

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 10TH FEBRUARY 2011
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Agenda Item 7

**Plans list Item 1 2/2010/1323/PLNG
Donhead St. Mary Parish Council**

Planning Application 2/2010/1323/PLNG

I have been instructed by Donhead St. Mary Parish Council to advise you that with regard to the above planning application, although they have no objection to the appropriate provision of a suitable site with associated amenities for gypsy/travellers, they do have the following concerns:

1. Potential increase in traffic on and onto the A30 which will exacerbate the volume of traffic generated by the nearby development of houses and the business park on the East of Shaftesbury.
2. Potential increase in crime during such local events as the Dorset Steam Fair.
3. Use of possible contaminated site.

As the proposed site is hard up against the Wiltshire border we also object to the proposal until Wiltshire Council in co-operation with Dorset County Council have jointly reviewed the proportionate need of the local gypsy/travellers community and has taken into account our concerns above. To this end Donhead St. Mary Parish Council has requested that this Proposal be called into Wiltshire Council's Southern Planning Committee and have been advised that this has been actioned."

Principal Planning Officer (Enforcement) Note:

The former Wiltshire authorities and Swindon BC had their own gypsy and traveller needs assessment (GTAA) prepared in 2006. This informed the regional spatial strategy during which process additional need for gypsy and traveller sites within Wiltshire was identified. The Council has been preparing an authority-wide Development Plan Document (DPD), which would have identified criteria for suitable sites to meet the need before identifying any specific site, however this has not been completed.

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 10TH FEBRUARY 2011
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Plans list Item 2 S/2010/1285 DEVELOPMENT OF 13 RETIREMENT HOUSES, INCLUDING PROVISION OF CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPED AREAS AT OPEN SITE BEHIND ANTROBUS HOTEL, KINGS ARMS INN AND LLOYDS BANK, SALISBURY STREET, AMESBURY, SALISBURY, SP4 7AW

1 further letter objecting to the application on the following grounds –

- 1) Still considers the density of the development to be low
- 2) Considers the suitability of the properties for the elderly in terms of wheelchair access to be poor
- 3) Insufficient parking for visitors and other people visiting the site.

Considers the development will be a 'sink estate'

Concern is still expressed about the noise that will occur from the Antrobus Hotel and the Kings Arms hotel which has a nightclub to the rear

Plans list Item 6 S/2010/1764 NEW YOUTH SERVICES AND PUBLIC PROTECTION BUILDINGS, ASSOCIATED CARPARKING AND EXTERNAL WORKS AT FORMER WILTON MIDDLE SCHOOL SITE, THE HOLLOWES, WILTON, SALISBURY, SP2 0JD

Late correspondence S/2010/1764

Representations

One additional third party objection letter has been received on highway safety grounds:

Vehicular access to The Hollows is restricted; it is a single track road with limited passing places and a blind right hand bend on the proposed entrance to the buildings. Another highways issue is the entrance to The Hollows from Waterditchampton; this is a blind road left hand turn immediately underneath the railway bridge.

The major concern for the residents is the safety of other road users and pedestrians should this application be granted. There has in past history been a fatality on The Hollows - with the increased traffic from the school being reopened and the potential for increased traffic to the Youth Services and Public Protection buildings brings with it a concern for the safety of the residents of The Hollows and other road users.

The residents firmly believe that this planning application should be rejected on the grounds that the highways infrastructure in the immediate area is insufficient for the additional level of traffic the roads will be expected to carry.

ADM Note - Wiltshire Council Highways Department have raised no objections to the application on highway safety grounds.

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 10TH FEBRUARY 2011
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

**Plans list Item 4 S/2010/1750 ERECTION OF A SINGLE THREE BED DETACHED DWELLING HOUSE AND FORMATION OF NEW ACCESS TO HIGH STREET
AT SITE NEXT TO ROSE & CROWN, HIGH STREET, BULFORD, SALISBURY, SP4 9DS**

Amendment to recommended conditions of approval (omit condition 14)

The officer report recommends condition 14 in relation to lighting the footpath. This was based on the concerns of the Parish Council and a previous suggestion of the applicant.

However, it appears that the applicant is only proposing the availability of the rear wall for a light, not the lighting itself. The applicant's proposal is that it would be installed, maintained and paid for by either Wiltshire Council or the Parish Council.

The Council's highways department has not recommended such a condition and consider that lighting is not necessary. While they would not necessarily object to the lighting, they would be unwilling to pay for it.

