

## REPORT OUTLINE FOR AREA PLANNING COMMITTEES

<b>Date of Meeting</b>	22 June 2016
<b>Application Number</b>	15/10659/FUL
<b>Site Address</b>	Ashley Common Road Malmesbury Wiltshire SN16 0HN
<b>Proposal</b>	Proposed Erection of Two Detached Dwellings & Associated Landscaping, Following the Demolition of the Existing Dwelling.
<b>Applicant</b>	Mr & Mrs C Beardsmore
<b>Town/Parish Council</b>	ST PAUL MALMESBURY WITHOUT
<b>Electoral Division</b>	SHERSTON – Cllr Thomson
<b>Grid Ref</b>	392348 186804
<b>Type of application</b>	Full Planning
<b>Case Officer</b>	Sam Croft

### Reason for the application being considered by Committee

Applications called in by Councillor Thomson for the following reasons:

- Scale of development
- Visual impact upon the surrounding area
- Relationship to adjoining properties
- Design - bulk, height, general appearance
- Car parking

### 1. Purpose of Report

To consider the above applications and to recommend APPROVAL subject to conditions.

### 2. Report Summary

Malmesbury and St Paul Without Resident's Association object to the application. 46 letters of objection were received from local residents relating to a number of consultations on revised schemes/plans.

The main issues in the consideration of this application are as follows:

- Principle of Development
- Design and Site Layout
- Impact on the locality/amenity
- Highways

### 3. Site Description

The Ashley is located off of Common Road within the defined settlement framework boundary of Malmesbury. The existing dwelling is a detached 3-bedroom bungalow with an integral single width garage. The property is located within a sizeable plot, with further parking provided on hardstanding to the front of the property, and a garden located to the rear. The application site has previously been sub-divided to allow the construction of a bungalow to the rear of Ashley, called The Birches. The Ashley and the Birches share a driveway off of Common Road.

#### 4. The Proposal

The application seeks the erection of two detached dwellings & associated landscaping, following the demolition of the existing dwelling.

Following discussions with Wiltshire Council some amendments to the plans have been made and submitted for consideration. These were mainly to address the potential overlooking issue between Plot 2 and The Birches. The proposal does however remain largely unchanged. In order to address this issue the applicant has submitted a number of revised plans which went out for consultation. The first approach sought to provide screening over the windows; however, it was considered that this would still result in a perception of overlooking even if it did diminish the actual visibility of the neighbouring property from the proposed development. The applicant subsequently submitted plans which sought to alter the layout of the first floor and further reduce overlooking by the use of obscure glazed windows and high level windows.

#### 5. Planning History

N/94/02033/OUT	Outline - two bedroom bungalow two bedroom bungalow	Approved
N/95/00561/FUL	Erection of dwelling	Approved
N/05/01733/FUL	Demolition of Existing Dwelling & Erection of Four Dwellings	Approved
15/01966/FUL	Erection of Two Detached Dwellings with Integral Garages & Associated Landscaping following the Demolition of the Existing Dwelling.	Withdrawn

#### 6. Local Planning Policy

##### National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF)

Paragraph 7, 14 and 17

Section 6 - Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes

Section 7 - Requiring good design

##### Wiltshire Core Strategy (Adopted January 2015)

CP1 - Settlement Strategy

CP2 - Delivery Strategy

CP57 - Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping

#### 7. Summary of consultation responses

St Paul Malmesbury Parish Council – Objected and raised the following concerns:

- Over development of the plot
- Impact on the adjacent property, The Birches, will result in a severe and permanent blight
- Impact of the proposal on the privacy of the neighbouring property
- The parking and egress inadequacies of the proposed development
- Highway safety

- The use of materials that hitherto have not been used or seen anywhere else on Common Road

Malmesbury & St Paul Without Residents' Association - The Association continues to have concerns about this application although it acknowledges the attempts by the applicant to address some of the significant unacceptable issues. The association wish to register their strong objection to the application on highway safety grounds.

