

SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 7 FEBRUARY 2019 AT ALAMEIN SUITE, CITY HALL, MALTHOUSE LANE, SALISBURY, SP2 7TU.

Present:

Cllr Fred Westmoreland (Chairman), Cllr Richard Britton (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr Christopher Devine, Cllr Jose Green, Cllr Mike Hewitt, Cllr Sven Hocking, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr Ian McLennan and Cllr John Smale

Also Present:

Cllr Richard Clewer

1 **Apologies**

There were none.

2 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2018 were presented.

Resolved:

To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes.

3 **Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

4 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

5 **Public Participation**

The committee noted the rules on public participation.

6 **Planning Applications**

18/10244/FUL - Kiln Close, Whaddon, SP5 3HEPublic Participation

Nigel Lilley spoke in support of the application

Mr Cope (applicant) spoke in support of the application

Elaine Hartford spoke on behalf of Alderbury Parish Council

The Senior Planning Officer, Warren Simmonds presented the application which was for a new dwelling with integral garage for access.

The Officer drew attention to late correspondence which had been circulated at the meeting. This detailed a representation of objection from S Stephens.

There were no consultee or Highways objections apart from drainage, which could be overcome with conditions. The Parish Council had objected.

The application was recommended for approval with conditions.

The Members had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officer, where it was clarified that the distance from Kiln Close Road to the base of the embankment was approximately 7 to 8m. The blue line denoted the land in ownership of the applicant, and the red line was the development site, and curtilage if approved.

The proposals include cutting into the embankment to approximately the half way point. The exposed section would be supported by a retaining wall. The excavation only related to what was necessary for the proposed building, the remaining embankment either side of the property would remain.

If there was a covenant in place over building on the land, that would be a private civil matter, not a material planning consideration either way.

The road was privately owned and the use of it was also be a private or civil matter.

Height of embankment, versus the building. I climbed on that yesterday, so any building above the embankment will be above the other houses – The ground level of the proposed house is similar to the other houses around it. Similar height above ground level to other similar houses.

An ecological report was carried out in October 2018, which recorded a single site, and it was not believed there would be any impact. No signs of badgers. Dormice survey recommended.

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

Alderbury Parish Council had objected to the application on the basis that the proposals were out-keeping and did not sit comfortably in the plot. The property would overlook those opposite. The site was shown at risk on Environment

Agency mapping. Kiln Close was private, maintained by residents and not suitable for heavy plant movement.

A covenant had been made in 2003 by the previous owner, that the land at the back of the 6 plots was only to be sold if all 6 agreed. The embankment was a haven for wildlife including the protected dormouse.

The Division Member Cllr Britton then spoke in objection of the application, noting that Kiln close was a small attractive development with modest sized properties. It was a pity that the covenant could not be taken into account. This was a narrow and thin plot and the proposals included an uncomfortable erosion of the bank. Quite out-keeping with the size of the other properties of area and abuts straight on to the road.

The brick retaining wall to the rear of the property must be a considerable wall in order to retain the embankment this would be in itself an alien feature. The sloping nature would continue either side of the property. This was shoe horning a large dwelling in to the plot.

Cllr Britton then moved the motion of refusal against Officer recommendation, on the grounds of overdevelopment, alien features of retaining wall, and visual impact. This was seconded by Cllr Devine.

A debate followed where they key issues raised included that the proposal would involve vast lorry movements to move the earth from the bank. It could be considered as overdevelopment, and would destroys the current streetscene.

There were other examples of similar developments in other areas, where it sat quite well. Kiln Close was a cul-de-sac, and the proposal was for one property only.

The end gable would butt right onto the road, right at the entrance to Kiln Close, which would be an overbearing element on the entrance on that close.

The Committee then voted on the motion of refusal.

Resolved

That application 18/10244/FUL be Refused for the following reason:

The proposed development would constitute an overdevelopment of the narrow, linear plot that, by reason of the necessary retaining wall(s) and excavations required, would introduce a conspicuous and alien feature into the site and would be out of keeping with the existing character of the surrounding area. In these respects the proposed development is considered discordant with the aims and objectives set out with Core Policy CP57 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy.

