Date of Meeting	26/05/11			
Application Number:	S/2011/0288			
Site Address:	78 Lower Road Salisbury SP2 9NJ			
Proposal:	Replace existing front wall with gated wall and dropped kerb			
Applicant/ Agent:	Dr Christopher Cochrane			
Parish:	SALISBURY CITY COUNCILFISH/BEM VILL			
Grid Reference:	412494 130493			
Type of Application:	FULL			
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:		
Case Officer:	Charlie Bruce-White	Contact Number:	01722 434682	

### REPORT TO THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

The application is made by a Wiltshire Councillor and representations objecting to the application have been made. In such instances the Council's Scheme of Delegation requires applications to only be determined by the relevant area planning committee.

## 1. Purpose of report

To consider the above application and the recommendation of the Case Officer that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

## **Neighbourhood Responses**

2 letters of objection and 1 letter of support

# **City Council response**

None received

#### 2. Main Issues

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

- 1. Highways considerations.
- 2. Character and appearance of the area

## 3. Site Description

The site relates to the front courtyard parking area to a terrace of three dwellings on Lower Road in Lower Bemerton. The courtyard is currently accessed by a single central entrance, with brick walls fronting the road to either side.

### 4. Relevant Planning History

07/1115	Replacement of existing garage with pitched roof two-storey extension and rear porch extension, with roof terrace over, improved parking arrangements on land shared with No.'s 80 & 82 Lower Road.	AC	18.07.07
09/0560	Side and rear extensions. Amendments to access, boundary walls and parking arrangements to no's 78, 80 & 82	AC	21.07.09

## 5. Proposal

It is proposed to create a new gated access and rebuild a front boundary wall.

## 6. Planning Policy

Local Plan: policies G2, TR11

Central government planning policy: PPG13

### 7. Consultations

City Council None received

Highways Officer No objection

# 8. Publicity

The application was advertised by site notice and neighbour consultation.

2 letters of objection were received. Summary of key relevant points raised:

- The proposed gated entrance is out of character with the open courtyard layout;
- A new access in this location would be a potential hazard in relation to the bus stop;
- Would create a hazard to pedestrians due to limited visibility at the access;
- Loss of off-street parking and manoeuvring space areas within the courtyard;
- It is not clear that the applicant has a right to use the parking spaces.

1 letter of support was received. Summary of key points raised:

- Would be positive in terms of the character of the street scene;
- Would discourage illegal parking on the pavement to the benefit of highway safety.

# 9. Planning Considerations

# 9.1 Highway considerations

The Highways Officer has commented on the application as follows:

I note the proposal to provide a separate access for 78 Lower Road and that the property is currently accessed via a shared private drive. Whilst the visibility to the South at the new access will be reduced in comparison to the existing shared access, pre-application advice was provided to the applicant, which confirmed that, in view of the traffic calming effect of onstreet parking and the general standard of the road, it would be acceptable to create a new access in this location.

Consequently no objection was raised subject to a condition concerning the surfacing of the new access.

Concern has been expressed by objectors that the new access would be created onto the highway at a location where a bus stop exists. However, the Highways Officer has confirmed that this is unlikely to present a safety concern.

With regards to parking provision, the resulting arrangement would include 2 spaces as well as a garage, which would comply with the parking standards set out in the Local Plan (as well as the parking strategy set out within the Wiltshire Local Transport Plan 2011-2026).

## 9.2 Character and appearance of the area

It is not considered that the character of the streetscene would significantly alter as a result of the new access arrangement, which would be gated with a pair of timber gates the same height as the existing wall, and it is noted that this is a similar arrangement to the neighbouring property at Nadder House. The rebuilt wall would be to the same height and with similar red bricks as existing.

### 10. Conclusion

The proposed access alterations would be acceptable in highway safety terms and would not have a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

### 11. Recommendation

# Planning Permission be GRANTED for the following reason:

The proposed access alterations would be acceptable in highway safety terms and would not have a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore accord with the aims and objectives of the development plan and other Government guidance, having particular regard to Local Plan policies G2, TR11 and PPG13.

## And 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) The development shall only be undertaken in accordance with the following approved plans:

Plan Ref....Proposed Site Plan...

Plan Ref....Proposed Front Elevation...

Date Received....21.02.11...

Date Received....25.02.11...

Date Received....25.02.11...

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

3) The development hereby permitted shall not be first brought into use until the area that is to be regraded has been consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel). This area shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of highways safety.

Policy: G2

## **INFORMATIVE:**

The applicant is informed that it would not be acceptable for the proposed drainage of the drive/ access to discharge into an existing highway drain. However, the drainage channel at the rear of the footway would seem to discharge into an existing surface water sewer, of which the applicant is informed that approval is required from the relevant water company.