Highways – No objection subject to conditions

Drainage – No objection

Environmental Health - As the proposal is for residential dwellings, it is unlikely to cause nuisance except possibly during the demolition and construction phase. It is accepted that there will be some noise during construction. To protect neighbours during this period, it would seem prudent to apply conditions to prohibit burning and restrict hours for noisy construction works as per the conditions below. Dust from building activities should be managed as necessary. There is nothing on the mapping layers to indicate any concerns over contaminated land for this site. Therefore, there are no concerns about this aspect.

## **8. Publicity**

Local Residents – 45 letters of objection were received from local residents across periods of consultation. The main concerns raised were as follows:

- Over development of the site
- Overlooking and loss of amenity
- Inconsistent and inaccurate plans
- Confusion over the number of windows being proposed
- Materials out of keeping with the character of the area
- Highways safety and inadequacy of the access
- The development would be overbearing
- Insufficient car parking is being proposed
- Impact on neighbouring development of excavation
- Loss of trees/hedgerow
- Proposed dwellings are out of proportion with surrounding development
- Drainage
- Right of Access

## **9. Planning Considerations**

### Principle of Development

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the 'Development Plan', unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan for this area is the Wiltshire Core Strategy (WCS) and limited saved policies in the North Wiltshire Local Plan. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is an important material consideration. The main policies considered relevant to the consideration of the principle of this development are Core Policy 1, Core Policy 2 and Core Policy 13 of the WCS and the policies of the NPPF.

The principle of the proposal is considered to comply with the settlement strategy for Wiltshire; in that the development is located within the defined settlement framework boundary of Malmesbury. It is also acknowledged that the Council cannot currently demonstrate a deliverable supply of land of housing for a 5 year period, plus requisite tolerances, although the situation is currently under review

in respect of preparation of a new Housing Land Supply Statement for 2016/2017. It is anticipated that this position will therefore change very shortly.

Given this position full weight cannot be given to policies in respect of the scale and distribution of housing under the terms of paragraph 49 of the NPPF. In the determination of planning applications, the most crucial issue to consider is whether or not the proposal accords with the relevant provisions of the development plan (the WCS). If it does not then the question of whether material considerations, including relevant policies in the NPPF, mean that permission should be granted despite conflict with policies arises. In understanding how to interpret paragraph 49 of the NPPF and what weight should be applied to policies within the WCS, the Council has relied on a number of appeal decisions in Wiltshire (Land at Arms Farm, Sutton Benger APP/Y3940/W/15/3028953 & Land to North of Holt Road and Cemetery Lane, Bradford-on-Avon APP/Y3940/W/15/3141340), and a recent court of appeal judgement that specifically examined how to apply and interpret paragraph 49 (C1/2015/0583 Suffolk Coastal District Council and Hopkins Homes Limited and C1/2015/0894 Richborough Estates Partnership LLP vs Cheshire East Borough Council First).

There are a number of important statements and points of clarity provided in the above decisions that are important to framing any discussion on this application and the degree of conflict with the WCS. Particularly relevant are the statements in the court of appeal decision, paragraphs 42 to 48 ('How is the policy in paragraph 49 of the NPPF to be applied?'), which highlight a number of key points. First, it is up to the decision maker to judge whether a plan policy is or is not a relevant policy for the supply of housing, this can include restrictive policies not necessarily related to housing specifically; however that may have the effect of limiting housing. Furthermore, the appeal court decision confirms that in their view there will be many cases in which restrictive policies are still given sufficient weight to justify the refusal of planning permission, despite their not being up-to-date under the auspices of paragraph 49. In conclusion, the appeal court decision confirms that ultimately it will be up to the decision-maker to judge the particular circumstances of each application and how much weight should be given to conflict with policies for the supply of housing that are 'out-of-date', and, that the fundamental purpose of paragraph 49 is not to punish Councils (and by extension local communities), but to provide an incentive to boost housing land supply. In this context, it is important to note that the scale of the proposed development at 2 dwellings is limited and, in the view of officers, would not significantly boost the supply of land for housing and therefore should only be given limited weight.

