

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 05TH JANUARY 2012
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Agenda Item 7

**Plan List Item 1 S/2011/1280 – Proposed 2 storey side extension
At Court Hay, Lower Road, Charlton all Saints, Salisbury. SP5 4HQ**

Representations

1 Submission from Third Party, letter attached in full (see **Appendix 1)**

Appendix 1

⑤ LC

Planning Department

| | |
|--------------|-------------|
| Rec. | 03 JAN 2012 |
| Acknowledged | |
| Copy to | JW |
| Action | |

Rivermeade
Lower Road
Charlton All Saints
Salisbury
Wiltshire
SP5 4HQ
Telephone: (01725) 514620
Friday 30th December 2011

Wiltshire Council
Development Services
Planning Department
PO Box 2281
Salisbury SP2 2HX

Dear Mr Guest

Re: Application No: S/2011/1280/FULL

Thank you for the invitation to attend the Southern Area Planning Committee meeting (ref. above application) on 5th January 2012. We are unable to attend but would however, like our letter dated 2nd September to be reconsidered and to make clear our endorsement of support for the generated objections from the Downton Parish Council.

In summary, our objections are centred on the bulk of the design being as large as the existing dwelling. This would affect our property by the larger scale and increased quantity of windows and doors being proposed which would be within a closer proximity to our property and hence will have a major impact on our privacy and quality of living:

Size and position of rear first floor bedroom window: Although this has now been reduced, it is still a large window and will present an intrusion on our privacy. Due to the extension of the building towards our property it will provide a viewing platform, overlooking our garden.

Size of kitchen rear door – The large scale rear door(s) is not in keeping with the current format and design of the existing building. These extensive doors will generate noise disturbance and being a kitchen, generate smells from the house as they have been detailed as being only 1.8 metres from our boundary. Moving the position of the current ground floor side door and window and including an extra window will present similar disturbances by moving the exits closer to our property.

Extension proposal to exceed the current building line at the rear – this extends the existing building contours and as a result, would overshadow our property. We have a side window to our living room and extending the building line will block our light.

We would be grateful if our points raised and concerns could be considered in the meeting.

Yours sincerely

A D Parker and S C Parker

**Plan List Item 2 S/2011/1494 – Erection of a replacement dwelling and the re-establishment of Dairy Cottage as two separate dwellings
At Lower Mere Park Farm, Mere Park, Mere, Warminster. BA12 6AD**

Amended Plans

Amended plans have been received lowering the height of the proposed dwelling by approximately 800mm. The height of the portico feature to the front elevation has also been lowered and simplified in design. The amended plans have been included within the presentation slides. Whilst a modest improvement, Officers do not consider that the amended plans overcome the recommended reasons for refusal.

Urban Design Comments

The Council's Urban Designer has commented on the proposed plans, including the latest amendments, and the proposed replacement dwelling is not supported. Full comments included as **Appendix 2**.

Architect's Rebuttal of Urban Design Comments

Included as **Appendix 3**.

Archaeology

A field evaluation has now been undertaken and a report submitted to and approved by the Council Archaeologist, who recommends that no further archaeological works are required due to the limited findings.

Appendix 2

S/2011/1494 Lower Mere Park Farm, Mere

In response to your request I make the following observations on the proposed replacement dwelling. These are made in the context of Local Plan Policy H30.

H30 (i): I consider the replacement dwelling is significantly larger than the one being replaced and will have a greater impact than the existing dwelling, and H30 (ii): I do not consider the external appearance of the dwelling is entirely appropriate to its rural surroundings:-

By comparison of the existing plan and elevation survey drawings with the proposed (see my sketches attached) the overall floor space appears to be at least 50% greater and with a noticeable increase in building mass and height. Considered three dimensionally this will collectively result in a dwelling of significantly larger overall scale.

At this overall scale the bulky form of the main house conflicts with the character and setting of the traditional farmstead: a cluster of buildings each of comparably modest size and appearance forming an unassuming whole within the landscape. The concentration of the principal living accommodation and; considerable size, uniformity and extent of the visible pitched roofscape, necessary to both accommodate a large attic storey and span a relatively deep floor plan, unfortunately contributes greatly to this bulky form. At this scale the largeness of the main house is also accentuated by the stately expression of the north and south facades.