8 **18/10741/VAR - Caddens, Barbers Lane, Homington, SP5 4NG**

Public Participation

Stephen Gledhill spoke on behalf of Coombe Bissett Parish Council

The Planning Officer, Joe Richardson presented the application which was for the variation of condition 2 of planning permission 18/00525/VAR to allow for amended design including insertion of window to west elevation and additional rooflight to bedroom 5 (18/10741/VAR).

The site had an extensive planning history which had seen the building evolve.

It was noted that a site visit had taken place earlier in the day.

The recent planning appeal decision was attached to the report at appendix 1, in which the Inspector had allowed the garage roof to be linked to the house. It also mentions that it was appropriate that condition 2 of the planning condition should be treated as the starting point, with no need for the windows to be fixed shut, and questioned the Council's condition for obscure glazing.

There were no objections from Highways and no comments from the Conservation Officer.

The application was recommended for approval with conditions.

The Members had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officer, where he was asked how many retrospective applications the Council received were refused. The Officer did not have the answer to hand and would provide one to the Committee following the meeting.

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

Coombe Bissett Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. Asking the Committee to refuse the variation, due to the impact of the very large dwelling on the small patch of land and the loss of privacy.

He urged the Committee to take into context the history of the development and the previous refusals and the appeal decision.

The Parish Council felt that the unscrupulous developer had made a mockery of the planning system, noting that the development was now larger than the size of the original one refused. He asked that the development not be permitted to go ahead with film on the glass.

The Division Member Cllr Clewer then spoke on the application, noting that the previous decision could not be changed, however this variation asks for 2 further windows which restrict the privacy of neighbours further, and had caused strong feeling in the community. He argued that it would increase the amount of

overlooking, noting that retrospective planning applications were not helpful. Dealing with whether the neighbouring amenity is further damaged.

Cllr Hewitt then moved the motion of refusal against Officer recommendation, on the grounds of overlooking, with a condition for the windows to be properly obscured glass, and not film. Noting that the Committees original decision that this was far too big for the site was correct. This was seconded by Cllr Hocking.

A debate followed where they key issues raised included that the Planning Inspector had overturned previous refusals.

The site visit had been beneficial. The damage has been done with the volume of build on this site. There were a number of houses that were not much different to this one. Understanding for the local community's view, unfortunately they would have to live with it, as the Inspector had approved it.

To see out of the roof window, someone would need to stand on a raised platform. If the window was obscured, it could still be opened.

The Committee then voted on the motion of refusal. The motion was not carried.

Cllr Westmoreland then moved the motion of approval, this was seconded by Cllr McLennan.

The Committee then voted on the motion of approval.

Resolved

That application 18/10741/VAR be Approved with conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

**DWG No: 216083/01 Rev B Site Location Plan and Proposed Block Plan
Date Received 29.11.18**

**DWG No: 216083/04 Rev F Proposed Ground Floor and First Floor Plan
Date Received 29.11.18**

**DWG No: 216083/08 Rev A Proposed Second Floor Plan Date Received
29.11.18**

**DWG No: 216083/06 Rev F Proposed Side Elevations and South Elevation
Section Date Received 29.11.18**

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

2. The development hereby permitted shall be demolished and all materials resulting from the demolition shall be removed within 56 days of

the date of failure to meet any one of the requirements set out in i) – iii) below:

i) Within 2 months of the date of this decision the following details relating to the construction of the development hereby permitted shall have been submitted for the written approval of the Local Planning Authority:

- a. specification of the roofing materials;
- b. construction of a sample panel of the proposed brick, mortar colour and pointing finish (in Flemish Bond), which is to be left on site throughout the works as a reference panel;
- c. a section drawing of the brick string course to be added to the front elevation of the dwelling;
- d. a section drawing at a scale of 1:5 showing the profile and means of fitting of the rainwater goods;
- e. details of lintels, which shall be pre-fabricated gauged bricks 4 course deep;
- f. details of window cills on the front elevation which shall be constructed from Bath stone and stooled; and
- g. details of the render to be used on the external elevations, which shall be a soft render, and will not feature a bell mouth detail.

