposals which cause significant harm to heritage assets should be refused (para 201, 202), and introduces the concept of “substantial” or “less than substantial” harm. Those developments which may cause “substantial” or “less than substantial” harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.


Policy H3.4 indicates that

- **sensitive design and layout, which ensures the significance of heritage assets and their settings are not subject to unacceptable harm. This shall be informed by appropriate heritage and archaeological assessments**

As referred to by policy H3.4 above, the site is located adjacent to archaeology of significant interest, and particularly the Woodbury Scheduled Ancient Monument. As originally proposed as part of the site allocation process and then as part of this application, the layout of the site was purposely designed so that housing was located in the northern half of the site, with open space to the south. This was intended to avoid the sensitive archaeology and the Scheduled Monument, and also achieve the full landscaping aims of Policy H3.4 (see original plan for 108 dwellings elsewhere in this report).

Unfortunately, following input from Historic England and WC Archaeology, it was discovered that the extent of the archaeological features in the area was greater than had been thought, including impact upon the sub-surface remains of the Iron Age holloway that runs directly into Woodbury Hillfort (A Scheduled Monument), but would also impact upon a large number of the graves of a Saxon Cemetery. As a result, a number of the proposed dwellings on the site in the south eastern corner were found to be infringing on the archaeological features.

The applicant has therefore repositioned some of the housing on the south western part of the site, adjacent the tree belt. The plan below shows an earlier amended scheme and the area of important archaeology:



Area of archaeology on site

Further to concerns regards this matter and the positioning of the housing adjacent the tree belt, a further adjustment to the scheme has reduced the scheme to 95 dwellings.

With regards the 95 house scheme, Historic England as commented thus (summary):

*Historic England has no objection to the application on heritage grounds. We consider that the application meets the requirements of the NPPF, in particular paragraph numbers 190 and 199.*

*However we consider that the proposed enhancement and interpretation proposed and outlined in our advice needs to be addressed in order for the application to meet the requirements of paragraph 202 (PPG Paragraph 020) of the NPPF. This can be addressed by Historic England being consulted on a suitable landscaping condition, on any permission granted. We can then agree a suitable landscaping design to ensure the trackway is interpreted in a way that enhances the designated heritage asset through the interpretation of the trackway.*

*We will also need to be consulted on any management plan for the open space to ensure that there are appropriate management policies and procedures in place for the scheduled area. This is so the Management Company is fully aware of the restrictions in this area and do not undertake works which could lead to prosecution.*

The Council Archaeologist has now confirmed that the reduced scheme of 95 dwellings is acceptable, subject to a suitable conditions as extract below:

*“The principal archaeological features identified within the red line boundary of the site are as follows:*

- 1. A pair of parallel ditches extending north-west from the nationally important Scheduled Monument of Woodbury Ancient Villages (Monument No. 1005652). The ditches appear to form a trackway leading from and to the Woodbury Ancient Villages. Part of the Scheduled Monument lies within the red line boundary but where no development or landscaping is proposed.**
- 2. A Bronze Age round barrow, possibly one of a number forming a barrow cemetery.**

**3. An Early Saxon (6th-century AD?) inhumation cemetery, probably of at least 60 graves, focussed on the earlier Bronze Age round barrow. The northern, southern, and western extent of the cemetery appears to have been defined by geophysical survey and trial trenching, although the wide spacing of burials means that further burials beyond the investigated area cannot be discounted. The eastern extent of the cemetery remains unclear. This cemetery is of high importance and may well be of national significance (Heritage Statement, Para. 4.4.8).**

**4. A prehistoric field system and possible enclosures.”**

*“Following previous consultation with the Archaeology Service, it is welcomed that the proposed layout of the residential development has been amended to avoid impact on the Saxon inhumation cemetery (or at least on its presumed extent), the Bronze Age barrows, and that part of the ancient trackway that lies closest to the Scheduled Monument of Woodbury Ancient Villages. It is welcomed that the line of the trackway in the west of the site will be marked by a ‘mown path’ within the open green space and will otherwise be ‘preserved’ by the alignment of the proposed access road in the east of the site. The further revised layout of 14th January 2022, especially Plots 81 and 82, has reduced the size of the open space north of the ‘mown path’, which will reduce the visual impact and landscape setting of the ‘mown path’ in relation to Woodbury Ancient Villages, which rather defeats the object, although the revised layout here will not unduly impact on below ground archaeology.*

*I agree with Historic England’s advice of 8 December 2021 that the route of the ancient trackway would be better marked by an avenue of trees or other planting to provide a more permanent landscape feature to a ‘mown path’. Historic England has advised that this is secured via a suitable landscaping condition on any permission granted so that Historic England can agree a landscaping design that ensures the line of the ancient trackway is interpreted in a way that enhances the designated heritage asset.*

*The revised proposed layout of the residential development is therefore broadly acceptable, subject to a programme of archaeological work to mitigate the impacts of proposed development on other buried archaeological remains. However, it is noted that the ‘Landscape Masterplan’ (ACD Environmental, Dwg No. 22723 10B) and associated ‘Soft Landscape Proposals’ plans provide for tree planting within the ‘Area of Archaeological Interest’, specifically proposed trees south of the access road and within the area of the Saxon cemetery. It is inconsistent that the development layout has been amended to avoid impact on the Saxon cemetery but that the landscape proposals now provide for tree planting within the area of the cemetery.*

*I am not currently aware that the landscape proposals have been revised.*

***The tree planting should therefore be amended in this area of the site*** to remove any likelihood of impact on graves of the Saxon cemetery or the Bronze Age barrows. The most suitable revised location for tree planting would be in the south-east corner of the site, away from the Saxon cemetery and including a reasonable buffer zone.

***Subject to revisions to the tree planting proposals, I am satisfied that the impacts of the development can be mitigated by an appropriate programme of archaeological work secured by condition”.***

Consequently, Members will note that due to the ongoing biodiversity matters, at the time of writing, the applicant will be asked to provide various revised planting plans. It is considered that the issues raised by WC archaeology AND Historic England as above can equally be dealt within those adjusted landscape plans. As a result, it is considered that the revised layout and any planting and other works can now avoid a “substantial” or “less than substantial” impact on sensitive archaeology and the setting of the Scheduled Ancient Monument, and therefore, the scheme meets the aims of Policy H3.4 in terms of its protection of the sensitive archaeological features.



This is considered to be of significant weight given the stance of the NPPF. A refusal on this point would therefore be difficult to defend.

### 9.3 Design, scale and impact on the wider landscape (including the AONB)

The site is located on an agricultural field, within the Special Landscape Area. Some distance to the south is the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Core Policy 51 of the WCS states Development should protect, conserve and where possible enhance landscape character and must not have a harmful impact upon landscape character, while any negative impacts must be mitigated as far as possible through sensitive design and landscape measures. Proposals should be informed by and sympathetic to the distinctive character areas identified in the relevant Landscape Character Assessment(s) and any other relevant assessments and studies. Further relevance is given to Para 176 of the NPPF which indicates great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty.

Policy H3.4 states that:

- **a strong landscape framework that maintains and enhances the existing woodland belts, including open space provision in the southern part of the site and a green corridor extending along the southern boundary of the site from the existing beech tree shelterbelt;**

The applicant has submitted a range of assessment documents related to the landscape impact of the proposal.

As indicated elsewhere in this report, this proposal was originally submitted for 108 dwellings, with open space to the south. The original submitted layout is below:



ORIGINAL 108 DWELLING SCHEME



Following initial consultation responses, and following significant concern from the Council's Archaeologist and Historic England (as outlined elsewhere in this report), part of the area of the planned housing (in the eastern portion of the site) had to be repositioned to safeguard important archaeology on the eastern part of the allocated site.

As a result of the archaeological constraints, the scheme was initially reduced to 101 dwellings and a replacement portion of housing located in the south western corner of the site. Unfortunately, this relocated area of housing is on the highest part of the site, adjacent the tree belt, along the southern edge of the site. This meant that a continuous green corridor along and adjacent the tree belt to the southern edge of the site could not be achieved as envisaged by policy H3.4.

Consequently, a further layout was submitted which reduced the scheme to 95 dwellings, and moved the dwellings further away from the tree belt, as below:



Scheme reduced to 95 dwellings (first version)

Further to reconsultation on this plan, third party concerns were received related to the impact of the scheme of the landscape character, and the mature tree belt, including representation making reference to the fact that this area and towards the hospital may be being considered as some form of green space area up to the hospital, as part of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan for Salisbury City. However, on this point, even if this area were being considered in this fashion, the Neighbourhood Plan for the city area is in its early stages and does not carry weight in the determination of this application. Furthermore, Neighbourhood Plan policies must not conflict with Core Strategy policies. Therefore, any future Neighbourhood Plan policies cannot over-ride the allocation of this site for housing.

However, regards the above adjusted layout, the Council's tree officer raised concerns about the proximity of the housing to the tree belt, as did the Council's ecologist. WC Landscape officer commented thus:

A). **Mown path** I note that HE would like the ancient trackway was delineated by vegetation, I am happy to support this.

