

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 05th SEPTEMBER 2013
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Agenda Item 7a

**Plan List Item 1 S/2012/1603/S73 – Application for the development of land without compliance with Condition 10 of Appeal Decision S/2010/0007 and in accordance with information submitted,
At Stonehenge Campsite, Berwick St. James, Salisbury, SP3 4TQ**

1 additional third party representation of objection received:

As we understand it, the documentation supplied by the applicant and Officers' report to the Committee for the 28th July meeting are unchanged. The number of lights appears to be the same, though we note from Officers' Report that wattages for wall-mounted lights have been reduced to 9 watts, which is a start.

We understand from your conversation with Mr Douse that it is possible that the applicant may come up with some suggested compromise on the day. This is clearly unsatisfactory – indeed would it be lawful to accept such a compromise, as it would deprive interested parties from considering and commenting on the actual proposal?

Having said that, we are clearly in the hands of the lighting consultant when it comes to understanding the effects of the proposals. As we understand it, a substantial proportion of the lighting proposed has yet to be installed, and it may be that the lighting which currently exists is to be moved or altered. We would therefore ask the Consultant, when considering any future proposals, to take into account the points we raised in our letter of 11 December (attached for ease of reference), which seem to us still to be relevant. We agree with your Consultant that uplighters in the middle of the country are quite unnecessary. Also, given the position of our house relative to the site, it is the wall-mounted lights near our border that will affect us most. If these are necessary, could they please be on the outer boundary facing inwards, so that they are as invisible as possible from our house.

We also understand that the applicant has pointed out that the hedging has increased the screening over recent months. We would point out that all the plantings are deciduous and the screening will be less effective in the winter months when the lighting will need to be turned on for the maximum period. Indeed, given that the site is largely unoccupied for many days in the winter months, might it be a condition that lighting is used only for those parts of the site that are actually being occupied?

Finally, we do wonder why all this extra lighting is necessary at all, as Mr. Grant has been running the campsite for several years with the existing lighting (without planning consent for it). We are concerned that what was once a tranquil and dark field in unspoilt countryside could be further (and significantly) changed and with many (39) lights will look like a runway at Heathrow or an industrial estate.

We therefore support your refusal of the application on the grounds, essentially as we interpret your report, that the lighting proposed is excessive.

Yours sincerely

Martin and Rosemary Gairdner

Agenda Item 7c

**Plan List Item 2 S/2012/1829 – Reserved matters application for 3 retail units, a doctors surgery and 30 apartments including parking, landscaping and recycling centre (following approval of outline application S/2005/0211)
At Local Centre, Old Sarum, Salisbury, SP4 6BY**

Comment from applicant:

I am aware that you have been in correspondence with the prospective operators of the shops at the local centre. They welcome the recommendation to approve the scheme which has been prepared having regard to their commercial requirements.

However, the proposed restrictions on the hours of operation and deliveries are a concern to them as this will not allow for a viable operation.

This has been explained as follows:

From a purely informative position, I did note in the report the proposed restriction on operating times for the retail units. Whilst this is not likely to be a major issue for the 2 smaller units it will undoubtedly cause problems for the convenience store operator. As I am sure you will be aware these stores by the very nature have to operate with extended delivery and trading hours to maintain viability and effective trading against major foodstore operators in the sector. The very nature of a store such as this, is to serve the local population outside normal trading hours for top up shopping. They have the added benefit of reducing car journeys given their immediate proximity to resident populations.

I am therefore at something of a loss as to why you would want to restrict trading hours on a Saturday, which for a substantial proportion of people is a normal working day in today's society and even more so why you would not allow the store to open at 7.00 am which is a time of the day when many potential customers will be leaving for work and wish to pick up a newspaper and early morning provisions. This time is quite standard throughout the convenience sector for a start and to limit this seems unduly harsh and may even detract operators from wishing to take the unit. Equally a 9.00 am start on a Sunday is much later than many customers would expect.