The 'Creating Places' SPD to the Local Plan promotes the reinforcement of local distinctiveness. Local stonework was an overriding feature of the existing farmhouse used in a substantial manner on three sides of the building. Its absence from the replacement main house is therefore an unfortunate loss. Characteristic local materials were used on principal elevations of rural houses of classical style helping to root these in their local setting. The illustration below of a Lutyens designed house illustrates this (where brick rather than stone quoins can form the connection with brickwork return facades).



The sheet of photo references submitted by the applicant show two individual buildings with classically proportioned facades which would appear to relate more closely to the overall scale of the existing farmhouse as this style is applied to a much shorter overall facade and lesser height pitched roof than that proposed.

Brian Johnson Dip Arch RIBA, Urban Designer, Economy and Enterprise, Wiltshire Council

Appendix 3

Dear Charlie

Thank you for the Urban Designers comments which are appreciated. We would however wish to make the following comments/suggestions:

- Looked at in two dimensions the proposed replacement dwelling is clearly larger
- That said the replacement dwelling has the same eaves height of 6.1m (correctly shown on Brian Johnson's overmarked drawing) and the perception of the size, mass and bulk of any building (certainly from close quarters) is derived as much as anything by the eaves. The receding ridge line (except at distance where it matters less anyway) is far more difficult to perceive as you are then looking along the plane of the roof.
- The full extent of the out-buildings is not shown on Brian Johnson's mark up. The out-buildings in fact extend to a point beyond that shown, to a point approximately 1.2m (4'0") short of the proposals. To assist Members we have added these elements to Mr Johnson's mark up (attached below)
- Much of the assessment of the increase in size is based on the conversion of the existing out-buildings to residential use ie a change of use and the introduction of a covered access rather than a great increase in floor area and therefore mass and volume as noted in Mr Johnson's text. Whilst we accept to some extent that this is a legitimate conclusion to draw, it hardly represents a 50% increase in the total amount of floor space. Indeed much floor space is being lost by the removal of other buildings in and around the area of the house. The removal of these buildings will collectively/significantly reduce the mass and volume of built form in the area of the proposed replacement dwelling whether viewed from near or afar.
- Houses serving farms of this size (300 acres) come in many shapes, sizes and styles and as such we find the apparent restriction of design/style options on this particular site to be at odds with the architectural variation seen in many of the farm houses within the local or wider area.
- We would also wish to take issue with the reference made to the distinctiveness of "the local stonework" as being an "overriding feature of the existing farmhouse". The use of local stonework relates to perhaps the saddest chapter of the evolution of the existing farmhouse which was (until the late 19th/early 20th century) built from a very attractive brick from its earliest times. The later stone extensions are not an "overriding feature" but an "overriding eyesore" both in terms of their design and detail and as such are hardly representative of the best that Lower Mere Farmhouse has to offer. This MUST surely be the better earlier brick elevations which were to some extent (but not to the domination of 3 sides) swallowed by the later, lesser work. If we are to take any steer from the past it must surely be to the best of the past.
- That said our Clients would be prepared to negotiate stylistic amendments along the lines of the Lutyens example included within Mr Johnson's report ie the use of brick or creasing tile quoins in lieu of stone. This issue could be dealt with by use of a standard condition of Approval governing materials/detail etc. In other respects the form and articulation of the roofscape is not so dissimilar to that shown in the example given.
- The "stately expressions" to the north and south could be tempered by a change of material/detail and should not be the cause of the "baby being thrown out with the bath water". Surely these issues could be dealt by condition and in discussion/agreement with the Planning Officers. Attached are two examples of how these two elements might be tackled BUT at the end of the day these are highly subjective issues. It will be noted on these illustrations that creasing tiles have been suggested BUT these could just as easily be transposed for brick quoin. Again we would be pleased to discuss/agree these relatively points of detail with the Planning Officers concerned.