B). **Hoggin path** I am happy to support this but it will have maintenance issues but would have a better appearance. The other consideration is buggy and wheel chair access on a rutted path. An alternative is a resin bound surface which is considerably more expensive.

C). **Area of Archaeological interest** I am happy to support the relocation of trees in clumps to the south east corner which should allow some Partial views across the site from the foot path.

D). **Landscape Masterplan Rev B** The following points have not been addressed (my comments dated 7/9/21):

1. The boundary to Odstock Road requires a native landscape buffer to provide connectivity and break up the harsh urban edge as illustrated in the planning layout (Bellway P1597.01 REV T) and on the proposed site access drawing (043.0017.001A) and referred to on the Landscape Masterplan REV B as SOFT LANDSCAPING rather than seeded.
2. Native planting along the northern edge (north of Block A) to strengthen the existing off site planting.
3. ~~Continuous hedgerow with trees, with breaks for pedestrian through routes, along the boundary with Rowbarrow. The current design breaks the line of the hedge with buildings and parking spaces. This will reinforce the buffer between the developments while maintaining access for cycle/footpath connections. It will also strengthen connectivity for biodiversity.~~ This looks OK now
4. The existing beech tree belt to the south retained and enhanced with understorey planting as recommended in the Ecology report. The proposed LEAP NEAP should be relocated north of the path to provide an adequate buffer to the tree belt. The proposed hedge to the SE corner should be removed
5. Following discussions with Mary Holmes (WC Ecologist) and looking at the recommendations of the submitted ecology report I agree that it would be a better approach to manage the existing grassland (POS to south) to improve the sward rather than re-seed. This is a more sustainable and cost-effective approach.
6. Strengthen the tree planting to the south eastern boundary with copses/groups of trees, though this may need to be coordinated with archaeology.  
See note above

E). **Tree Officers comments** I agree with the Tree Officers comments. The liveability concerns as well the threat of tree fall could result in mismanagement of the tree belt and threaten its integrity. Any loss or weakening of the tree belt would leave the development visually exposed. There needs to be a reconfiguring of houses south of the spine road that ensures the amenity of residents and the trees are protected..

F). **The reason for the buffer** It's important not to lose sight of why the buffer was included in the first place:

The applicant's constraints and opportunities plan in the DAS (chapter 5.0) correctly describes the linear buffer south of the proposed spine road as an 'elevated open area, less suitable for development', and it contributes to the settlements character and setting. This is also reflected in the design objectives (DAS chapter 6.0)

- Achieve a development which is appropriate in scale and design and one which preserves the existing settlements' character and setting.
- Create a design led bespoke solution respecting the character of the area.
- Create a development which sits well in its landscape setting and retains and enhances the features of landscape value.

The original proposals are described in chapter 7.0. The layout has evolved incorporating the design objectives and mitigation recommendations in particular:



- A sinuous spine road to demarcate the **lower development edge and upper visual buffer** creating a transition to the countryside
- A large open space to meet **visual mitigation**, recreational and heritage asset protection objectives.

Members should also note the comments of the ecology officer regards the 95 houses scheme which also reflected the above concerns, as did the third party comments outlined elsewhere in this report. Consequently, the applicants again revised the scheme, in order to reposition the housing as far as they were able from the southern tree belt, as the plan below shows. The number of dwellings remains at 95:

Current scheme



An enlarged extract from the amended plan below shows the repositioned dwellings in the context of the tree belt:



With regards to the adjusted plan above, the revised layout has buffer zones of 16.5-28 m between the proposed houses and treeline tree trunks. Space between the proposed footway and the trees will be utilised for further tree planting which with under storey management will protect and enhance the orchids as per the applicants Lyndsey Carrington Associates Helleborine Survey. A revised Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural/Method Statement has also been submitted. As a consequence, the Council's tree officer has raised no objections, subject to suitable tree protection measures being put in place during construction. With regards to the revised plan, the WC Landscape officer has also confirmed that the revised scheme is now far more acceptable. Likewise, the Council's archaeologist and ecologist have not raised objections.

It is appreciated that several third parties have concerns about constructing any dwellings to the south of the planned spine road on this development, or indeed, any dwellings at all on this site. However, it must be remembered that the site is allocated for approximately 100 dwellings, so a refusal on landscape impact grounds would be difficult to support per se regards the whole site, and notwithstanding, much of the development is located on the less elevated part of the site, and so would not be prominent in the landscape to the north, south or from the AONB. The development would also be seen in the context of the adjacent housing development, and would be reasonably well screened by the undulating landscape, landscape features and planting, and particularly the mature tree line along Downton Road, which currently perform a significant screening function.

Regards the housing repositioned on the most elevated southern part of the site, it is accepted that this small portion of the development will be more prominent in the landscape than the rest of the scheme, particularly elevated points to the north and south/east/west, including within the immediate context. However, this part of the development would also be screened by the mature beech tree planting which exists to the immediate south of this site. Whilst this top southern part of the development may be visible from across parts of the city and Old Sarum monument, it is considered that it would be seen in the context of the two mature tree belts, so when seen from vantage points from the north across the city, the development would be effectively contained between the Downton Road tree belt, and the upper tree belt to the immediate south. Officers have looked at this aspect closely, and from distance and vantage points, during most weather conditions, the top part of the site is not actually as readily visible to the surrounding area as one would first imagine. Thus, in reality, it is officers opinion, that the housing proposed south of the spine road will not have a significant landscape impact, particularly when seen against the mature tree belt.

Furthermore, in mitigation, it is arguable that the removal of part of the development from the eastern part of the application site to preserve the sensitive archaeology actually results in a visual improvement compared to the original, as from officers observations, that eastern part of the site is somewhat visible from northern vantage points (particularly the Southampton Road area and east of the city) as well as the adjacent footpath system to the immediate east of the site. Similarly, given the distance to the AONB boundary to the south, and taken together with the screening offered by the mature tree belt, it is considered that the development would be unlikely to harmful to the landscape character of the AONB to the south. Given that the Council's Landscape officer is now more content with the revised layout, and that a green buffer/corridor will still be provided adjacent the tree belt to the south of the site, the proposal is therefore considered to accord with the local plan allocation policy, and the aims of policies CP51 and C6.

As a result, as it must be accepted that the allocation of the site intrinsically affects the landscape character of the site, it is not considered that the overall visual impact on the wider landscape character would be so significant as to warrant refusal.

With regards the above, Members will however note that the WC Ecology response produced elsewhere in this report (which was drawn up in consultation with the Council's Landscape officer) suggests planning conditions to deal with the detailed landscaping for the site. This is because the development will need to prove that it meets the emerging bio-diversity standards. These bio-diversity standards have yet to be adopted by the Council at the time of writing, and the Council is therefore not yet in a position to agree such landscaping works, it is considered that landscaping conditions are the most appropriate way of dealing with this matter (together with the archaeology protection and enhancement). Once the revised landscaping scheme is submitted to the Council, these will be checked to ensure that a bio-diversity gain can be achieved, as well as protecting and enhancing the sensitive archaeology on the site.

Whilst the third party landscape impact concerns are noted and have been taken into consideration, a refusal on landscape impact grounds would therefore be difficult to justify.

### Design and layout of the housing

The proposal should aim to conform to the objectives of Core Policy 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy which aims to achieve a high standard of design in all new developments, including extensions, alterations, and changes of use of existing buildings. Development is expected to create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complimentary to the locality. The NPPF has been recently updated to include more reference to design and landscaping matters, including a National Design Guide, which mirror the aims of Policy CP57 and the Creating Places SPG.

The design of the adjacent existing Rowbarrow development to the north was somewhat unusual in that it took the design concept and form of a "country house" surrounded by subservient estate dwellings. It is considered that this concept has worked well in overall design and landscaping terms, with the prominent three storey apartment block being the only part of the previous scheme visible from a distance (namely Southampton Road and northern vantage points). However, as this new housing scheme would be separated from the existing Rowbarrow and its architectural concept, it is considered appropriate that the new scheme need not seek to mimic the design concept of the existing.

However, in terms of general design, the overall design of the proposed dwellings would reflect the visual appearance of the other adjacent housing area (north of Ancient Way), with mostly two storey dwellings. A two and half storey block is planned on the north western edge of the site adjacent the corner of Odstock Road and Ancient Way, although this will be partially screened by existing mature planting along this road. Provided materials used are similar to those used in the adjacent development and are muted in tone, the development would sit comfortably with the existing developments adjacent, and it seems unlikely that the development would be any more prominent in the landscape than existing housing on other elevated position around the city fringes.