(ii) If within 5 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or fail to give a decision within the prescribed period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.

(iii) If an appeal is made in pursuance of ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted scheme shall have been approved by the Secretary of State.

REASON: The development shall be carried out in accordance with the details to be approved in accordance with the requirements of this condition.

In the event of a legal challenge to this decision, or to a decision made pursuant to the procedure set out in this condition, the operation of the time limits specified in this condition will be suspended until that legal challenge has been finally determined.

3. The additional rooflight within the eastern roofslope as shown in approved plan DWG No: 216083/08 Rev A Proposed Second Floor Plan Date Received 29.11.18 serving bedroom 5 shall retain the obscure glazing in perpetuity.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

4. Prior to the first use of the rooms served by: the rooflight in the eastern elevation; the rearmost of the rooflights in the western elevation; and the first floor windows in the western elevation, as shown on drawings 216083/04E and 216083/06E, the previously mentioned windows shall be

fitted with obscure glazing and thereafter the obscure glazing shall be retained.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

5. The garage hereby permitted shall not be used until the first five metres of the access, measured from the back edge of the carriageway, has been laid with a consolidated surfaced. The access shall be retained as such thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

6. The garage hereby permitted shall not be used until the access, turning area and parking spaces have been completed in accordance with the details shown on the approved plans. The access, turning area and parking spaces shall be retained for the purposes of parking and vehicle manoeuvring at all times thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

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), the garage hereby permitted shall not be converted to habitable accommodation.

REASON: To secure the retention of adequate parking provision and to limit the residential conversion of the garage space, in the interests of highway safety and amenity.

8. Works associated with the construction of the development hereby permitted shall only take place between the hours of 08:00 to 17:00 from Mondays to Fridays and between the hours of 08:00 to 13:00 and on Saturdays. No construction works associated with the development hereby permitted shall take place at any time on

Sundays and on Bank or Public Holidays.

REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of noise and activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

18/11174/FUL - Former Lloyds Bank, Mere, BA12 6DP**Public Participation**

Dan Wilden spoke in support of the application

John Jordan spoke on behalf of the Parish Council

The Senior Planning Officer, Warren Simmonds presented the application which was for Conversion of existing bank to create three 1 bed and one 2 bed flats with parking.

The building was not listed; however, it was next to a listed building, and it was in a conservation area.

As part of the development, a modern rear extension would be removed and replaced with a low wall to improve visibility.

A small outbuilding adjacent to parking space number 5, had an external door. It was confirmed that the allocation of space number 5 would be tied to the ownership of the outbuilding.

No third party representations had been received and there were no objections from the Conservation Officer.

In respect of the marketing and disposal of the building, Cllr Jeans had informed the Officer that it was his belief that this had not been carried out correctly.

The former use of the building as a bank was A2 use. Rural facilities that benefit rural communities should be retained for community use, how relevant that was, is a matter for debate.

The application was recommended for approval with conditions.

The Members had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officer, where it was clarified that the development allowed for one parking space for the double one-bedroom apartments.

Whilst Officers had been made aware that a representation had been made to Cllr Jeans, no representation had been submitted to the Planning Authority. As such it would have to be treated as unsubstantiated.

During marketing of the Bank, there had been an amount of interest, however this had not been commercial. And only for residential. The marketing process had been carried out.

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

Mere Town Council spoke on the application, noting that Mere was not a large town and there were not many employment opportunities so people did have cars. These apartments were all double bedroom, it was likely that 5 parking

spaces would not be sufficient. The site was right in the centre of Mere, and the area was already completely burdened with vehicles. It would add to a big problem that was already present. If the bins were in the car park area it would cause issues on collection day. A development of just 2 apartments would have been better for this site.

The Division Member Cllr Jeans then spoke in objection of the application, noting that the applicant had stated that a marketing exercise was conducted. It states "Lloyds Bank in The Square, Mere closed for business on 24th September 2017.

A national agency, CBRE, were asked to market the site for the bank to dispose of it, and a brochure was circulated to more than 1000 agents and clients and also appeared online. This marketing process commenced on 25th September 2017. CBRE confirmed that they had an amount of interest but all from residential developers and none from commercial operators at all.

