

SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 26 JULY 2018 AT ALAMEIN SUITE, CITY HALL, MALTHOUSE LANE, SALISBURY, SP2 7TU.

Present:

Cllr Fred Westmoreland (Chairman), Cllr Richard Britton (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr Matthew Dean, Cllr Christopher Devine, Cllr Mike Hewitt, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr Tony Deane (Substitute) and Cllr Robert Yuill (Substitute)

Also Present:

303 **Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

- Cllr Jose Green, who was substituted by Cllr Tony Deane
- Cllr John Smale who was substituted by Cllr Robert Yuill
- Cllr Ian McLennan
- Cllr Sven Hocking

304 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2018 were presented.

Resolved:

To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes.

305 **Declarations of Interest**

The following declarations of interest were made:

- In relation to application 17/00457/FUL, Cllr Tony Deane noted that he had worked for the same company as Mr Simon Wheeler, but had left a decade before he was director of the company. As this did not constitute an interest, Cllr Deane took part in discussion and voted on this application.

306 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

307 **Public Participation**

The committee noted the rules on public participation.

308 **Planning Appeals and Updates**

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

Resolved

That the appeals report for the period of 15/06/2018 to 13/07/2018 be noted.

309 **Planning Applications**

310 **18/00457/FUL - Court Farm, Lower Woodford, SP4 6NQ**

Public Participation

Selig Finklaire spoke in objection to the application

John Kirkman CPRE spoke in objection to the application

Joe Studholme spoke in objection to the application

Simon Wheeler Spoke in support to the application

Anthony Wells Spoke on behalf of Durnford and Woodford Parish Councils

The Senior Planning Officer, Richard Nash presented the application for an Energy Storage Capacity Mechanism Plant to support the National Grid, at Court Farm, Lower Woodford. The application was recommended for approval with conditions.

He explained that this application had been deferred twice, the first so that a site visit could be held, and the second time to received comments on the late correspondence which had been received from the applicant.

The Transport Statement showed approaches from the south of the site, using Camp Hill. It detailed that 16.5m long articulated vehicles would be used to transport materials to the site during the construction stage. A 13.5m axel crane would also be used on site. There would be approximately 252 various movements over the 15 week build phase.

Highways has commented that the existing visibility splays were sufficient for the development.

The late correspondence circulated at the meeting explained that land in private ownership could be designated as public highway.

Over 130 objections had been received and more were also included in the late correspondence.

The advice from the Fire Service as detailed in the late correspondence, could be included as a informative, if Planning Permission was granted.

The Archaeologist remained content with their advice in the main report.

Members had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officer, where it was noted that works could be carried out on the highway without the owners permission.

It was confirmed that there had not been any pre-application discussions and that there was no legal requirement for the applicant to do so.

It was understood that the applicant had looked at alternative sites, however he was not obliged to provide information on that as part of this application.

The Landscape Officer had made an assessment prior to the May meeting.

Central Government encouraged Local Authorities to support ways of energy efficiency.

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

Some of the main points covered were that almost 150 people had registered objections to the application, and that those representations highlighted concerns including the possible noise that would be generated from the site. Whilst local residents were in support of the principle of the energy plant, it was widely felt that this particular site was inappropriate, and that further investigations in to alternative sites should be considered.

However it was also noted by the applicant's representative that the application site had been chosen as it met with all requirements, and was recommended for approval by the Local Authority.

The Parish Council representative drew attention to two new pieces of information which had come to light. It was felt that the new designated access route via Camp Hill and through the village of lower Woodford was equally not viable. It was stated that there was a county monument record of a monument site which covered part of the proposed site and had not been disclosed in the report.

The Division Member Cllr Hewitt moved the motion of refusal, against Officer recommendation, this was seconded by Cllr Matthew Dean.

Cllr Mike Hewitt then spoke on the application, he noted that there was no benefit to the locals, no local work or financial benefit to the local village. He queried the flat pack status of the parts to be delivered to the site.

A noise registering 60 to 65 decibels would produce a hum at all times, in the wind that would carry a long way, despite any planting around the outside. The planting would also require adequate watering to keep the trees alive and to grow.

Light pollution would be seen, and it was not clear whether it would take a human or small animal to trigger the security lighting.

The site was pasture land used to raise sheep at this time of the year. He felt the beauty of the spot would be spoilt by these proposals.

Whichever way you bring a large lorry in would damage the trees along the road.

It has been mentioned that there were alternative sites proposed. This development could be put under the ground, but would cost much more money to do that. Have it lower so noise not carried though the valley.

The only reason to accept this application would be because it comes under government guidance for green energy. It may be a benefit to Salisbury but not to the local valley.

A debate then followed, where they key issues raised included that the consideration was a balance between the importance of the structures with the impact on the community.