The Council's Urban Design officer has raised some issue regards the layout of part of the housing, due to the relationship with the car parking and access arrangements. However, WC Highways do not object to the road layout proposed, and the design issues raised are not considered so onerous as to warrant a refusal of the whole scheme on that basis, as the areas of concern are reasonably typical of modern housing developments, and only a modest number of dwellings would be affected. The rejigging of these areas is also likely to result in other areas of the scheme being rejigged, which may then have a knock -on impact on other issues which have been resolved. The scheme will have significant landscaping surrounding it, including tree planting and hedging along its northern edge, and western edge with Odstock Road. Elsewhere, tree and other planting which enhances biodiversity and protects and

enhances archaeological features will be introduced. In the medium to long term, it is therefore considered that the scheme will become less visible in the landscape, but also lead to enhancement in general terms of the overall landscape character.

### Sustainable design

Regards sustainable design matters, some third parties have raised this as an issue, citing that the scheme does not include any solar panels, or heat pump systems etc. The applicants have submitted a Sustainability Statement which outlines why such infrastructure have been discounted, and indicates a range of measures which will be included in the scheme to improve its sustainability and reduce its waste footprint. Many of the measures will be secured by the various planning conditions imposed on this consent if granted (ie waste containers, cycle parking, green travel plan, ecological gains, footpath improvements, electric vehicle charging points). Whilst therefore the scheme does not include any solar panels or similar renewables, a refusal of the scheme on this point would be difficult to justify, given that it is the governments stated position that Planning consents should not go above and beyond or duplicate Building Regulations. Taking a wider holistic approach to sustainable design, officers therefore consider that the aims of policies CP41/42 are not considered to be breached.

### 9.4 Impact on Amenity

A number of concerns and objections have been expressed by third parties, including residents of the adjacent Rowbarrow development. These are summarised elsewhere in this report. All have duly been taken into account as part of the deliberations associated with this application.

In terms of amenity of existing residents of Rowbarrow, the proposed dwellings would be located to the south of existing housing, within the area allocated for housing by policy H3.4. Whilst some of the third party concerns relate to the loss of this area of land as informal open space and as a visual amenity, it would be impossible to meet the planning policy aspirations for this site without changing the character of the site significantly, and thus affecting the amenities of the adjacent residents by a certain degree. A refusal on this point would therefore be difficult to justify.

Due to the contours of the land, the proposed housing would be naturally elevated several metres above the existing Rowbarrow development. However, the developments would be separated by the existing linear bank area adjacent the existing Rowbarrow development, and for the most part, by the width of roads, so in some parts the new and existing houses would



be more than 30 metres apart, as illustrated below by the sectional drawings:



Whilst many of the new housing along the northern part of the site have been designed with side elevations facing northwards, it is accepted that some of the planned dwellings would face northwards towards the existing housing. However, it is considered that as designed and laid out, the scheme offers a pleasant layout, which offers surveillance of the associated roads and open space areas, and given time, will fit well into the character of the surrounding area.

The alternative to this would be to have some kind of tall screening fence erected along the northern edge of the new scheme which may reduce some overlooking but which in officers opinion would be visually detrimental. Alternatively, significant tree planting along the northern boundary of the site could be a solution. Whilst this latter option may be feasible in principle, any such planting would need to be of a significant width, and/or if the scheme were adjusted to move dwellings away from this northern edge, it would be unlikely that sufficient dwellings would be able to be provided on the remaining part of the site to meet Local Plan aspirations, particularly as the amended scheme is already providing below the number of houses indicated in the Local Plan allocation.

As the Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing at the time of writing, any significant under-provision of housing on this allocated site would be an issue. Given that the site has been allocated, and that intrinsically, housing on this site would by definition have some impact on existing amenities, it is therefore considered that the proposed housing would not be so harmful to amenity in terms of overshadowing or loss of privacy as to warrant refusal.

WC Public Protection has indicated:

*“Whilst the proposed site is set back from one of the arterial roads into Salisbury with existing housing between, we would still advise the applicant to carefully consider the design of the properties ensuring they are insulated effectively to provide appropriate amenity for future occupants. We would therefore recommend a scheme of insulation is submitted; this can be covered by a condition. The applicant has submitted a Waste audit and Construction Environmental Management Plan (December 2019). There are a few points we would recommend amending and adding to protect the amenity and minimise disturbance for existing residents;*

- Working hours to be conditioned to 08.00 to 18.00 Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 Saturdays. No work on Sundays and Public Holidays.
- No idling engines of lorries whilst waiting outside the site
- Include details of any generators to be onsite and their location
- Include external lighting plan, indicating where the lights will be positioned

- *Where piling is required this must be continuous flight auger piling wherever practicable to minimise impacts.*

- *Contaminated land – Condition recommended to reduce the risks associated with land contamination. If step 1 indicates no likely legacy impacting the proposals then steps 2 and 3 are redundant”*
- *Electric Vehicle charging points provided to meet the Council sustainable design policy CP55.*

As a result, it is considered that the proposal, with some mitigation via conditions, would accord with the aims of policies CP55 & 57 of the WCS. A refusal on amenity grounds would therefore be difficult to support.

#### 9.5 Highway safety/parking

The proposal would be accessed off the Odstock Road with a new vehicular access. It is noted that some of the third party comments refer to an alternative location for an access, but this would not accord with Policy H3.4, which clearly envisages an access to the west off Odstock Road. The policy also states that:

- **provision made for transport network improvements necessary to accommodate the scale of development envisaged, as identified through a comprehensive transport assessment**

A detailed Transport Assessment and draft Travel Plan has been submitted with the application. The Council’s Highways officer has commented thus:

*I note that the site is allocated for residential development under WHSAP and policy H3.4. The application includes a Transport Assessment which has considered the transport implications of the proposed development. Assessed in a reasonably robust manner, the development can be expected to generate up to the following trips, where a trip is a one-way vehicular movement:-*

*12 hour day 461  
AM peak hour 48  
PM peak hour 46*

*The trips will distribute along the three significant possible access routes to and from the site:-*

*Odstock Road south*

*Odstock Road north and hence through the Harnham gyratory junction (the majority of these movements).*

*Rowbarrow*

*The proposed development is proposed to be served by a ghost island right turning lane - which is an appropriate form of junction subject to some adjustments as will be set out below, and will assist in ensuring that emergency vehicles to and from the hospital are not unduly impeded.*

*A number of objectors have suggested that the cycle route on the development side should be continued across the access junction. This would cause vehicles on Odstock Road to stop to give way to cyclists thus impeding emergency vehicles, and therefore I disagree that this would be an appropriate way to deal with the cycle route*

*The car parking provision of the development is satisfactory.*

*Policy H3.4 indicates that the development should make provision for network improvements necessary to accommodate the scale of the development. The Salisbury Transport Strategy (STS) at page 66 identifies that the development is expected to contribute to the schemes to improve the Harnham Gyrotory. The Salisbury Transport Strategy identifies at page 73 that the development is expected to contribute to the scheme to improve the pedestrian and cycle route from Salisbury to the hospital.*

- *Contribution to the measures of Salisbury Transport Strategy to improve local junctions in the area*
- *Contribution of £10000 index linked and ten year time limited towards installing Real Time Information at the bus shelter local to the development.*
- *Raised kerbs and bus shelter at the northbound bus stop on Odstock Road.*
- *Raised kerbs and replacement bus stop sign at the southbound bus stop on Odstock Road.*

In clarification of the above and in response to the change to 95 dwellings, the Highways officer has indicated the following:

*The Planning Layout is generally satisfactory including parking provision and visibility splays. I am satisfied that refuse vehicles will be able to access the parts of the estate necessary. I remain concerned that the paths across the public open space areas are indicated as hoggin surfaced – which will not last in a long-term way without regular maintenance, and will not be as user friendly as a tarmac surfaced path.*

*I am unable to find that the revised plans include details of drainage. Therefore I am unable to check if the large number of soakaways have been designed out of their carriageway locations (see the concerns expressed in my previous comments). The Council as Highway Authority will not adopt the roads on the estate if the roads include soakaways as this presents a significant maintenance liability and can cause destabilisation of the roads and footways. If you establish that it is still intended to locate soakaways in the roads you should require a clause in the S106 that a private management company be set up to maintain the roads, footways, street lighting and drainage throughout the estate.*

Consequently, whilst some of the third party concerns relate to the impact of this development on the surrounding highway systems, a refusal based on highway impacts or parking would therefore be difficult to justify.

### Pedestrian Linkages

Policy H3.4 refers to linkages to the existing development being provided.

The site is located sustainably, close to bus routes and within easy cycle and walking distance of facilities. The proposed housing would be linked with the existing Rowbarrow development

to the north via a new footpath link to the east, see plan below. It is considered that this pathway linkage should be secured as part of the public open space matters in the S106.