I question this when I am aware of a significant applicant regarding the Mere area, this being our local dentist who claimed he offered more than the guide price and in effect was not entertained by the selling agent. I know of another similar case where commercial activity was not welcome, however because of commercial sensitivity I cannot give the information in public and may be not at all.

I supplied details to the Planning Officer of our local dentist experience; the dentist had given me permission to air this in public today. Apparently, we as Wiltshire Council take the word of the applicant when a marketing exercise is conducted regarding commercial interest, unless someone challenges it. As explained, in my opinion it is difficult to challenge a commercial marketing exercise in public and indeed sometimes in a lesser public environment. However, I have brought this to your attention.

One of the 5 offered parking spaces is next to the out buildings access door, is this access door going to be in the control of the person who will have the adjacent parking space? If not, I cannot see how it can be a valid car parking space, because of the obstruction caused by the parked vehicle. The door to the shed is not shown on the plan, is it to be blocked and if so how will the building be accessed.

Smaller properties like these proposed, will have some trade vehicles brought home, and when a van is parked in the 1st car parking space, the visibility into a busy small road would be obstructed, and require a tight manoeuvre to exit. These vehicles will often be reversing out, where is the turning space?

When this building was a bank, customers or staff made little use of the buildings car park, which was now being considered for 5 parking spaces. Customers walked or used spaces in and around the Square freed up by residents going to work or going out. Mere already has around 50 properties that have no or insufficient parking and live near Mere Town Square. About 25 of these were flats some of whose residents had trade vehicles. The Old Ship

Hotel was also being developed, again with local knowledge I know more overspill will result.

Mere has little public transport and none to some local destinations. Vehicles are part of the rural seen in Mere, they are needed for work and everyday transport, for instance hospital appointments.

In the evenings North Street and nearby roads are almost impassable for parked vehicles, as explained some are trades vehicles, taking up much of the road. Parking has become so severely oversubscribed; Mere Town Council have set up a committee to look into the parking problems we have.

A resident has attended to represent those living in or near Mere Square and The Town Council Chairman. Wiltshire has gone against Highways recommendations before armed with local knowledge, I hope you will support me to refuse this and maybe at your discretion, question the marketing exercise.

Cllr Jeans then moved the motion of refusal against Officer recommendation, on the grounds of overdevelopment. This was seconded by Cllr Dalton.

A debate followed where they key issues raised included that there was no documented evidence to support the accusation that marketing was not carried out correctly.

The proposals were not for a new build, the development in the built environment was the same.

Highways had not registered any objections on parking grounds and the development met the current requirements on parking.

A similar building which had previously been a bank in Amesbury had sat empty for a long time. Buildings like these large banks did not transfer very well into a shop. The solution for the bank in Amesbury was a nightclub.

The view of the Town Council was recognised, that there were problems with parking, however the development included parking spaces for all of the apartments.

The Committee then voted on the motion of refusal. The motion was not carried.

Cllr Westmoreland moved motion of approval. This was seconded by Cllr Hewitt.

Resolved

That application 18/11174/FUL be Approved with 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:

**DRG No. 8980/200 dated November 2018, as submitted to the local planning authority on 23.11.18, and
DRG No. 8980/201 dated November 2018, as submitted to the local planning authority on 23.11.18**

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

3. Notwithstanding the approved drawings, no works shall commence with respect to the relevant details, until details of the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

(i) Large scale (1:10) section details for the two new doors within the front south elevation

The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission

4. No development shall commence on site until details of the works for the disposal of sewerage including the point of connection to the existing public sewer have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be first occupied until the approved sewerage details have been fully implemented in accordance with the approved plans.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission

5. 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, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first occupied until surface water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: The application contained insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission

6. No railings, fences, gates, walls, bollards and other means of enclosure development shall be erected in connection with the

development hereby permitted until details of their design, external appearance and decorative finish have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the development being occupied.

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

7. 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, and the marked out. These areas shall be maintained for those purposes at all times thereafter.

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision is made for parking within the site in the interests of highway safety.