The other factor which I know will be an issue is no deliveries before 7.30 am and at all on Sundays. Whilst the 7.30 time limitation can be adhered to for large vehicle deliveries I am sure you can understand that news and milk deliveries by their very nature take place before these hours. These are normally from transit type vehicles but for logistical reasons have to take place early. Neither is it possible for a convenience store to have no deliveries on a Sunday I am afraid. It is essential for the smooth operation of a store of this type to be able to take deliveries on a Sunday. Operators are sensitive to noise

issues and will always try to minimise this whilst undertaking deliveries so as to avoid complaints from neighbours.

In the circumstances I would be grateful if you could report this requested amendment to members at tomorrow's South Area Planning Committee meeting i.e an adjustment of the hours as follows:

Condition 12 *"the retail units shall not be open to the public except between the hours of 07.00 and 23.00 every day."*

Condition 13 *"No deliveries shall be taken at or collections made from the development except between the hours of 06.30 and 20.00 every day."*

This is fundamental as the prospective tenant of the local store would not be able to take the local convenience store unit unless the hours are adjusted as requested and this underpins the viability of delivering the local centre

I would suggest that this should not cause undue loss of amenity to residents on the development as the local centre has immediate access from the main road and those who purchase or rent flats above the shops will be aware of the opening hours. In terms of security the shops would be very well exposed to the main road and passers by.

Thank you for your assistance.

Regards

Glenn Godwin

Director

Pegasus Group

Planning | Environmental | Retail | Urban Design | Renewables | Landscape Design | Graphic Design | Consultation | Sustainability

Pegasus House | Querns Business Centre | Whitworth Road | Cirencester | Gloucestershire | GL7 1RT

T 01285 641717 | **F** 01285 642348 | **M** 07920 136319 | **E** glenn.godwin@pegasuspq.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Manchester

[Twitter](#) | [Linked-in](#) | www.pegasuspq.co.uk

Pegasus Group is the trading name of Pegasus Planning Group (07277000) registered in England and Wales.
This email and any associated files, is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient you should not use the contents nor disclose them to any other person. If you have received this message in error please notify us immediately.
Please consider the environment before printing this email and any attachments.

Agenda Item 7d

Plan List Item 3 S/2013/0406 - Demolition of existing laundry buildings; erection of three four-bedroom dwellings with associated parking, access and landscaping works At Shrewton Steam Laundries Ltd, High Street, Shrewton, Salisbury. SP3 4BZ

1 email received from applicants in support of the application, provided in full:

We write in relation to the above application, to be considered at your Committee on 5 September. Our company is a small local building firm. This site represents a significant investment for us.

We bought the site in November 2010. It has remained on the market since this time while we sought consent for a redevelopment scheme for the site. The 3rd paragraph under heading "9.3 Loss of Employment" of the Officer Report is incorrect in this regard.

We commissioned consultants to prepare the current application for 3x 4-bedroomed detached dwellings. The application before you is the 3rd scheme for this vacant and derelict site (significant structural collapse has occurred during our ownership) and we are keen for a constructive resolution. We originally wanted to build small units, as sought by the Parish Council in their response to the current application. However a previous proposal for just this was unsuccessful on urban design and parking provision grounds (in addition to the matters referred to below). Accordingly, we have sought a pragmatic solution to address the issues affecting the site.

Highways (access and parking), ecology, heritage and design matters are all addressed by the current proposal. The only matters potentially remaining outstanding for the proposal before you are:

- flood risk considerations; and
- matters deriving from the former employment use of the site.
-

Flood Risk considerations

Finished site levels

It is relevant to note that an objection from the EA to the scheme was withdrawn in June (see attached letter), subject to a number of conditions including site and finished floor levels.

However, following lobbying by your officers, a further letter re-instating elements of the objection was submitted by the EA in July due to unfounded concerns expressed regarding ongoing control at the site.

Before doing this, it is relevant to note that the July letter from the EA states that "*Hydraulically the current submitted scheme as designed maintains and improves flood flows in this area and is therefore acceptable to us in flood risk terms*" and "*there is a satisfactory scheme to address flood risk*". In short, the application would improve the flood risk situation for Shrewton.