The cost to the applicant (and future owner) of installation, maintenance and electricity is likely to be significant. On reflection, it is considered that the imposition of condition 14 is not justified in planning terms. If no lighting is installed, while the footpath may be made slightly more gloomy, it is already dark even without the proposed development.

While the Parish Council's concerns are understood, it is not considered that the absence of lighting to the rear, and the effect on the footpath, is harmful enough to justify condition 14. This condition is therefore not now recommended.

Parish Council response

Appended in full.

**Plans list Item 5 S/2010/1713 TO DEMOLISH AND CLEAR THE EXISTING DERELICT POULTRY SHEDS, SILOS, DWELLING AND VARIOUS OUTBUILDINGS AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A REPLACEMENT DWELLING, STABLES, MÉNAGE, OFFICE BUILDING, STORAGE BUILDING, NEW ACCESS AND LANDSCAPING
AT SUMMERFIELD HOUSE, BERWICK ST. JAMES, SALISBURY, SP3 4TQ**

Letter from applicant

Appended in full.

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 10TH FEBRUARY 2011
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Reference: A: S/2010/1750/FULL dated 24 Nov 10
B: Telecon Clee/Bruce-White 5 Jan 11

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

For: Mr Charlie Bruce-White
and for: Conservation Officer - Mrs Jocelyn Sage

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

For: Mr Richard Romero

HIGHWAYS

Please pass to the Officer dealing with this application

VERY STRONG OBJECTION

Reasons :-

1. Over-Development of a very small and eccentrically shaped site

- a. The proposed structure would dominate and overshadow the Public Footpath (Bulford ROW 6) that borders the site. This Footpath already tends to be dark and over-shadowed and, as such, frequently attracts acts of hooliganism. This proposed development would exacerbate the problem.
- b. The proposal affords no facility for the turning of motor vehicles on site other than by mechanical means. Since this method of turning is relatively cumbersome, inevitably this would degenerate into the reversing of vehicles in or out of the site, via the site entrance, onto the main road (A3028 - The High Street). The recent development of the road junction with the A303 at Folly Bottom, has resulted (and continues to result) in ever-increasing use of the A3028 by vehicles of all shapes, sizes, and weights and this difficult situation would be compounded by the entrance and exit of vehicles from the site, further complicated by lorry deliveries to the immediately adjacent vehicular entrance to the Public House.
- c. The site, in its entirety, is closely overlooked by the immediately adjacent Public House.
- d. At present, the site serves as a small, green buffer in the centre of a fairly closely developed area; to fill it in a wanton way with this sort of development would be entirely detrimental to the area and its surroundings.

2. Design

The proposed structure is reasonably orthodox in architectural character. Nevertheless, the site lies close to the edge of the Bulford Conservation Area (and therefore subject to more than ordinary consideration) and, since it immediately borders a number of listed buildings of conventional designs appropriate to their day, it would be out of character with its surroundings.

3. Environmental Considerations

- a. The proximity of the site to the Public House and to a lesser (but not negligible extent) to the Working Men's Club raises an environmental objection - both, on occasions and in the ordinary course of events, are sources of substantial noise pollution and concentrations of motor vehicles and people. If allowed to go ahead, the proposed residential house would be a constant source of friction and complaint waiting to happen. The Rose & Crown Public House is a substantial and valuable facility in this Parish and any new development that might jeopardise the facility licence is viewed with dismay by this Council; it is the opinion of this Council (of which the Councillors have a very close grasp of the circumstances and recent events surrounding the Public House), that it would defy common sense to allow new residential development this close to a Public House and its attendant Car Park. The position would be exacerbated by the noise generated by the Public House coolers, that lie on the side of the proposed development, as does the Public

ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 13th January 2011

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 10TH FEBRUARY 2011
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

House Restaurant to which an external door has to be left open so as to serve as an immediate Fire Exit leading to a narrow path, initially running between the two properties.

b. The proximity to the large and very busy Murco Garage lying immediately to the east of the site raises yet another environmental objection. The comparatively recent development of this substantial Public Filling Station and Shop in the middle of a well-developed residential area, was extremely controversial at the time and only succeeded, after two public appeal proceedings. The Inspector presiding at the appeals at the time commented that, whilst an application for a substantial Petrol Filling Station would not normally be countenanced in the centre of a residential area, there were historical factors that legally could not be gainsaid; to now add to this aberration, by allowing further residential development close to this facility, makes no sense and is opposed by this Council. Apart from fumes, noise, and light pollution, the potential risk, however small, associated with substantial underground fuel storage needs to be taken into account.