Original layout (left) and revised connection to BRIT8 footpath (right)

The Rights of Way team have commented thus:

*“Footpath BRIT8 runs immediately to the south of this development; the planning layout shows a proposed hoggin path running parallel to BRIT8 along the edge of the proposed open space. I have discussed this with the Countryside Access Officer for the area and he has suggested that either this path should be realigned to incorporate BRIT8 where it runs along the southern boundary. We’d be happy for this section of BRIT8 to be surfaced with a self-binding hoggin as proposed on the path across the open space. Having them parallel seems pointless and potentially detrimental to the PRow so it should be either on the same line or separated out further to make the route clearly distinct. Or if their hoggin path is not realigned to incorporate BRIT8, the line of BRIT8 needs to be acknowledged and protected from any planting schemes. We note on one of the plans that area is marked for increased mixed native shrub planting and we need at least 2m clear along the line of BRIT8 as it is currently used on the ground. Mike Crook previously submitted comments on the Local Plan document which had an interest in this area. Please see the paragraph below:*

*“The eastern half of BRIT8, from the link into the housing to the main road is very steep. Steps and surfacing must be provided here. Where the route meets the main road, a pavement must be provided to the point where a signalised crossing is available – either at the existing P+R facility or the new access road into the site on the north of the road. The footway link near 14 Barrow Close should be upgraded to provide both pedestrians and cycle access onto Flint Way. This should be a green link across to BRIT16, into the P+R site and the new development – ie not just incorporated into pavements or the internal road network.”*

*We believe the development here will increase the footfall on the section of BRIT8 which runs from the south eastern corner of the development to the A338 Downton road, so feel it would be appropriate for improvement work to be undertaken here as part of this development rather than waiting for some future development on adjacent land. It would require clearing the vegetation back by at least a metre and installing steps and laying a sealed path surface material i.e. tarmac or the like.”*

The Council’s Rights of Way team have indicated that instead of building out a new path adjacent the existing right of way path, that the existing right of way down to the A338 Downton Road be improved. Amended plans have been provided which therefore remove part of the new pathway shown above, and instead, the existing right of way is improved and upgraded. It is considered that this can be secured via the S106 agreement, and enhances the linkages not only for new residents but also of existing residents.

With regards to linkages to the surrounding area, residents could also use the pavement to the west of the site. Between the proposed development and the existing Rowbarrow development there is an area of grass with some landscaping. This is managed by the developer and residents of the existing Rowbarrow development (ie not the applicant). There is already informal pathways across this land leading through the site and the scheme envisages that these informal pathways would remain, and be used by residents of the new housing. The development would also allow residents to access the adjacent field systems, which contain the network of rights of way, and it will be possible for residents of the new development to access the existing shop/facilities on the existing Rowbarrow site, and also Britford School, as the existing Rowbarrow residents do.

Given that the development would facilitate the enhancement of footpath BRIT8 for the benefit of the wider Rowbarrow residents, it is therefore considered that the proposal would be sufficiently linked to the surrounding area to encourage travel by foot and cycle, and would therefore meet the aims of the Council's Transport strategy and policies.

As a result, it is considered that the proposal, with some mitigation via conditions and S106 contributions, would accord with the aims of policies H3.4, CP57, 61- 66 of the WCS.

#### 9.6 Ecological Impact/River Avon Catchment Area/drainage

WCS policy CP50 & 52 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity) and the NPPF requires the Local Planning Authority to ensure protection of important habitats and species in relation to development and seeks enhancement for the benefit of biodiversity through the planning system.

As outline elsewhere in this report, the proposal would be adjacent a mature tree belt along the southern edge of the site, and also a smaller tree belt to the north along Ancient Way. The southern woodland belt is also of ecological value. The site it is also situated within the River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC) catchment area. The SAC is designated for several species of wildlife that depend on pristine water quality that is typical of chalk rivers such as the Avon. It is part of a network of sites across Europe designated in order to protect these and other species vulnerable to man-induced habitat change. This SAC is particularly vulnerable to the effects of pollutants including phosphate and nitrogen which may enter the river for example at sewage treatment works or from fertilizers applied to farmland throughout the catchment.

The application is accompanied by ecological survey and related reports which has been reviewed by the Council's Ecologist, who has commented as follows on the 95 dwelling scheme:

*The site comprises semi-improved grassland - calcareous indicators were recorded. Plantation woodlands reported to be well-structured. Scrub has a diverse range of species. Clearly therefore the site is of significant biodiversity value. However, it has not been assessed in terms of the UK Habitat Classification and the net change in Biodiversity Units has not been calculated using the Natural England metric. It is highly unlikely this layout would deliver a net gain as required by CP50 and the NPPF, although the Council will wish to see that as much offsetting is provided within the site as possible. Given the advanced stage of this application I recommend this is dealt with by condition (please see amended wording below).*

*The application has been revised down from 101 to 95 dwellings, and more open space is provided including a wider buffer to the southern beech plantation. The whole of the development lies within about 150m of the plantation, it will therefore be readily accessible*

unless fencing is erected to control access. Although people are more likely to access the plantation from the NEAP in its current location compared say, to the north east of the site, many people will access it regardless of the NEAP. All things being equal, if the NEAP can be relocated this may bring some benefit.

The Tree Officers comments of 9 December 2021 demonstrate there is a real risk of the southern plantation becoming an issue for future residents in terms of amenity and liability due to the fact a number of plots are located within 30m of the nearest trees. The experience of all tree officers at the Council has been that mature trees cause fear and frustration for householders and eventually there is no alternative but to remove trees regardless of the ecological implications - which in this situation are significant, as discussed below. Removals and windthrow could result in the removal of an 80m length of the tree line, i.e. a third of the current length. This would make it impossible for the development to achieve a net gain for biodiversity by a significant margin which necessarily means I must object to the current layout.

I note from the landscaping plans, masterplan etc, that extensive wildflower seeding is proposed in the open space. This is currently set out as a complex arrangement of different seed mixes – why bother, the site already comprises semi-improved grassland which will have a better outcome for biodiversity if it is enhanced through management. I recommend, following comments from Mary Holmes and Maxine Russell, that a revised landscape scheme is secured by condition to reflect this.

- Beech plantation on south west boundary – Ecological Appraisal recommends understory planting although none is proposed in the Soft Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan. This however is unlikely to establish as I understand from representation responses this woodland has been unthinned in 70 years. White helleborine has been recorded in some numbers in this and the plantation on the northern boundary. The site is potentially of Wiltshire importance. Insufficient information provided to demonstrate whether the helleborine will be impacted by recreational pressure and if so, how it will be protected (see table above for information required). I note that the northern plantation is owned by Wiltshire Council and therefore mitigation may be needed through a S106 agreement.
- Condition required to retain, protect and manage both the southern and northern tree belts for their biodiversity value.
- Breeding skylark in the semi-improved grassland – condition for ECoW.
- The report evaluates the bat assemblage using a method (Wray et al 2010) of arguable validity. From transect and static data there is a serotine roost nearby, which would raise the assemblage to being of County importance. This species is tolerant of artificial lighting to a degree and the access road avoids tree planting / scrub on the site perimeter. I recommend impact of lighting on bats is addressed through a condition for lighting with wording to ensure regard is taken for bats as part of the street lighting layout.
- Coverage of ecological issues in the submitted Waste Audit and CEMP (Savills, December 2019) is inadequate. Condition required to ensure an ECoW is available to minimise biodiversity loss during the construction phase.

Latest plans submitted 14 Jan 2022 show the development buildings have been pulled back from the line of tree planting shown on the OS Mastermap layer, by a few metres to just over 20m, which is closer to the minimum recommended by the Tree Officer. Now



however a longer length of the tree line is vulnerable, to removals approximately 120m. It seems inevitable that trees will need to be removed 'before their time'.

***I consider this will be acceptable.*** Streetview shows the beech plantation to be in need of thinning and management and this could gradually lead to a reduction in the beech canopy to create a more diverse woodland in keeping with the new adjacent land use. I consider my recommended condition for biodiversity net gain below, will be sufficient to secure this.

### Appropriate Assessment

#### River Avon SAC

*This development falls within the catchment of the River Avon SAC and has potential to cause adverse effects alone or in combination with other developments through discharge of phosphorus in wastewater. The Council has agreed through a Memorandum of Understanding with Natural England and others that measures will be put in place to ensure all developments permitted between March 2018 and March 2026 are phosphorus neutral in perpetuity. To this end it is currently implementing a phosphorous mitigation strategy to offset all planned residential development, both sewered and non sewered, permitted during this period. The strategy also covers non-residential development with the following exceptions:*

- *Development which generates wastewater as part of its commercial processes other than those associated directly with employees (e.g. vehicle wash, agricultural buildings for livestock, fish farms, laundries etc)*
- *Development which provides overnight accommodation for people whose main address is outside the catchment (e.g. tourist, business or student accommodation, etc)*

*Following the cabinet's resolution on 5th January 2021, which secured a funding mechanism and strategic approach to mitigation, the Council has favourably concluded a generic appropriate assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019. This was endorsed by Natural England on 7 January 2021. As this application falls within the scope of the mitigation strategy and generic appropriate assessment, I conclude it will not lead to adverse impacts alone and in-combination with other plans and projects on the River Avon SAC.*

#### New Forest SPA

*This site lies within the 13.8km zone of influence of this SPA and is therefore screened into appropriate assessment. This was increased from 8km at the beginning of September 2021.*

*The site delivers a degree of recreational space on site and is linked to other land which provides longer recreational routes. As such, and as for all sites allocated in the WHSAP, the development complies with the generic appropriate assessment for the New Forest currently being prepared by Wiltshire Council. The approach has yet to be finalised with Natural England, which is expected to be before the end of September. At that stage the Council hopes to be able to conclude this appropriate assessment favourably to enable a lawful permission to be granted.*

As outlined elsewhere in this report, following the above comments (and those of the wc landscape officer and tree officer), the current scheme maintains 95 dwellings, but is pulled away from the mature tree line along the southern edge of the site.

