

## Strategic Planning Committee

---

### MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 26 AUGUST 2020 AT ONLINE MEETING.

#### **Present:**

Cllr Fleur de Rhé-Philippe MBE (Chairman), Cllr Christopher Newbury (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Andrew Bryant, Cllr Ernie Clark, Cllr Andrew Davis, Cllr Stewart Dobson, Cllr Sarah Gibson, Cllr Ross Henning, Cllr Carole King, Cllr Tony Trotman and Cllr Fred Westmoreland

#### **Also Present:**

Cllr Brian Dalton

---

#### 29 **Apologies**

There were no apologies for the meeting.

#### 30 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the last meeting were presented for consideration and it was;

#### **Resolved:**

**To approve and sign as a correct record the minutes of the previous meeting on 27 May 2020.**

#### 31 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

#### 32 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chair announced that if the Committee took a short break at any point, the broadcast would continue with a holding slide.

Therefore, she requested that Members and Officers did not engage in discussion during that break and that they muted their microphones.

#### 33 **Public Participation**

The Chairman detailed the procedure for the meeting and the procedures for public participation which were set out at item 5 of the agenda.

Public Participation

Ian Jewson (Agent) provided a statement in support of the application.

Lee Burman, Development Management Team Leader presented a report which recommended that permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in the original report to Committee and completion of a S106 Planning Obligation which had subsequently been agreed in draft form. With the dual recommendation that if the applicant failed to complete the planning obligation in the draft form as now agreed and within 3 months of the resolution, or an extended timeframe to be agreed with the Committee Chair and Vice chair if necessary, that the application be refused. (This was updated in agenda supplement 2 from the original officer recommendation to refuse the application.)

The proposal was for works to the existing road network to provide a new road link connecting B4069 Langley Road and Parsonage Way, including the provision of a footway/cycleway and new landscaping. Construction of new double roundabout junction on Langley Road and single roundabout on Parsonage Way. Stopping up of existing section of Parsonage Way.

The scheme sought to reorder the existing road layout in the locality and make use of the previously permitted and constructed internal haul road at the Wavin site as part of the local public road network. Two new road junctions at the western and eastern ends of the haul road/existing Parsonage Way were required to facilitate this, as were some minor improvements to the haul road as constructed. This would allow the existing Parsonage Way to be stopped up and its use changed to outdoor storage thereby creating a single, undivided site for Wavin facilitating improved site management and operation.

At the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee on 15 August 2018 the committee resolved to approve this application subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement, or to refuse the application in the event that the agreement was not completed, this was in accordance with the officer recommendation. The committee report and minutes from that meeting were contained in the agenda pack.

Several disputes had arisen since the resolution on 15 August 2018 and material considerations had arisen which meant that the wording to the refusal reason previously reported and agreed needed to be updated.

However, since publication of the agenda report talks with the applicant and their representatives had continued and the matters of dispute had been satisfactorily resolved. Therefore, the officer had changed the recommendation from refusal (as detailed in the agenda) to granting permission with conditions and completion of the S106 planning obligation based on the wording now agreed between the parties (as detailed in agenda supplement 2).

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

In response to public statements the officer stated that the Council had clarified that the agreement did not seek to override any disputed land interests and that it was purely about physical delivery of the scheme. A position had been reached where both parties were satisfied.

The Chairman then proposed a motion that the officer's recommendation to grant permission subject to conditions and completion of the s106 planning obligation as detailed in agenda supplement 2 be adopted. This was seconded by Cllr Newbury.

A debate followed where comments included that the work of applicants, agents, solicitors and officers was acknowledged. Some members were pleased that a solution had been found resulting in the amended officer recommendation to grant permission.

At the conclusion of the debate each Member was asked in turn to confirm that they had been able to hear and where possible see all relevant materials and to indicate their vote.