Importantly, the decision goes on to highlight that paragraphs 14 and 49 of the NPPF do not make 'out of date' housing policies irrelevant to the determination of applications and that the weight given to such policies is not dictated by the NPPF and will vary according to circumstances on a case by case basis. This will also depend on the extent to which relevant policies fall short of providing for the five-year supply of housing land and the action being taken by the local planning authority to address the shortfall. Currently, the shortfall is only 36 homes and there is no indication that rural areas are struggling to deliver housing. The Council has continued to promote development in the Malmesbury Community Area (which covers this site) at sustainable locations and recent committee approvals have seen further housing sites approved, subject to signing of S106 agreements overall and above those minimum indicative targets.

In both of the Wiltshire based appeal decisions the Inspectors considered that weight should be applied to Core Policy 1 of the WCS despite paragraph 49 being engaged and, in fact, in the Sutton Benger appeal the inspector applied full weight to Core Policy 1. However, following the appeal court judgement the Council agrees that Core Policy 1 must be seen and assessed in the context of paragraph 49 and cannot be considered 'up-to-date'. Nevertheless, the Council still believes that Core Policy 1 must carry significant weight in any decision making process; as the fundamental principles of the policy largely align with core planning principles of the NPPF, as set out in paragraph 17. It sets out the overarching spatial strategy for Wiltshire and, as highlighted above, the shortfall in supply is low and there is no evidence of significant unmet demand in the community area. As such, the

settlement strategy and Core Policy 1 remains fundamental and relevant to the determination of this application.

On balance it is considered given the sites location with the defined settlement framework boundary for Malmesbury and in the context of the current limited shortfall in the supply of land for housing, the principle of the development is considered acceptable. In order for the development to be considered unacceptable in this location the development would need to result in significant harm to the local character and amenity or be subject to specific site constraints sufficient to warrant a refusal.

#### Impact on the Context and Character of the Site and Surrounding Area

The proposal is for proposed erection of two dwellings following demolition of the existing dwelling known as the Ashley. It is noted that concerns have been raised by the Parish and local residents that the erection of two dwellings on the site would represent an over development of the site in question. However, it should be noted that along Common Road there would appear to be a number of developments that have result from the demolition of the existing property and the erection of a number of dwellings in the plot. The density of development on the site would appear to be less than that which has previously been permitted elsewhere in the area and is not considered to be over development of the site subject to appropriate design of the scheme.

The site is steeply inclined, rising from 50m at the road to 54m at the rear boundary. The larger of the two dwellings, on the site of the original bungalow, has been designed to take advantage of this change in site levels, with the basement built into the site so that it is fully below ground to the rear but open at the front, to allow access to the integral garage. Consequently, the ridge height of the replacement dwelling would not be significantly higher than that of the existing bungalow. It is however noted that this would result in the introduction of a number windows higher than those in the existing bungalow which have the potential to result in overlooking to neighbouring properties. This concern was raised in respect to the original submission which proposed a significant number of windows which had the potential to result in overlooking of the property to the rear know as 'The Birches'. In order to address this issue the applicant has submitted a number of revised plans which were published for consultation. The first approach sought to provide screening over the windows; however, it was considered that this would still result in a perception of overlooking even if it did diminish the actual visibility of the neighbouring property from the proposed development. The applicant subsequently submitted plans which sought to alter the layout of the first floor and further reduce overlooking by the use of obscure glazed windows and high level windows. It is considered these revisions addressed the concerns of overlooking, despite continued objection from local residents, and that it would not warrant refusal of the application