In this regard the Council's ecologist has now indicated that the development is now acceptable, subject to suitable conditions including revised landscaping plans, and a financial contributions via the S106.

The Council's Ecologist has also advised that the application cannot be approved until a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has been carried out by the Council (in consultation with Natural England), and that HRA has been positively concluded – ie the ecological impacts of the development have been considered acceptable. This process is ongoing at the time of writing. The Council's Ecologist is content that any permission is made subject to a positive HRA outcome. Thus, should Members be minded to approve this proposal, permission will only be issued if the HRA process is completed positively.

Subject to suitable conditions, and a positive outcome to the HRA process, it is therefore considered the proposal achieves the aims of Core Policies CP 50,52 and CP69 of the WCS. A refusal on ecology grounds would therefore be difficult to justify.

### 9.7 Open Space and provision of MUGA

With regards to the above biodiversity, landscape, and archaeology issues, discussions have been undertaken with the applicant and the Council's open space officers. The revised open space areas are considered to be acceptable. However, the wc open space officers would normal expect the provision of a public play equipment and a multi use games area (MUGA) to be provided on this site, in the open space area. However, on this particular occasion, the Council's open space officer has suggested that if officers and members are so minded, a financial contribution towards providing a MUGA off site can be sought.

Given that any MUGA would be quite large and urban in its design, and require land to be levelled, it is considered that on this occasion, there would be good visual impact reasons not to place the MUGA within the open space area of this development. Furthermore, as the open space and wider area adjacent is archaeologically and ecologically sensitive, it is also considered that there would be advantages to not having such works in this area, or encouraging intensive use of this area by users.

### 9.8 Drainage/Flooding

Policy H3.4 refers to flooding matters, stating that:

- **A Flood Risk Assessment (incorporating an assessment of the predicted effects of climate change) and comprehensive drainage strategy to inform site layout and design of the site so that surface water is controlled and does not exacerbate flooding off site**

Suitable reports have been submitted as part of this application. This site is located in an elevated position, and officers are not aware that the other Rowbarrow developments have caused or been affected by any flooding issues.

The Applicant and Council's Drainage officer have had a protracted exchange regards various Drainage related issues. It appears to have been agreed between the parties that there are no significant flooding/drainage related issues related to this development, subject to suitable conditions.

In regards to the matter raised by WC Highways of soakaways being placed under the carriageways, as this may lead to future maintenance issues. However, it is understood that the road system will be privately run by a management company, and notwithstanding, it is

considered that soakaways, their maintenance, and the maintenance of the highway is not particularly a Planning matter which stop this proposal from being progressed. Such matters are usually a matter for Building Regulations, or a separate Highway or Drainage matter as part of the Council's separate roles as Highway Authority and Drainage Authority.

The proposal is therefore considered to accord with the aims of CP67 of the WCS.

### 9.9 Community facilities

Policy H3.4 makes no reference to the need for the developer to provide community facilities, other than a reference to GP surgery matters. No evidence has been submitted by any consultee or third party as part of this application which requests and justifies any such contribution over the 2 years this application has been under consideration. It is also understood that no such contribution was requested or sought on the recent Netherhampton Road application to the west of Harnham.

The existing Rowbarrow developments were subject to a community financial contribution, which was intended to provide a community centre on the area of open space land adjacent to Ancient Way. However, due to escalating build costs, and the lack of desire of the Rowbarrow residents to see a large building constructed on the open space, the community centre project folded. The monies collected via the previous S106 agreements was therefore utilised for other community projects.

As a result, officers consider that it would be difficult to include any such provision or contribution as part of any future S106. Notwithstanding, there is no room on the development site for the provision of any such on site facility, given the need to provide sufficient number of dwellings to meet the allocation whilst avoiding harm to the ecological, landscape, and heritage assets. Furthermore, the quantum of the housing in this proposed development would only result in a modest contribution towards such facilities, particularly given the significant level of other contributions that are being requested.

### **10.0 S106 mitigation matters**

The proposal will be required to provide the following mitigation as part of a legal agreement.

- **Provision of 40 percent affordable housing, including 10 percent adaptable units, which meet correct unit mix, and minimum size standard**

The Council's Housing Officer has advised the following:

#### Policy Requirements:

There are 40 Affordable Housing units proposed on a scheme of 95 dwellings. This meets the policy requirement for 40% on-site Affordable Housing provision within the

40% Housing Zone. This will assist in addressing the need for affordable housing in Salisbury where there is a high level of need for both affordable rented and shared ownership housing.

### Tenure

I note that the revised Tenure Layout and Planning Layout (attached) show that some of the units (plots 7, 51, 52 and 53) have switched tenure. This results in a tenure mix of 60% Affordable Rent and 40% Shared ownership as required.

### Floorspace

I confirm that the floorspace measurements provided meet the requirement to provide units to at least 85% of the Nationally Described Space Standard.

### M4(2) Adaptable Units

I note that all but seven of the Affordable housing units will be provided as M4(2) Adaptable units.

### Unit Size Mix

Whilst the unit size mix does not fully reflect need in accordance with Core Policy 45 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy due to a lack of larger units, I acknowledge the constraints highlighted by the applicant and on this occasion, as it only affects one or two units, the unit size mix proposed is considered to be acceptable.

Affordable Rent : 6 x 1 bed / 2 person flats; 12 x 2 bed / 4 person houses; 5 x 3 bed / 5 person houses; Shared Ownership: 11 x 2 bed / 4 person houses; 4 x 3 bed / 5 person houses.

### Parking

Whilst not considered acceptable from an Affordable Housing perspective, I acknowledge that a rear parking court (for units 47 to 50, 54 and 55) will be provided on this occasion due to previous re-designs. However, it should be noted by the applicant for the design of future schemes that rear parking courts for Affordable Housing units are not considered acceptable as they can cause management issues for Registered Providers.

### Transfer to Registered Provider:

The affordable dwellings will be required to be transferred to a Registered Provider, approved by the Council, or to the Council, on a nil subsidy basis. It is strongly recommended that the applicant makes contact with Registered Providers and Wiltshire Council's Residential Development Team as soon as possible in order to discuss the best option for the affordable dwellings including an indication of transfer prices that can be expected. A list of Registered Providers who work in partnership with Wiltshire Council can be provided on request.

### Nominations:

The Local Authority will have nomination rights to the affordable dwellings, secured through a S106 Agreement.

- **Provision and maintenance of public open space, play equipment, and off site contributions towards Youth and Adult provision and a MUGA, including provision of the planned pathways across the open space**

The Council's Open space officer has confirmed that:

The 95 dwellings would generate a requirement for Casual Open Space, Equipped Play and Youth and Adult. The Casual and Equipped Play requirements are both met on-site.

The Youth and Adult requirement would equate to an off-site contribution of **£61,380** to be used towards the cost of providing or improving youth and/or adult sports and ancillary services provision at Churchill Gardens, Salisbury.

The Council will require the provision to be secured in perpetuity and Wiltshire Council will not adopt the Public Open Space. As the provision required exceeds 1000m<sup>2</sup> the Council would expect to see a NEAP within the development. The NEAP is split into two: the equipped play as one part and the MUGA as the second part, we would accept 50% of the provision as an off-site contribution.

The full provision required is 1152m<sup>2</sup>: 576m<sup>2</sup> of this as an off-site contribution of **£82,944.00**. This would go towards providing a MUGA or other area of play within the vicinity of the development. The rest of the provision to be provided as per the NEAP standards on the play spec (excluding the areas related to the MUGA).

- **Financial contribution to enhancement of existing footpath system BRIT 8 from the site boundary to the A338 road**

The Council's Rights of Way officer has requested a contribution of **£10,000 pounds** towards an enhancement of the BRIT8 footpath, running from the site boundary (where an internal path is proposed across the site), and northwards down to the A338 road.