When each Member had voted, the Democratic Services Officer announced the decision as follows:

**Resolved:**

**To delegate authority to the Head of Development Management to grant permission subject to conditions listed in the original report to Committee dated 15/08/2018; and the completion within three months of the date of the Committee resolution of the s106 agreement / planning obligation to secure Highways provisions as agreed and engrossed as a final document as at 25/08/2020. To delegate authority to the Head of Development Management in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee to agree an extended timeframe to secure signing and completion of the agreement if that proves necessary due to land interests, COVID 19 or other factors beyond the control of the Council and applicant.**

**In the event that the applicant fails to enter into the agreement as engrossed within this timeframe, or an extended timeframe if agreed as necessary in consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Committee, refuse permission for the following reason:-**

**The proposed development without the required planning obligation fails to deliver the necessary highways works and enhancements required to secure a safe and appropriate development and the specific requirement of the Council's Strategic Planning Committee resolution not to prejudice delivery of the permitted Rawlings Green Rail bridge and thereby conflicts with Wiltshire Core Strategy (Jan 2015) CP3 CP34(ix) CP57 (ix) CP60 CP61**

**CP62; Chippenham Sites Allocation Plan (May 2017) CH2; and paragraphs 11 and 108 (b) 109 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2019) .**

35 **Salisbury Central Area Framework**

The Committee received a presentation from David Milton, Major Projects and Spatial Planning Manager on the Salisbury Central Area Framework.

The Central Area Framework (CAF) was initially in response to the Novichok incident in Salisbury in 2018. The report would update the committee on the outcome of the recovery process and subsequent consultations which helped to shape the CAF. The CAF was designed to be more rigorous, realistic and pragmatic than previous Salisbury visions and based on more credible economic testing of scenarios.

Covid had accelerated trends that the CAF had identified, for example the shift to online shopping, therefore the need to improve the offer of town centres was clear, to make a visit to the town centre a unique visitor experience. Key themes were identified as:

- Creating people friendly streets
- Improving open space and the environment
- Creating vibrancy
- Bringing out the qualities
- Identifying character areas and their roles in the city

Two stages of very robust public consultation had been undertaken in 2019 and 2020 as detailed in the report. A future highstreets bid was in to revamp the station approach. Match funding had been obtained from the LEP. Many costed strategies were in place and were ready to roll out when funding could be identified and obtained. The document had been produced in accordance with Wiltshire Council land use planning protocols. It was hoped the committee would endorse the document.

In response to councillors technical questions it was stated that it was a fairly common practise for Wiltshire Council to produce such master plans and recommend that they are endorsed and taken account of as a material consideration when considering planning applications, for example the document produced regarding housing for Army rebasing and the plan for the central Maltings. It was hoped that elements could be added to any new local plan so that there would be more weight behind the plans and policies. Regarding the lower public support for centralising car parking and increasing park and ride it was felt this was often due to residents using the car parks overnight, so rigorous consultation would be needed and alternatives provided.

No members of the public had registered to speak.

Cllr Brian Dalton, representative of Salisbury Harnham was given the opportunity to speak, stating that this had been consulted on at Salisbury Area

Board on several occasions. Cllr Dalton wished to advise the committee regarding the people friendly streets scheme that was soon to be introduced in Salisbury. The scheme had been amended by Wiltshire Council as a result of public feedback. Cllr Dalton was concerned regarding the timing of this as schools would be going back, major roadworks were to be completed on the A338 and the new scheme implemented. He felt that public opinion on this project was split.

In response the officer stated that the scheme soon to be implemented in Salisbury was completely separate to the CAF. That was in response to government funding provided to respond to the Covid crisis.

The Chair then proposed a motion that the Salisbury Central Area Framework, as presented, and subject to any other minor alterations required to improve its clarity, was:

- Recognised as an evidence-based document to inform the Local Plan Review, emerging Salisbury Neighbourhood Plan and future planning guidance; and
- Endorsed as a material consideration in the making of planning decisions.

This was seconded by Cllr Newbury.

A debate followed where comments included that there were real worries regarding the effects of reducing car usage in city centres as the old and vulnerable needed their cars. Others felt that this was a strategic document and design guide, the details would occur in individual applications that came to committee and could be debated at the point, but the CAF in general was worth endorsing. Some felt that town centres were changing and had to adapt. The committee commended officers on the hard work taken to produce the documents for the CAF.

At the conclusion of debate each Member was asked in turn to confirm that they had been able to hear and where possible see all relevant materials and to indicate their vote.

When each Member had voted, the Democratic Services Officer announced the decision as follows:

**Resolved:**

**That the Salisbury Central Area Framework, as attached at Appendix A, and subject to any other minor alterations required to improve its clarity, was:**

- **Recognised as an evidence-based document to inform the Local Plan Review, emerging Salisbury Neighbourhood Plan and future planning guidance; and**
- **Endorsed as a material consideration in the making of planning decisions.**

36 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 10.30 am - 12.00 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Tara Shannon of Democratic Services, direct line 01225 718352, e-mail [tara.shannon@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:tara.shannon@wiltshire.gov.uk)

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