It is suggested, erroneously, that there may be an inability to ensure ongoing control of site levels. This is incorrect. Through a combination of both a) the site levels conditions suggested by the EA in their June letter (or a more detailed version of these) and b) the Environment Agency's legislative remit, it is considered a satisfactory level of ongoing control can be secured.

Section 6(4) of the Environment Act 1995 indicates that the EA shall "exercise a general supervision over all matters relating to flood defence". Specifically, under Section 109 of the Water Resources Act, any works within 8m of the top of the bank of a designated "main river" (such as the adjacent River Till) requires a consent from the

EA. It is relevant to note that the terms of this “any works” goes significantly beyond the scope of the planning system. It can include, for instance, headwalls; outfall structures; fences; riverbank revetments and other structures that, within the context of the Town Planning system would represent “minor” or de minimus works that would fall below the threshold of needing planning permission.

Outside the 8m consent easement width, all land raising within a floodplain including that which does not require planning consent needs consent from the EA under Section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991, when local bylaws and the general supervisory duty are considered alongside this.

Thus, in lay terms, the consenting regime operated by the EA is similar to that of Building Regulations – but is specific to river corridors and their floodplains. It has the ability to prevent the installation of structures that would compromise the function of main river channels and their floodplains, including the ability of land to convey flood waters.

Thus, provided acceptable site levels can be specified (and they can in this case) we see no reason why a reasonable, proportionate and enforceable position could not be established in relation to this scheme.

Sequential Test

Within the context of the Sequential Test, the site should be considered as a Windfall site. It should be seen within a *balanced* context of seeking to avoid the derelict buildings on site remaining and deteriorating further and becoming an eyesore at the heart of the village. A Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the settlement has been undertaken by RPS. The justification to reduce the geographical area of search has been given (contrary to the contents of the Officer report). This is provided at paras 4.10 and 4.11 of our consultants’ Design and Access statement, as follows:

The parish of Shrewton represents 5% of the population of the Amesbury Community Area (33,190). The adopted South Wiltshire Core Strategy proposes an additional 2395 houses within the whole Community Area between now and 2026. Of these, most are to be provided from identified sites at the larger settlements, however 170 units still need to be provided by as-yet-unidentified sites. It is reasonable to expect that Shrewton will take its’ fair proportion of this. 5% of the additional 170 houses is around 8-9 units.

A number of sites have been suggested in the Parish to deliver housing and are documented in both the South Wiltshire and county-wide SHLAA documents (from 2009 and 2011 respectively). RPS consider the site against all of these and conclude that, of those sites within the parish potentially able to deliver the required level of development, none are more preferential in flood risk terms.

Flood Risk – Summary

It is crucial to note that, if the landform at the site now was already that proposed by the current application, development proposed on the site would not lie within any Flood Zone. Accordingly none of the above flood risk considerations would apply. Thus we consider that the position taken by Council Officers regarding these points has been unduly burdensome in financial terms, and is potentially open to challenge.

We have spent over £30,000 modelling the site and surrounding area, and assessing the flood risk of the schemes. This demonstrates a significant intent to propose a scheme that is realistic, pragmatic and safe.

Employment Uses

Our Commercial Agents, Myddleton and Major have evaluated this matter closely and their conclusions have been included in the submission. The derelict buildings are unsuitable for continued employment use, and would need to be redeveloped in any event for re-use to occur. An employment redevelopment would be “economically unviable” due to the approximate 600,000sq ft of employment space readily available (as at March 2013).

Other Matters

We have submitted a viability report to the Council, and this has been accepted by your officers as demonstrating that the development should not incur affordable housing and other developer contributions. We estimate that the development (as it stands) will make a loss of around £158,000.

Despite the lack of viability for the project (as it stands, even without S106 contributions), we are keen to implement the proposed development at the site in order to:

- minimise losses;
- to keep our local staff and contractors employed; and
- to address the eyesore that the site has become.