- **Ensure that proposed linking pathways to the surrounding area are provided up to the site boundary with unfettered public access and a scheme for their provision**

In association with the above, footpath linkage, and to ensure that the scheme address the policy requirement of H.3.4, it is considered that a clause is required in the S106 which ensures that users of the proposed pathways through the site can do so unfettered. (Despite there existing informal pathways through the adjacent land which the proposed paths will align to, it is recognised that the land beyond the site boundary to the north and east is not in the control of the applicant and thus public egress onto that adjacent land cannot be controlled by this S106)

- **Provision of waste and recycling facilities**

The Council's Waste and recycling officer has indicated that recycling bins for the development will need to be provided as follows:



Property type category	Contribution per house/per category	Quantity	Total
Individual house	£91	80	£7,280
Bin store for block of 6-10 flats	£581	2	£1,162
		<b>Total</b>	<b>£8,442</b>

- **Provision of educational facilities**

Members will note that policy H3.4 refers to a contribution being required from this development towards the proposed primary school at Netherhampton Road. However, the Council's Education officer has indicated:

We have reviewed the revised application's impact upon local primary and secondary school infrastructure in the light of recently updated school numbers forecasts and latest birth data. As a result, we no longer have cases for developer S106 contributions at primary or secondary age level, as the pupils generated by the development can be accommodated without the need to expand school provision in this area.

Early years contributions requirements: Current cost multipliers per place: 0.04 per dwelling for 0-2 year olds and under (4per 100 dwellings) and 0.09 per dwelling for 3-4 year olds (9 per 100 dwellings). £17,522 per place.

**Total required as per calculations above =10 nursery places - £175,220 towards the development of Early Years provision**

- **Provision of off site highway works and contributions towards sustainable transport measures and a private management company be set up to maintain the roads, footways, street lighting and drainage throughout the estate.**

Policy H3.4 indicates that the development should make provision for network improvements necessary to accommodate the scale of the development. The Salisbury Transport Strategy (STS) at page 66 identifies that the development is expected to contribute to the schemes to improve the Harnham Gyratory. The Salisbury Transport Strategy identifies at page 73 that the development is expected to contribute to the scheme to improve the pedestrian and cycle route from Salisbury to the hospital.

The Council's Highways officer has requested the following contributions and works:

i)Contribution to the measures of Salisbury Transport Strategy. The development feeds into the same over capacity junctions and parts of the network as the 640 dwelling development at Netherhampton. The Salisbury Transport Strategy (STS) exists to quantify and achieve improvements to capacity and to sustainable transport (public transport, cycling and walking across the city). Measures to be provided through the STS benefit all new Salisbury developments by reducing car trips on the network and encouraging active and sustainable travel. It is equitable that in line with other Salisbury residential developments a pro rata contribution to the STS measures be provided. This can be based on the contribution to the STS secured from the Netherhampton application reference 19/05824. **A contribution of £230,280 index linked and 10 year time limited is therefore required**

- ii) Contribution of **£10000 index linked and ten year time limited** towards installing Real Time Information at the bus shelter local to the development.
- iii) Prior to occupation of the 50<sup>th</sup> dwelling, raised kerbs and bus shelter at the northbound bus stop on Odstock Road, raised kerbs and replacement bus stop sign at the southbound bus stop on Odstock Road.
- iv) No dwelling hereby approved shall be occupied until a full travel plan based on the submitted framework travel plan, including the appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator, and **contribution of £1000** to the Salisbury Cycling and Walking maps, and the offer of green travel vouchers to each dwelling, is provided.
- v) Prior to occupation of the 90<sup>th</sup> dwelling a Traffic Order to implement waiting restrictions on the estate roads hereby approved, if that is deemed necessary by the Highway Authority in the event of the roads having been put forward for adoption, or if sought by the Highway Authority and agreed by the developers in the event of the roads not having been put forward for adoption, shall have been prepared, consulted upon, and advertised, with a final report recommending whether to proceed with the Order prepared for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Highways. In the event that the Cabinet Member for Highways approves the Order the amendments shall be implemented. The Highways officer has confirmed that in the interests of avoiding excessive indiscriminate parking within the development to the detriment of road user safety and convenience. The developers will bear the costs of the above condition, irrespective of whether the Order is proceeded with.
- vi) That a private management company be set up to maintain the roads, footways, street lighting and drainage throughout the estate.

- **Provision of public art**

The Council's Public Art officer has indicated that in accordance with Core Policy 3 & 57, saved policy D8, and the Council's Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (October 2016) which refers to the 2011 public art guidance note, **£28,500 (based on £300 per dwelling)** which could be commuted to the Council's arts service to engage an experienced professional public art specialist to devise, manage and deliver the art and design process and programme.

- **Contribution towards Biodiversity Net Gain project**

Following submission of a revised Biodiversity Metric Calculation which has been approved by the LPA (as per the planning condition below), any deficit in on-site mitigation will be paid at the following rates:

- i) **£25,000 per Biodiversity Unit with an additional £5,000 per unit administration charges**
- ii) **£3300 per 100m of Hedgerow Unit, including fencing with an additional £660 per 100m for administration**

## **11. Conclusion and Planning Balance**

The site is allocated for approximately 100 dwellings in the Wiltshire Site Allocation DPD 2020. Therefore the principle of housing development on the site is acceptable in principle. As the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply, the provisions of the NPPF (paragraph 11) are relevant. This states that applications for sustainable housing that accord with the development plan should be approved, unless there is significant harm to “assets of particular importance”, such as heritage assets or AONB landscape. Thus, depending on the significance of the impacts of the development, this carried significant weight.

The housing will have general impacts on the character of the site and also introduce more traffic into the area, and thus more noise and general disturbance. However, the allocation process considered general impacts of the development, such as the impact of housing on surrounding landscape features and the highway system, and hence, a refusal of this scheme on the basis that it would be prominent in the landscape or affect the highway system would be difficult to justify. This impact should not carry significant weight.

Furthermore, the amended proposal now includes some housing on the most elevated southern part of the site, it is considered that overall, the landscape harm would not be significant enough to warrant refusal. Indeed, the amended proposal also safeguards important archaeology, and would allow the prominent eastern part of the site to left free of development, thus having a beneficial visual and landscape impact in general terms, and would position some of the new housing away from existing Rowbarrow dwellings to the north. There would also be beneficial biodiversity gains. These benefits are of significant weight.

Additionally, the site would provide good sustainable linkages to the surrounding area and facilities, and subject to a suitable S106 agreement, would provide significant mitigation, including the provision of much needed affordable housing, and improvements to the general highway system, and an adjacent footpath, which is of significant weight.

Consequently, subject to a suitably positive outcome in terms of a Habitats Regulations Assessment by the Council and suitable conditions and a S106 to achieve the required mitigation, it is considered that the proposal would therefore accord with the aims of the allocation policy H3.4, and particularly the aims of saved policies D8, C6, R2, and policies CP 20, 41,42, 43, 50, 51, 52, 57, 58, 61 and 67,69 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the aims of the NPPF.

### **RECOMMENDATION: SUBJECT TO:**

- i) A POSITIVE OUTCOME TO A HABITATS REGULATIONS ASSESSMENT (HRA) BY THE COUNCIL, and**
- iii) A SUITABLE S106 LEGAL AGREEMENT BEING ENTERED INTO WITH REGARDS THE PROVISION OF THE FOLLOWING MITIGATION:**

- **Provision of 40 percent affordable housing on site (including mix, adaptable standards, and minimum size standard)**
- **Provision and maintenance of public open space, play space (including connecting paths across the open space), together with off site contribution for MUGA**
- **Financial contribution to enhancement of existing footpath system BRIT 8 from the site boundary to the A338 road**
- **Ensure that proposed linking pathways to the surrounding area are provided up to the site boundary with unfettered public access and a scheme for their provision**
- **Financial Contribution to and Provision of waste and recycling facilities**
- **Financial Contribution to educational facilities**
- **Provision of off site traffic works and sustainable transport contributions and a private management company be set up to maintain the roads, footways, street lighting and drainage throughout the estate.**
- **Provision of/financial contribution to a public art scheme**
- **Provision of Biodiversity enhancement contributions**

**THEN APPROVE, subject to the following conditions:**

Three Year commencement

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

Approved plans

2.The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans and details:

P1597.01 Rev Y	Planning Layout
P1597.02 Rev N	Materials Layout
P1597.03 Rev N	Building Heights Layout
P1597.04 Rev Q	Tenure Layout
P1597.05 Rev N	Parking Layout
P1597.06 Rev N	Refuse Layout
P1597.07 Rev N	Enclosures Layout
P1597.08	Location Plan
P1597.09	Net Areas Layout
P1597.SS.01 Rev E	Preliminary Streetscenes
P1597.SS.02 Rev D	Preliminary Streetscenes
P1597.SS.03 Rev A	Preliminary Streetscenes