The smaller of the two dwellings would be located closer to the road and would be located entirely above ground. Due to the incline the dwelling would be positioned below the larger dwelling and would sit lower in site. In comparison to the height of neighbouring properties it is not considered that the dwelling would be out of keeping with the scale and bulk of other dwellings positioned just off Common Road. It is noted that the existing hedges and vegetation at the site are to be retained and reinforced helping to provide some screening to the development. The orientation of the dwelling does not follow the general development pattern of the area; however, there are a number of other examples of dwellings that do not face out directly onto Common Road. Furthermore, this is considered to be the only way that two dwellings could be positioned within the site without resulting in one or both of the dwellings suffering from poor levels of amenity. The onsite constraints also to some extent dictate that which is achievable on the site. The orientation of the property would mean that it would look out on the neighbouring property's access to the front and No.1 The Swinfords, which has no habitable windows facing the proposed dwelling. It is noted that concerns have been raised by residents in respect to overlooking from the first floor windows on the North

West and North East Elevations; however, as these look out over the road and the access for both the development site and neighbouring site the separation between the proposed dwelling and the nearest neighbouring properties is considered sufficient to not result in any loss of amenity as a result of overlooking.

In respect to design, the dwellings are to be finished in off white render with grey powder coated windows. The applicant originally proposed a double pitch standing metal seam roof; however, this has been changed to grey slate following comments made by local residents. Retaining walls at basement level would be finished in Cotswold stone cladding. It is noted that concerns have been raised by a number of residents about the design which is considered to be out of keeping with the area and the impact this would have. The street scene of Common Road includes a mix of dwellings of different ages and constructions. There are other examples within the street of render dwellings. Although the immediate area is dominated by brick built dwellings, there are other examples of both render and painted brick within Common Road. This is a more modern style of property and the proposed design as a whole would not appear so incongruous with the appearance of the street scene or cause any significant harm to the visual amenities of the area such that the proposals would warrant a refusal of planning permission.

#### Impact on Neighbour Amenity

The development would result in a slight decrease in the distance between the nearest and The Birches to 16m, as the existing bungalow is currently situated at an angle within the site. In addition, it is anticipated that the ridge height of the larger dwelling would only be 2m higher than that of the existing bungalow. As set out above, it is noted that the development would result in a number of windows in the rear elevation which have the potential to look out over the property; however, following a number of alterations it is considered that the scheme that is now in front of the Council would not result in a significant loss of residential amenity. The first approach sought to provide screening over the windows; however, it was considered that this would still result in a perception of overlooking even if it did diminish the actual visibility of the neighbouring property from the proposed development. The applicant subsequently submitted plans which sought to alter the layout of the first floor and further reduce overlooking by the use of obscure glazed windows and high level windows. The two new dwellings would be located to the north of The Birches, so would not result in any loss of light.

The nearest adjacent property, No.1 Swinford Paddocks, would be located 7m to the west of the larger dwelling and over 9m from the single storey aspect of the smaller dwelling and 12m from the 2 storey which is considered to be an acceptable distance given that No.1 Swinford Paddocks only has two obscure glazed windows which would face into the site. It is not considered that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the occupiers of this dwelling in terms of loss of outlook or loss of privacy. No.1 Swinford Paddocks is located to the west so it is not considered that there would be any loss of light to the property.

It is noted that one local resident has raised concerns about the impact of the erection of the dwelling and the excavation of parts of the site, specifically in relation to the driveway for plot 2 would result in a detrimental impact to their property. The driveway is located over 4m from the nearest boundary and it therefore considered unlikely that the excavation would result in any impact to the neighbouring property.

#### Highways

The Council's Highways Officer has raised no objection to the principle of the development. With regard to detail, the Council would expect the access to demonstrate that 2.4m x 43m is available in both directions. In the south west direction, this may require the hedge/vegetation to be cut back. The access should have a minimum width of 4.5m.

Car parking will need to be in accordance with the Council's car parking guidelines. The guidelines require that 3 spaces are provided for a 4 bed property and 2 spaces for a 3 bed. Having reviewed the plans the Highways officer has confirmed that this requirements are being met by the proposal with both dwellings providing two parking spaces and the larger of the two dwellings providing an additional parking space in the form of a garage which measure 6m by 5.6m.