4. **Lastly**, it is understood that the Conservation Officer, on this occasion, has raised no objection to this proposal. Council is at a complete loss to understand this, as her objections at the time of a previous proposal (S/2008/358 dated 22 Feb 2008), taking only those factors pertinent to the site itself and its proximity to the Conservation Area, were very closely similar to those stated above. Similarly, Environmental Health objections to previous proposals on this site appear to have been withdrawn for reasons which this Council also finds difficult to understand. The site has a history of refused applications: strong conservation and environmental objections, that, in the past, have always been put forward by the appropriate Departments in the then Salisbury District, appear to have collapsed of little short of exhaustion.

5. To conclude, it cannot be emphasised enough that Bulford Parish Council is wholly and implacably opposed to this new proposal to develop the site for residential purposes: whilst the *material considerations* are considered to be strong enough, Council considers that it would defy common sense to permit this proposed development.

(JBB Clee)
Planning Officer,
Bulford Parish Council.

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 10TH FEBRUARY 2011
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Susan Grant
Summerfield House Berwick St James, Salisbury Wiltshire SP3 4TQ

Mrs Judy Howles
Development Services
Wiltshire County Council
The Planning Office
61 Wyndham Road
Salisbury
Wilts
SP1 3AH

Dear Mrs Howles

4 February 2011

Application S/2010/1713/S73 Summerfield House, Berwick St James, Salisbury SP3 4TQ

I write with reference to the above application which I obviously support but would be grateful if you and members of the Southern Area Planning Committee would kindly take the time to read the following comments. **I believe it necessary and appropriate to comment on the Agenda Items and furthermore to correct some of the misleading comments that have been made about the application.**

1. Ref Agenda Item 9e Section 3 – Site Description – and Section 9 – Planning Considerations. The site is currently occupied by one complete timber framed poultry shed and approximately one third of another. (Part of the latter having become unsafe and removed), together with the Dutch barn and a few sundry sheds.
2. Ref Section 8 – Publicity

The Ménage has been constructed in the knowledge of the Planning Officers and is subject to a Deed of Unilateral Undertaking. It utilises an existing concrete base therefore reducing the necessity to tip material which is a condition of the existing permission.

The existing entrance is *not* currently incorrectly sited.

We are unable to demolish all chicken sheds until we have complied with planning conditions. The neighbour who suggests otherwise is mistaken. The sheds are temporarily used to store our possessions. We have no where else to put them. . Indeed if this permission is refused there will be no requirement for their demolition which nobody wants, us included.

We do not have alternative intentions for the site. The *very* few individuals in the village who are trying to assert this are just causing mischief.

The small group of campaigners are well aware that we will submit an *amendment* in view of the new position of the ménage, as are the Planning Officers with whom the *amendments* have been discussed. We have been very open about this. We have never, as one campaigner suggests: “indicated that (we) propose to apply for permission for a *more far reaching amendment* to the plans”. Again, I believe this type of suggestion is just calculated mischief.

The assertion that we have ignored all of the conditions on the planning approval is simply untrue and discussions have been held with your Officers. I have been working through the conditions and at the present time have, I believe, addressed the vast majority. (Including condition 17 – programme of archaeological work following initial visits by a professionally recognised archaeological contractor) They have been *submitted together* (and form part of a recent application) as we could not afford to submit them individually. (Over twenty at approximately £80 a submission!) - For your interest only, at the time of writing, the application has been submitted but not registered.

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 10TH FEBRUARY 2011
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

I trust the Planners and Councillors will ignore the apparent unpleasant attempt of one of the campaigners (Stephen Bush) to publically discredit my husband and our business. I am saddened and astounded that some individuals appear to have the arrogance to make their own false assertions about (amongst other things) our financial situation, our aspirations and intentions.

The Councillor's decision should not be allowed to be influenced by confusing inaccuracies and opinion which are banded about by a few vociferous individuals as though they are fact. **Some of the more wealthy and articulate members of our community may not be aware of the realities of steering a relatively new business and a young family through a recession.**

3. The reality of our situation is:

We could not afford to commence the build for economic reasons

This application is nothing more than a request for an extension of time in accord with the relevant section of the Act.

There have been no significant material alterations to planning policy since the original approval

There have been no *significant* material changes to the characteristics of the site and its surroundings that would warrant not permitting an extension of this permission..

Highways have no objection

Ordinarily this application would not have come to Committee but would have been approved under delegated powers.

It is supported by all professional officers.

(If it is not approved then the large ugly buildings on site will be permitted to stay!)

Yours sincerely

Mrs SR Grant