P1597.SEC.01	Site Sections
P1597.1.01	Type 1 - (S05), Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.1.02	Type 1 - (S05), Elevations
P1597.2.01 Rev A	Type 2 - (Baker), Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.2.02 Rev A	Type 2 - (Baker), Elevations - Brick
P1597.3.01	Type 3 - (Tillman), Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.3.02	Type 3 - (Tillman), Elevations - Brick
P1597.3A.01	Type 3A - (Ploughwright), Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.3A.02	Type 3A - (Ploughwright), Elevations - Brick
P1597.4.01 Rev A	Type 4 - (Cartographer), Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.4.02 Rev A	Type 4 - (Cartographer), Elevations – Brick
P1597.BLKA.01 Rev A	Block A, Ground & First Floor Plans
P1597.BLKA.02 Rev A	Block A, Second Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.BLKA.03 Rev A	Block A, Front & Side Elevations
P1597.BLKA.04 Rev A	Block A, Rear & Side Elevations
P1597.BLKB.01	Block B, Ground Floor Plan
P1597.BLKB.02	Block B, First Floor Plan
P1597.BLKB.03	Block B, Second Floor Plan
P1597.BLKB.04	Block B, Roof Plan
P1597.BLKB.05	Block B, Front Elevation
P1597.BLKB.06	Block B, Side Elevation
P1597.BLKB.07	Block B, Rear Elevation
P1597.BLKB.08	Block B, Side Elevation
P1597.SL.01	Type SL - (Slater), Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.SL.02	Type SL - (Slater), Elevations - Brick
P1597.BO.01	Type BO - (Bowyer), Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.BO.02	Type BO - (Bowyer), Elevations - Tile Hung
P1597.BO.03	Type BO - (Bowyer), Elevations - Brick
P1597.CA.01	Type CA - (Carver), Floor & Roof Plans
P1597.CA.02	Type CA - (Carver), Elevations - Brick
P1597.CA.02	Type CA - (Carver), Elevations - Tile Hung



P1597.CO.01 Type CO - (Cooper), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.CO.02 Type CO - (Cooper), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.GO.01 Type GO - (Goldsmith), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.GO.02 Type GO - (Goldsmith), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.GO.03 Type GO - (Goldsmith), Elevations - Tile Hung  
P1597.MA.01 Type MA - (Mason), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.MA.02 Type MA - (Mason), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.MA.03 Type MA - (Mason), Elevations - Tile Hung  
P1597.SA.01 Type SA - (Saddler), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.SA.02 Type SA - (Saddler), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.SC.01 Type SC - (Scrivener), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.SC.02 Rev A Type SC - (Scrivener), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.TA.01 Rev A Type TA - (Tailor), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.TA.02 Rev A Type TA - (Tailor), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.TA.03 Type TA - (Tailor), Elevations - Tile Hung  
P1597.TH.01 Type TH - (Thespian), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.TH.02 Type TH - (Thespian), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.TH.03 Type TH - (Thespian), Elevations - Tile Hung  
P1597.GAR.01 Twin Garage - Gable Side, Plans & Elevations  
P1597.GAR.02 Single Car barn - Plans & Elevations  
P1597.GAR.03 Double Car barn - Plans & Elevations  
P1597.GAR.04 Single Garage - Plans & Elevations  
P1597.BIN.01 Bin Store - Plans & Elevations  
P1597.BIN.02 Bin Store - Plans & Elevations  
P1597.CYC.01 Cycle Store - Plans & Elevations  
P1597.Q.01 Type Q - (Quilter), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.Q.02 Type Q - (Quilter), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.3.05 Type 3 - (Tillman), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.3.06 Type 3 - (Tillman), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.3A.04 Type 3A - (Ploughwright), Floor & Roof Plans  
P1597.3A.05 Type 3A - (Ploughwright), Elevations - Brick  
P1597.CH.01 Type CH Rev A - (Chandler), Floor & Roof Plans

P1597.CH.02 Type CH Rev A - (Chandler), Elevations - Brick

P1597.CO.05 Type CO - (Cooper), Floor & Roof Plans

P1597.CO.06 Type CO - (Cooper), Elevations - Brick

P1597.GAR.05 Car barn - Plans & Elevations

P1597.GAR.06 Garage - Plans & Elevations

### Tree reports

Tree Protection Plan – BELL 22723 03C Sheet 1 & 2

Arboricultural Impact Assessment/ Method Statement BELL 22723 rev C (dated 18/01/2022)

### Archaeology

Heritage Statement, Savills, November 2021

Geophysical Survey, SUMO, March 2020

Archaeological Evaluation and Ground Penetrating Radar Survey Report, Wessex

Archaeology October 2020

### Drainage

Site Appraisal report Rev D March 2019 (Flooding and surface water)

Amending Drainage Technical Note and the following:

- Drawings 501-505: The updated drainage strategy layout showing the proposed site levels and retaining wall locations and heights
- Drawing 554-556: Showing cross sections of the soakaways
- Drawings 508-512: Showing the catchment area layout for the drainage strategy
- The Management and Maintenance strategy report
- Appendix E - the hydraulic calculations for each SuDS component on site.

### Landscaping

Landscaping Management and Maintenance plans BELL 22723(ACD December 2019)

Landscape Masterplan - BELL22723 10B

Soft Landscape Proposals - BELL22723 11B - Sheets 1-6

Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (November 2021) (Savills Landscape)

### Transport and Access

043.0017.001 rev D

Transport Assessment Addendum and revised plans (November 2021) (Paul Basham Associates)

Travel Plan December 2019 (Paul Basham Associates)

Transport Assessment Part 1 & 2 December 2019 (Paul Basham Associates)

### Ecology report

Lyndsay Carrington Ecological Appraisal and Phase 2 Survey Document October 2018

Updated May and December 2019

White Helleborine Survey ACD December 2019

### Waste and sustainable design

Waste Audit and CEMP 2019

Sustainability Statement – Southern Energy Consultants 13<sup>th</sup> January 2020

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt

### Materials

3. Before the relevant dwellings are occupied, details of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofing of the buildings, and hardsurfaces, including paths across the open space areas, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

REASON: In the interests of the visual appearance and amenity of the development and area

### Water efficiency

4. The residential development hereby approved shall be designed to ensure it does not exceed 110 litres per person per day water consumption levels (which includes external water usage). Within 3 months of each phase being completed and the housing being brought into use, a post construction stage certificate certifying that this standard has been achieved shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval.

REASON: To ensure compliance with the mitigation strategy for nutrient neutrality in the River Avon SAC catchment.

### Lighting

5. All lighting provided on site during the construction phase, and with regards the development phase and street lighting, shall be in accordance with the appropriate Environmental Zone standards set out by the Institute of Lighting Engineers in their publication GN01:2011, 'Guidance for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light' (ILP, 2011), and Guidance note 08/18 "Bats and artificial lighting in the UK", issued by the Bat Conservation Trust and Institution of Lighting Professionals and will demonstrate that bat habitat (trees, scrub and hedgerows) on the perimeter of the site will remain below 1 lux. Footpaths across open space will remain unlit for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: In the interests of the amenities of the area and to minimize impacts on biodiversity caused by light spillage to areas above and outside the development site.

### Biodiversity Net Gain landscaping and archaeology

6. Notwithstanding the landscaping details submitted as part of this application, before development commences, a completed Biodiversity Metric Calculation, a revised Soft Landscape Specification, Soft Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan and Soft Landscape Proposals drawings will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval (including details of how such areas are to be protected during construction). The Biodiversity Metric Calculation will include a drawing showing the location and extent of each

baseline habitat referred to in the metric and the Soft Landscape Specification, Soft Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan and Soft Landscape Proposals drawings will be revised to demonstrate the following:

- i) Sufficient habitat/hedgerow creation and enhancement will be achieved on site to deliver a net gain in biodiversity
- ii) Existing semi-improved grassland within the area shown as wildflower meadows on the approved Landscape Masterplan is retained and enhanced
- iii) The sensitive archaeology on and adjacent the site would remain protected and unaffected in perpetuity, including the ancient trackway shown on the approved plans, the route of which should be enhanced. The management plan shall include management and maintenance responsibilities and 'no dig' areas for the open green space.
- iv) The Soft Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan will include a management plan for the beech plantation on the south west site boundary which will map the full extent of white helleborine and identify thinning and understory planting to enhance the biodiversity value of the plantation. The development will be built out in full accordance with the approved calculation and approved revised landscape documents and communally managed wildlife habitats will be retained for biodiversity for the lifetime of the development. The management of the open green space and landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with the approved management plan.

If, despite every attempt to achieve a biodiversity net gain within the application site, a shortfall in biodiversity units is identified, this will be made up through a S106 legal agreement financial contribution to off-site Council approved biodiversity net gain project at agreed rates per biodiversity/hedgerow unit.

REASON: Additional information is required to conclude the development would comply with CP50 and the NPPF, and to protect and enhance sensitive biodiversity and archaeology on the site

#### Protection during construction

7. Before any construction or other works commence, the following habitats will be securely fenced off/protected before works commence, and vehicles, compounds, stockpiles and any construction related activities will be excluded from those protection areas throughout the construction period:

- All retained semi-improved grassland (i.e. grassland within area shown as Wildflower Meadow on the approved Landscape Masterplan.
- Beech tree belt along the south west boundary of the application site and the existing tree belt along the north boundary of the site with Ancient Way, including canopy and root zones as per the approved Tree Protection Plan and Method Statement
- Works should avoid/protect the scheduled ancient monument and archaeological deposits

REASON: Insufficient information provided with the application to comply with policy CP50 and the sensitive archaeology on the site and adjacent.