It is noted that concerns have been raised about the impact of the development on highways safety and the level of parking being provided. The highways officer has raised no concerns in respect to these matters and accordingly the development is considered appropriate. It is also noted that some comments have been made in respect to the right of access across the land; however, this is a civil matter rather than a planning matter is not a consideration in the determination of this application.

#### Drainage

It is noted that concerns have been raised by local residents about the impact of the development in terms of drainage specifically in respect to the public foul sewer. The Council's Drainage Officer has stated that the clearances mentioned in the supporting statement and shown on the proposed plan will be required by the sewerage undertaker or will require a formal diversion agreement with them which would also require this standoff distance. This would be separate to the planning permission and an informative setting out that the applicant should note that the grant of planning permission does not include any separate permission which may be needed to erect a structure in the vicinity of a public sewer. Such permission should be sought direct from Thames Water Utilities Ltd / Wessex Water Services Ltd. Buildings are not normally allowed within 3.0 metres of a Public Sewer although this may vary depending on the size, depth, strategic importance, available access and the ground conditions appertaining to the sewer in question. Conditions have also been attached requiring the submission of foul and storm drainage details prior the commencement of development.

#### Conclusion

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 require that the determination of planning applications must be made in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Overall, it is considered that the development complies with Core Policy 1, 2, and 57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy as well as the relevant policies in the Malmesbury Neighbourhood plan. Furthermore, the development would provide public benefit in the form of boosting the supply of housing in the context of the current limited shortfall in the supply of land for housing. The addition of two dwellings, although limited, would result in a reduction to this shortfall. On balance, it is considered that the development itself would not result in sufficient harm to the character of the area or the amenity of neighbouring development to outweigh the benefits and to warrant the refusal of the application.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Planning Permission is APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- 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.

- 2 No part of the development hereby permitted shall be first occupied until the access, turning area and parking spaces have been completed in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans. The areas shall be maintained for those purposes at all times thereafter.

REASON:

In the interests of highway safety.

- 3 The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the area between the nearside carriageway edge and a line drawn 2 metres parallel thereto over the entire site frontage has been cleared of any obstruction to visibility at and above a height of 900mm above the nearside carriageway level. That area shall be maintained free of obstruction at all times thereafter.

REASON:

In the interests of highway safety.

- 4 No construction or demolition work shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or outside the hours of 07:30 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.

REASON:

In the interests of local amenity.

- 5 No burning of waste or other materials shall take place on the development site during the demolition/construction phase of the development.

REASON:

In the interests of local amenity.

- 6 No development shall commence on site until the exact details and samples of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON:

The matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, in the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

- 7 No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of foul water from the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON:

To ensure that the development can be adequately drained

- 8 The development shall not be first occupied until foul water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON:

To ensure that the development can be adequately drained

- 9 No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the site (including surface water from the access / driveway), incorporating sustainable drainage details together with permeability test results to BRE365, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON:

To ensure that the development can be adequately drained

- 10 The development shall not be first occupied until surface water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON:

To ensure that the development can be adequately drained

- 11 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending those Orders with or without modification), no development within Part 1, Classes A-E shall take place on the dwellinghouses hereby permitted or within their curtilage.

REASON:

In the interests of the amenity of the area and to enable the Local Planning Authority to consider individually whether planning permission should be granted for additions, extensions or enlargements.

- 12 The dwellings hereby approved shall achieve a level of energy performance at or equivalent to Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. No dwelling shall be occupied until evidence has been issued and submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority certifying that this level or equivalent has been achieved.

REASON:

To ensure that the objectives of sustainable development equal or equivalent to those set out in Policy CP41 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy are achieved.