Regards,

Jonathan Ross
Relph Ross Partnership

Page 5

Plan List Item 3 S/2011/1639 – Redevelopment of existing educational premises including demolition of several buildings, new build of 9,900 sqm. Redesign and configuration of external playing fields and landscape areas, 150 car parking spaces and 7 coach spaces At Sarum Academy, Bemerton Heath, Salisbury. SP2 9HS

Additional letter received from the Wiltshire Police Architectural Liason officer states that the applicants should aim to achieve a secure by design award. Officers consider an additional informative would be appropriate to secure this.

Further comments received from the councils ecologist include a request for a condition that an ecological construction method statement is submitted for the site.

Also makes a request for an ecological management plan to be submitted that addresses the maintenance of all landscape features at the site with particular reference to their value for biodiversity.

Therefore the officer recommendation is changed to read –

APPROVE subject to the conditions in the officers report and the following two additional conditions –

- 16) No development shall commence on site until an ecological landscape management plan, including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscape areas has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The ecological landscape management plan shall be carried out as approved in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To ensure the proper management of the landscaped areas in the interests of visual amenity and wildlife interests.

- 17) No development shall commence on site until an ecological construction method statement, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The ecological construction method statement shall be carried out as approved in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: *To ensure the proper management of wildlife during construction.*

Plan List Item 4 S/2011/1611 – Erection of 2 log pods for tourist accommodation on two approved caravan pitches and creation of a fire pit At Stonehenge Campsite, Berwick St James, Salisbury. SP3 4TQ

Representations

4 additional third party representations have been received, summarised as follows:

- It is reasonable to condition that pods should not be attached to any drainage system or water supply and should not be permanently furnished (site is for caravans or tents and the pods are an alternative to tents, which do not have connections to water or drainage).
- The Inspector was clear that the caravan site area should not have any fire pits. The officer recommendation overrules opinions of Strategic Landscape Officer, the CPRE, both village councils and local opinion.
- No other local sites are allowed fire pits.
- The proposed firepit is closer to neighbouring dwellings than where the firepits presently are (all within the upper part of the site).
- The officer comments that fire hazard is not a planning issue, but the proposed firepit is considered to increase the risk of irresponsible behaviour such as launching Chinese lanterns and should be refused on disturbance grounds.
- Still concerned about visual impact of the pods which would be more visible than a caravan or tent, as all aspects of the site can be seen, especially during winter months.
- Disagree with agents assertion that additional fire pit would not have a detrimental effect on neighbouring properties. Have had to visit the site to ask patrons to keep noise down after 23:00hrs curfew. Reference to appeal decision with curfew on firepits of 23:00hrs. Suggest curfew of 21:00hrs on all firepits.
- Support addition of log pods to campsite, no difference to the footprint of a medium sized tent, ecologically fashionable, more environmentally friendly than a large motor home and a first for the area without encroachment on villagers.

1 email received from applicant in support of the application, summarised as follows:

- The site has full planning permission for a permanent Campsite & Caravan Park for a minimum of 15 mixed Motorhomes, Caravans, & Tents for all year round use.
- Fallback position is the 2 pitches can be used for 2 pitches for Motorhomes, Caravans, Tents or Mobile Log Pods of unlimited size, which can be furnished and connect to Electric hook ups and mains water and could be bright White (far less attractive than the proposed wooden pods)
- Application for 2 pods to let to tourists who don't have a Caravan or even a Tent
- The application has the full support of all the relevant parties and complies with policy T7.
- At the appeal the inspector concluded that this was a highly suitable tourism site.
- Application should have been determined under delegated powers
- Agree with recommended conditions
- Since 11 July we have had over 600 pitch nights with no complaints or issue from any neighbour or local villager (demonstrates strong demand for the campsite and that the site will not cause problems from landscape, noise, light or fire pits).

Area Development Managers notes –

- There are no planning conditions restricting firepits/open fires on the planning consent for Brades Acre overnight caravan/tent park at Tilshead (S/1979/1207) or the planning consent for Stonehenge Touring Park at Orcheston (S/1988/1267)

- The appeal decision for the campsite application (S/2010/0007) does not restrict the timings/hours of use of the firepits. The only condition referring to hours of use is in relation to unamplified music:
(4) No unamplified music to be played after 2300 hours on any day of the calendar year on the land notated "campsite/red land" or land noted as Rally Fields/Blue Land on drawing WGDP 01.