### Ecological Clerk of Works

8. Before construction works commence, a qualified Ecological Clerk of Works will be appointed by the applicant/developer who will attend site regularly (at least once a month) throughout the construction phase of development, documenting each visit, the advice issued as a result of the visit and the effectiveness of all ecological mitigation measures. These documents will be made available to the Council as Local Planning Authority on written request.

The Ecological Clerk of Works will:

- Undertake checks for bats, birds, herptiles, hedgehogs and dormice no more than 48 hours before vegetation is removed / felled and ensure wildlife is appropriately protected
- Ensure habitat protection fencing remains effective throughout the construction period
- Ensure retained semi-improved grassland is managed twice annually with cuttings removed off site throughout the construction period in accordance with the approved revised Soft Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan.
- Anticipate, prevent and respond to pollution that risks entering surface or ground water.

REASON: To ensure compliance with ecological protection and mitigation measures.

### Provision of Bat roosts etc

9. Before development commences, details of the location and design of integral bat roosting features, swift bricks, bee homes and hedgehog access holes in garden fencing will be submitted for Local Planning Authority approval. At least 20% of all approved dwellings/apartments will have at least one of these features. The development will be completed in accordance with the approved details, and prior to any of dwellings/apartments affected being first occupied.

REASON: To contribute to offsetting the loss of wildlife as a result of the development.

### Parking and turning areas

10. Before the relevant apartment/dwelling is occupied, the garaging/parking/cycle parking and associated turning areas associated with that apartment/dwelling shall be constructed and provided on site, and shall be maintained in perpetuity thereafter for the purpose.

REASON: In order to ensure that suitable parking and turning areas are provided on site

### Vehicular access works

11. Prior to first occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted the vehicular access onto Odstock Road shall be provided with visibility with nothing to exceed the height of 600mm above carriageway level between the carriageway edge, and a line drawn from a point 2.4 metres back along the centre line of the access from the carriageway edge, to points on the nearside carriageway edge 90 metres to the north, and 90 metres to the south.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

12. Prior to first occupation of any dwelling the ghost island right turning lane outlined on approved drawing P.1597.01 rev Y on Odstock Road including a pedestrian refuge, any

required street lighting and highway drainage alterations to accommodate the right turning lane, resurfacing of the entire width of Odstock Road over the length of the right turning lane scheme, shall all have been constructed and made permanently available for use in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of providing safe and convenient access to the development.

#### Construction Transport Management Plan

13. Prior to commencement of the development a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The Plan shall include details of construction vehicle routing, construction staff vehicle parking areas within the site, local road cleaning, and measures to prevent excessive mud and dust being deposited on the public highway. The site construction shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and road user convenience.

#### Electric Vehicle Infrastructure

14. No development shall commence on site until a scheme of Ultra Low Energy Vehicle infrastructure has been submitted to the LPA. The scheme must be approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to implementation and thereafter be permanently retained.

Reason: Core Policy 55; Development proposals, which by virtue of their scale, nature or location are likely to exacerbate existing areas of poor air quality, will need to demonstrate that measures can be taken to effectively mitigate emission levels in order to protect public health, environmental quality and amenity.

#### Contaminated Land

15. No development shall commence on site until an investigation of the history and current condition of the site to determine the likelihood of the existence of contamination arising from previous uses (including asbestos) has been carried out and all of the following steps have been complied with to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority:

- Step (i) A written report has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority which shall include details of the previous uses of the site and any adjacent sites for at least the last 100 years and a description of the current condition of the sites with regard to any activities that may have caused contamination. The report shall confirm whether or not it is likely that contamination may be present on the site and the potential impact of any adjacent sites.
- Step (ii) If the above report indicates that contamination may be present on, under or potentially affecting the proposed development site from adjacent land, or if evidence of contamination is found, a more detailed site investigation and risk assessment should be carried out in accordance with DEFRA and Environment Agency's "Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination CLR11" and other authoritative guidance and a report detailing the site investigation and risk assessment shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.



Step (iii) If the report submitted pursuant to step (i) or (ii) indicates that remedial works are required, full details must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing and thereafter implemented prior to the commencement of the development or in accordance with a timetable that has been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority as part of the approved remediation scheme. On completion of any required remedial works the applicant shall provide written confirmation to the Local Planning Authority that the works have been completed in accordance with the agreed remediation strategy.

Reason: Core policy 56, To reduce the risks associated with land contamination

#### Acoustic report

16. Prior to commencement of development an acoustic report shall be submitted to the LPA for approval in writing prior to implementation. The report shall demonstrate that the internal and external amenity standards of BS8233:2014 *Guidance on sound insulation and noise reduction for buildings (or any subsequent version)* and WHO *Guidelines for Community Noise* (1999) can be achieved within the development. The report must include full details of any scheme of mitigation required to achieve this which if approved must be implemented in full and maintained in that way in perpetuity.

REASON: In the interest of amenity

#### Protection of amenity during construction

17. Notwithstanding the submitted CEMP December 2019, no construction or demolition work shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or outside the hours of 0800 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.

REASON: In the interest of amenity

18. Notwithstanding the submitted CEMP December 2019, prior to commencement of the development a revised Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The revised Plan shall include additional/revised details of:

- Working hours – to match that stipulated by this consent
- No idling of engines of lorries whilst waiting outside the site
- Details of any on site generators and their locations
- An external lighting plan and positions on site
- Details of piling – must be continuous flight auger piling wherever possible
- Show how the works will avoid/protect the scheduled ancient monument and the archaeological deposits
- Show how the works protected the tree belts along the south and northern boundaries of the site and the sensitive ecology

The site construction shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan.

Reason: In the interests of amenity

### Archaeology

19.No development shall commence within the area indicated by the approved plans until:

- a) A written programme of archaeological investigation, which should include on-site work and offsite work such as the analysis, publishing and archiving of the results, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority; and
- b) The approved programme of archaeological work has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Regards a) above, this relates to the areas identified by the exploratory archaeological investigation and that will be impacted by the proposed development. This will include areas of the prehistoric field systems and enclosures identified by the exploratory trial trenching in the area of residential development, the trackway that lies along the proposed access road, and areas closest to the Saxon cemetery to ensure that any outlying graves are identified and recorded.

REASON: To record and advance understanding of any heritage assets to be lost and to make this evidence publicly accessible.

### Drainage

20.Notwithstanding the drainage details submitted as part of this application, no development shall commence which would involve or relate to drainage provision until a scheme showing the following:

- a) the results of infiltration test; and
- b) confirmation that all finished floor levels are shown to be above the maximum predicted 100 year flood level, and
- c) confirmation that each relevant household will be informed of its responsibility for the maintenance and protection of any sustainable urban drainage systems within its curtilage.

has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme/details.

REASON: In the interests of achieving sustainable drainage

## **INFORMATIVE**

### Archaeology

As the applicant/developer is aware, the site contains sensitive archaeology. Consequently, appropriate care needs to be taken when developing this site.

The programme of archaeological work should comprise the following elements:

- i) Prior to the commencement of development, the detailed archaeological investigation of areas of archaeological interest identified by the exploratory archaeological investigation and

that will be impacted by the proposed development. This will include areas of the prehistoric field systems and enclosures identified by the exploratory trial trenching in the area of residential development, the trackway that lies along the proposed access road, and areas closest to the Saxon cemetery to ensure that any outlying graves are identified and recorded. The programme of archaeological fieldwork may also include archaeological monitoring during development and landscaping works.

ii) A programme of assessment, analysis, reporting, and publication that is commensurate with the significance of the archaeological results. The condition will not normally be fully discharged until this element of the programme of archaeological work has been satisfactorily completed.

Appropriate measures should also be put in place to ensure that the 'area of archaeological interest' that is to be preserved in situ and that part of the Scheduled Monument that lies within the red line boundary are not subject to any construction activities, such as temporary soil bunds, temporary compounds or access routes, or similar, during the course of the development. The measures should comprise part of the Construction Environment Management Plan.

#### Acoustic report

In discharging this condition the applicant should engage an Acoustic Consultant. The consultant should carry out a background noise survey and noise assessment according to BS8233: 2014 (or any subsequent version) and demonstrate that internal and external noise levels will not exceed the guideline noise levels contained in Section 7.7 (table 4) of BS8233:2014. The report should also demonstrate that internal maximum noise levels in bedrooms will not normally exceed 45dB LAmax between the hours of 23:00 and 07:00.

#### Biodiversity Net Gain

The biodiversity Metric Calculation should be undertaken in accordance with the latest metric made available by Natural England or a metric otherwise approved by the Local planning Authority. Please mark up changes to the Soft Landscape Management and Maintenance Plan and the Soft Landscape Specification as tracked changes to reduce time handling discharge of condition application.