The site construction traffic, would be highly inconvenient during the construction process.

There was clearly line of site between the application site and local historic views. To provide natural screening and to maintain that screening in this location would be difficult.

These battery packs were a national strategic target; however it would be more suited somewhere such as Southampton in the built up industrial area.

In the event of an appeal the LA would be invited to suggest conditions but it is at the inspector's discretion as to whether he added, changed or accepted those.

It was felt by some Members that the site was not appropriate, and there had been suggestions for alternative sites, however the application was for Court Farm, and therefore the alternative sites issue was not relevant to this committee.

The type of lighting could be restricted by use of a condition.

The Committee then voted on the motion of refusal.

Resolved

That application 18/0047/FUL be Refused, against Officer recommendation, for the following reason:

The site is located in an elevated area of open countryside, and adjacent to a public right of way. The proposal due to its nature would be of a

utilitarian, industrial appearance, of a large scale, and require security fencing and lighting.

Whilst planting is proposed that may eventually screen the development, because of its prominent siting, scale and design the development would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the site and locality, and the wider landscape. The proposal also incorporates lighting and equipment that could result in pollution at an unacceptable level. The application has not satisfactorily demonstrated how light and noise emanating from the development would be controlled.

Additionally, the application proposes access to the site for large vehicles during the construction process, via unsuitable narrow and winding roads that are further compromised by low trees and overhead wires. Such access would also be likely to require removal of planting and banking that is not within the Applicant's control and which in turn could result in a detrimental impact on visual amenity.

Furthermore, there are known important archaeological features within and adjacent to the application site, with significant potential for additional important features. The proposal has not satisfactorily demonstrated that these features will not be lost or compromised as a result of the development.

For these reasons, the proposal would be likely to have an adverse impact on the historic landscape, amenity, and highway system of the area, and consequently, would be contrary to Core Policies CP42(i), (v), (vi) & (vii), CP48, CP51, CP57(i) (iii) and (vii), CP58 (i), CP61 (ii), and CP62 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy, and saved Policy C21 (iii) (iv) and (v), as well as the guidance given in the NPPF.

311 **18/03584/FUL - Florence House, Romsey Road, Whiteparish, SP5 2SD**

Public Participation

Steve Young (agent) spoke in support of the application

Trevor King Spoke in Objection on behalf of Whiteparish Parish Council

Planning Officer Christos Chrysanthou presented the application for the erection of a 2 bay garage/outbuilding (Resubmission of 17/00444/FUL). The application was recommended for approval with conditions.

The Officer noted that the previous application had been refused in April 2017. This application differed in that the proposed garage had now moved back 1.5m away from the road, compared to its location on the previous application. The new proposal also included the planting of beech hedging to the front of the site, to provide some screening.

The Parish Council had objected to the proposal and there were two neighbour objections also.

Highways had suggested limiting the height of the proposed hedge to 600mm.

Members then had the opportunity to ask technical question of the Officer, where it was noted that the hedge on the front of the property next door was already well over 600mm in height, as there were no current restrictions in the area.

There had not been a pre-application discussion. The dimensions of the proposed garage were W 6.1m, D 5.8m, and H 4.1m to roof ridge.

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

The Local Ward Member Cllr Richard Britton moved the motion of refusal, against Officer recommendation, on the grounds of, the scale and design of the development, and the visual impact upon the surrounding area, and its relationship to adjoining properties. This was seconded by Cllr Jeans.

Cllr Britton noted that the movement back from the road of about 1m did not seem to address any of the reasons for refusal given for the previous application.

The application proposed screening, which Highways stated must be kept to 600mm, therefore it could not be accepted as screening.

He felt that this was a prominent alien feature in this road. The other garages were set back or careened from the road. The development would have a major impact on the street scene and on the adjoining property Mulberry House, which was slightly set back.

A debate then followed, where they key issues raised included, that other properties in the area which had garages, did not have them at the front.

There would be a negative impact on the neighbour, and the street scene, as this was a large 2 car garage.

The application did not differ in a way to address the reasons for refusal given last time.

The Committee then voted on the motion of refusal.

Resolved

That application 18/03584/FUL be refused against Officer recommendation for the following reason:

The development proposal is substantially the same as the previously refused scheme (LPA ref: 17/00444/FUL). The proposed garage would be

sited directly in front of the main dwellinghouse and would be readily visible in the surrounding street scene, being positioned closer to the road than the existing dwellinghouses. The proposed garage, by reason of its scale, mass and siting would be visually prominent and would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the street scene.

The proposed development is therefore considered contrary to the aims and objectives of CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework.

312 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items

(Duration of meeting: 3.00 - 5.00 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Lisa Moore of Democratic Services, direct line (01722) 434560, e-mail lisa.moore@wiltshire.gov.uk

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