- 13 No demolition, site clearance or development shall commence on site, and; no equipment, machinery or materials shall be brought on to site for the purpose of development, until a Tree Protection Plan showing the exact position of each tree/s and their protective fencing in accordance with British Standard 5837: 2012: "Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction -Recommendations"; has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and;

The protective fencing shall be erected in accordance with the approved details. The protective fencing shall remain in place for the entire development phase and until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Such fencing shall not be removed or breached during construction operations.

No retained tree/s shall be cut down, uprooted or destroyed, nor shall any retained tree/s be topped or lopped other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars. Any topping or lopping approval shall be carried out in accordance British Standard 3998: 2010 "Tree Work – Recommendations" or arboricultural techniques where it can be demonstrated to be in the interest of good arboricultural practise.

If any retained tree is removed, uprooted, destroyed or dies, another tree shall be planted at the same place, at a size and species and planted at such time, that must be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

No fires shall be lit within 15 metres of the furthest extent of the canopy of any retained trees or

hedgerows or adjoining land and no concrete, oil, cement, bitumen or other chemicals shall be mixed or stored within 10 metres of the trunk of any tree or group of trees to be retained on the site or adjoining land.

[In this condition “retained tree” means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; and paragraphs above shall completion of the development, whichever is the later].

**REASON:**

The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken in an acceptable manner, to enable the Local Planning Authority to ensure the retention of trees on the site in the interests of visual amenity.

- 11 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documentation:

P048-50 Location Plan  
P048-62 Plot 1 - Bin and Cycle Stores  
Received on 26/10/2016

P048-53 Rev A Plot 2 Basement  
Received on 23/11/2016

P048-SK51 Rev B Site Plan  
Received on 15/02/2016

P048-54 Rev A Plot 2 Ground Floor  
P048-57 Rev D Elevations - Plot 2 (Sheet 1)  
P048-58 Rev D Elevations - Plot 2 (Sheet 2)  
Received on 21/04/2016

P048-55 Rev D Plot 2 First Floor  
P048-59 Rev C Elevations - Plot 1  
Received on 10/05/2016

**REASON:**

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 12 **INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:**  
Any alterations to the approved plans, brought about by compliance with Building Regulations or any other reason must first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before commencement of work.
- 13 **INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:**  
The applicant should note that the grant of planning permission does not include any separate permission which may be needed to erect a structure in the vicinity of a public sewer. Such permission should be sought direct from Thames Water Utilities Ltd / Wessex Water Services Ltd. Buildings are not normally allowed within 3.0 metres of a Public Sewer although this may vary depending on the size, depth, strategic importance, available access and the ground conditions appertaining to the sewer in question.

14 INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

The applicant is requested to note that this permission does not affect any private property rights and therefore does not authorise the carrying out of any work on land outside their control. If such works are required it will be necessary for the applicant to obtain the landowners consent before such works commence.

If you intend carrying out works in the vicinity of the site boundary, you are also advised that it may be expedient to seek your own advice with regard to the requirements of the Party Wall Act 1996.

15 INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

Please note that Council offices do not have the facility to receive material samples. Please deliver material samples to site and inform the Planning Officer where they are to be found.

16 INFORMATIVE TO APPLICANT:

The applicant is advised that the development hereby approved may represent chargeable development under the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) and Wiltshire Council's CIL Charging Schedule. If the development is determined to be liable for CIL, a Liability Notice will be issued notifying you of the amount of CIL payment due. If an Additional Information Form has not already been submitted, please submit it now so that we can determine the CIL liability. In addition, you may be able to claim exemption or relief, in which case, please submit the relevant form so that we can determine your eligibility. The CIL Commencement Notice and Assumption of Liability must be submitted to Wiltshire Council prior to commencement of development. Should development commence prior to the CIL Liability Notice being issued by the local planning authority, any CIL exemption or relief will not apply and full payment will be required in full and with immediate effect. Should you require further information or to download the CIL forms please refer to the Council's Website

[www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planninganddevelopment/planningpolicy/communityinfrastructurelevy](http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/planninganddevelopment/planningpolicy/communityinfrastructurelevy).