

## SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

---

### DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 1 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT ALAMEIN SUITE - CITY HALL, MALTHOUSE LANE, SALISBURY, SP2 7TU.

#### Present:

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

#### Also Present:

---

#### 73 **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies were received from:

- Cllr Brian Dalton who was substituted by Cllr Peter Edge.

#### 74 **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 11 August 2016 were presented.

#### **Resolved:**

**To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes.**

#### 75 **Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

#### 76 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

Cllr Chris Devine asked for clarification on whether Central Government had repealed the requirement for new schools to have sprinkler systems.

During a Councillor briefing after the meeting Mike Wilmott, Head of Development Services, gave the following feedback in response to the above question:

The Government had issued an update to the department of education's 'Design in Fire Safety in Schools' publication which now stated that building regulations did not require the installation of fire sprinkler suppression systems in schools and therefore the governments published guidelines no longer included this expectation. The Head of Development Services pointed out that sprinkler systems were a matter for building regulations rather than planning and therefore planning conditions could not require such systems anyway, however it would still be possible as it had been before to put an informative on planning permissions for School buildings advising on the preference for installing sprinklers in School buildings should the committee wish to do so.

#### **77 Public Participation and Councillors' Questions**

The committee noted the rules on public participation.

#### **78 Planning Appeals and Updates**

The committee received details of planning appeals logged and those determined for the period 29/07/2016 and 22/08/2016.

#### **Resolved**

**That the report be received and noted.**

#### **79 Planning Applications**

#### **80 16/05522/FUL and 16/05781/LBC: Poppy Cottage, 7 High Street, Downton, Wiltshire, SP5 3PG**

#### **Public Participation**

Adam Mussell spoke in support of the application

The Planning Department Team Leader introduced the application for a 2 story rear extension to create a larger kitchen/dining and WC/utility on the ground floor and an additional bedroom at 1<sup>st</sup> floor. The application was recommended for refusal.

The Conservation Officer clarified issues detailed in the report relating to the listed buildings, these included the loss of an outshut and an eyebrow dormer, which was characteristic of buildings of this period. The design was considered unsympathetic and non traditional. The over scaled design would impact on the detached barn which was a separately listed building.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officers. It was noted that an out shut was a single story rear extension under a lean to roof, where the scullery and pantry were housed. The proposed extension was larger than the original extensions footprint.

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

Councillor Chris Devine proposed refusal as per Officer's recommendation; as he felt that the design went against what was typically expected for a listed thatched property such as this. Councillor Ian McLennan seconded the motion.

The Committee discussed the application, noting that personal circumstances were not valid planning considerations and could not be taken into account. It was also noted that the Committee had upheld the Officers view on listed building developments for much smaller scale alterations on other developments; and that this development was much greater in size and impact.

It was felt that the development design was not in line with the style of historic Wiltshire listed buildings and despite the requirements of the applicant for additional space for his family, this grade 2 listed building was not suitable for development of this style and size.

**Resolved**

**That application 16/05522/FUL be REFUSED as per the Officers recommendation for the following reasons:**

**The application dwelling is a grade II listed building located within the Downton Conservation Area. The proposed development would involve the loss of a rear outshut and will result in the creation of a two storey rear extension (with flat roof dormer). The fact that the development does not affect the public view is not a principal consideration, given that anything which affects the character of a listed building, whether visible by the public or not, has to be assessed for its long-term impact on the designated heritage asset. The development is judged to result in 'less than substantial harm' to the listed building but such harm should only be accepted where the development results in a public benefit. It is not considered there is a public benefit for this proposal. The development is considered to be contrary to Core Policy 58 of the Adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy and Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.**

**Resolved**

**That application 16/05781/LBC be REFUSED as per the Officers recommendation for the following reasons:**

**The application dwelling is a grade II listed building located within the Downton Conservation Area. The proposed development would involve the loss of a rear outshut and will result in the creation of a two storey**

rear extension (with flat roof dormer). The fact that the development does not affect the public view is not a principal consideration, given that anything which affects the character of a listed building, whether visible by the public or not, has to be assessed for its long-term impact on the designated heritage asset. The development is judged to result in 'less than substantial harm' to the listed building but such harm should only be accepted where the development results in a public benefit. It is not considered there is a public benefit for this proposal. The development is considered to be contrary to Core Policy 58 of the Adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy and Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

**80a 16/05036/FUL: Flat 1 and Flat 2, Brooks Court, 63 Castle Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP1 3RN**

Public Participation

Paul Stephens (Agent) spoke in support of the application

The Planning Department Team Leader introduced the application for a single storey extension to Flat 1, and Sun Room extension to be added to Flat 2 located above the Flat 1 extension. The proposal originally included the erection of an outbuilding for a home office for Flat 2 but this had been removed from the proposal. The application was recommended for approval.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officers. It was noted that the building was late Victorian around 1900/1910.

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

Councillor Peter Edge proposed approval as per Officer's recommendation; this was seconded by Councillor Richard Britton.

The Committee discussed the application, asking why the local Member had called it in. This information had not been included in the paperwork provided.

Following the meeting the Local Member confirmed that the reasons had been provided when she had called this application in. They were, visual impact upon the surrounding area, relationship to adjoining properties, design – bulk, height, general appearance and Neighbour concern regarding this and previous planning applications on this site, as incremental development.

**Resolved**

**That the application be APPROVED as per the Officers recommendation, with 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) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:**

**Application Form  
Drawing No. 02 Revision B  
Drawing No. 03 Revision C**

**REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**

- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the single storey extension for flat 1 and roof of the sunroom at flat 2 hereby permitted shall match in material, colour and texture those used in the existing building.**

**REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and to protect the character and appearance of the area.**

**81 16/06259/FUL: The Coach House, 63A Castle Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP1 3RN**

Public Participation

Paul Stephens (Agent) spoke in support of the application

The Planning Officer introduced the application for a rear single storey double height extension at The Coach House, 63a Castle Road, Salisbury, which was recommended for approval.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officers. It was noted that the tree preservation order detailed in the report was for a tree which had been removed following damage. The size of the proposed development had been assessed and was not felt to affect the next property. Access to the property was from Castle Road.

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

Councillor Chris Devine proposed approval as per Officer's recommendation; this was seconded by Councillor Richard Clewer.

The Committee discussed the application, noting that when the original application for the site had come to committee it was approved on the understanding that it was never meant to be anything more than a single person's house, whilst the proposed extension was appropriate, no further development of the size should be considered.

It was noted that the condition to limit the development of an inside mezzanine floor was added to enable Officers to judge the effect a first floor would have on neighbouring props, should the applicant decide at a later date to add one.

The Committee asked the Officers to look into the details of the missing tree which had been removed following damage, as it was queried that the tree preservation order may have required it to be replaced.

#### **Resolved**

**That the application be APPROVED with the following conditions:**

- 4) **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.**

- 5) **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:**

**Application Form  
Drawing No. 01  
Drawing No. 02**

**REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.**

- 6) **The brick and roof tile to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match in material, colour and texture those used in the existing building.**

**REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.**

- 7) *Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), no mezzanine or other form of internal floor to create a first floor level shall be constructed in the development hereby permitted.*

*REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.*

**82 Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items

(Duration of meeting: 6.00pm – 7.10pm)

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

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

This page is intentionally left blank