8. No part of the development shall be first occupied until the existing outbuilding has been removed and new walling provided, and visibility splays shown on the approved plans have been provided with no obstruction to visibility at or above a height of 600mm above the nearside carriageway level. The visibility splays shall be maintained free of obstruction at all times thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

10 **18/11534/FUL - 138 Winterslow Road, Porton, SP4 0JX**

Public Participation

Ben Diffey spoke in support of the application

Den Taylor spoke in support of the application

The Senior Planning Officer, Georgina Wright presented the application which was for Extension and renovation of 1950's chalet bungalow to form a family home (Resubmission of 18/08676/FUL). The application was recommended for refusal.

The proposed design was similar to the 2 storey neighbour on one side, but would be significantly larger in plan form, out of proportion and rendered, not brick.

There were no consultee objections.

The Members had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the Officer, where it was clarified that the difference in ridge height between the proposed development and the neighbouring property on the left was 0.25m.

The Officer explained that the application had been called to Committee as it had originally started in March 2017 with a pre-app, since then, it had been changed 5 times. These changes had altered the scheme significantly however,

not enough to recommend approval. She noted that the applicant required a large development, and felt it would be better for the current scheme to be considered by Committee and if not approved for a new scheme to be produced.

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

The main points raised included that the proposed development was not as large as some other properties along the road, with numbers 130 and 124 of similar styles.

The Division Member Cllr Hewitt then spoke in support of the application, noting that the former owner of the bungalow was an elderly single resident, and now the property did not meet the needs of the new owners who had a modern family.

The development would allow for a family home which would be of a far superior appearance to what was currently there. There were no objections from the Parish Council or anyone else, and parking is provided.

Cllr Hewitt then moved the motion of approval against Officer recommendation. This was seconded by Cllr John Smale.

A debate followed where the key issues raised included that the plot was narrow, however there were no objections from neighbouring properties.

The current bungalow was the only property which had not been developed. The extensions would leave very little of the existing house though so it was considered to be a replacement dwelling rather than extensions. Next door had set the precedent.

The development was large, however the plot was adequate enough for it. This house will accommodate people in later life as it is accessible throughout.

The Committee then voted on the motion of approval.

Resolved

That application 18/11534/FUL be Approved with conditions:

- 1. WA1 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. WM13 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:**

Application Form & Certificate

Ref: OS Location Plan. Received – 29.11.2018

Ref: B3087 01c – Proposed Floor Plans & Elevations. Received – 29.11.2018

Ref: B3087 03a – Site Plan. Received – 29.11.2018

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

- 3. WB1 No development shall commence above slab level 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: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.

- 4. WM1 No development shall commence on site until details of the proposed ground floor slab levels have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved levels details.**

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, in the interests of visual amenity

- 5. WC1 No development shall commence on site until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the details of which shall include:**

- finished levels and contours;**
- site sections showing how the development will sit on the site/rising ground**
- means of enclosure;**
- car park layouts;**
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;**
- all hard and soft surfacing materials;**

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 ensure a

satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

6. **WC2** All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner; All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

7. **WD20** No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the parking area shown on the approved plans has been consolidated, surfaced and laid out in accordance with the approved details. This area shall be maintained and remain available for this use at all times thereafter.

REASON: To ensure that adequate provision is made for parking within the site in the interests of highway safety.

8. **WE 1** 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 dwelling house 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.

9. **WE5** 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 window, dormer window or roof light, other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted in the eastern or western elevations of the development hereby permitted.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

10. **WE12** Before the development hereby permitted is first occupied the first floor windows in the eastern and western elevations (which are shown on Plan Ref B3087 01c to serve bathrooms/ensuites), shall be glazed with obscure glass only, to an obscurity level of no less than level 5 and the windows shall be maintained with obscure glazing in perpetuity.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

11. **WE14** The flat roof area of the development hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

12. No construction or demolition work involved in the development hereby approved shall take place on Sundays or Bank/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 amenity

11 **Planning Appeals and Updates**

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

Mike Wilmott, Head of Development Management, gave an update on the Five-Year Land Supply.

12 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items

(Duration of meeting: 3.00 - 5.50 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