However the scheme is not expected to deliver a profit.

To compound this, it is further suggested in the Officer Report that, to address the flood risk matters above, Plot 3 should be omitted from the scheme. We estimate that the omission of this unit would result in a £309,000 loss.

We would be happy to answer questions regarding the scheme, and hope you will be able to support the application at the Committee on Thursday.

Yours sincerely

JOHN RATTUE & MERVYN GRIFFITHS

Representations

1 additional third party representation of comments received:

We would like to make the following two comments in relation to the proposed development of the site.

The current state of the site is a dangerous eyesore, and is having an adverse effect on residents and visitors to the village alike - anything would be better than the status quo!

We feel that the proposed plan for the old school site in the village could result in 'family' properties coming on to the market as older residents downsize to the new age-restricted properties on the school site. We believe that this could help overcome the shortage in the village of affordable family properties, removing the need for the laundry site to have the more dense layout that I believe the Council favoured at one point.

John and Sheila Sweeney - The Old Bakery, High Street, Shrewton.

1 additional third party representation of objection received:

I am unable to attend this meeting but wish to put forward my strong opposition to the proposed plans as they stand. I would like to underline once more my point of view and attach my original letter. I rely on your including them in the meeting tomorrow.

I was very concerned to read in the planner's documentation regarding this application that "it is not considered that Winterbourne House would be unduly affected" by this development. Can I suggest that planners view the actual boundary to this property in relation to the proposals?

I must agree with the correspondence recently uploaded to the relevant area of the council website – the property is in a dangerous state of disrepair and needs urgent maintenance before a serious accident occurs.

Emily Westlake, Winterbourne House, Tanners Lane, Shrewton

Letter:

I refer to the above planning application. We are the tenants of Winterbourne House, which directly borders the development site.

We have now considered the revised planning application in full and have many concerns about them, many of which were addressed in previous correspondence and are in no way tackled in the revised plans.

It is of particularly great concern that the planners have shown little empathy whatsoever to the needs of the village when considering this development. Wiltshire Council has in place many strategies to prevent building works from taking place which would not be of benefit to the local community, e.g. business/residential use (core strategy 5); inclusion of social housing (core strategy 3). Moreover, rules are in place to prevent building within flood plains. All of the above have been passed over in the current plans. To allow the current plans to be passed in their current form would be considered to be a misapplication of existing Wiltshire Council policy.

In their covering letter enclosed with the proposed plans, the planning consultants state:

Furthermore, in the context of the Sequential Test, the site should be considered as a Windfall site. It should be seen within a *balanced* context of seeking to avoid the derelict buildings on site remaining and deteriorating further and becoming an eyesore at the heart of the village.

Should we residents infer from this that we should be grateful that the developers have bought this site and should be content with their proposals, whatever form they take? The developers have allowed the site to fall in to terrible disrepair and have shown no respect for the safety of residents or the impact on the village of this neglect.

I am including detailed objections to the current plans as stated below:

- 1/ Change of use from employment land to residential
- 2/ Social Housing requirements/Appropriateness of proposed dwellings for the village
- 3/ Flooding issues
- 4/ Issues regarding the overlooking of existing properties
- 5/ Anomalies in the application form

Addressing each of these points in turn:

1/ Transfer of use of the site from business to residential

Middleton and Major have submitted a detailed report in support of the planner's application for transfer of use. The content of this report is questionable. The report contains copious erroneous statements and includes numerous phrases one can only assume are designed to mislead, as detailed below:

- The author states in paragraph 6 that 'Since purchase the current owners have had a regular dialogue with nearby local residents and the Parish Council, all of whom support proposals to remove these derelict industrial buildings and replace them with housing to complement the immediate surroundings'.

The current site owners have **never** made any form of contact with us, and had we have been contacted; we would have stated our **absolute objection** to the transfer of use. When I personally initiated contact with the planners for this site in October 2012, the two initial responses were brusque and incomplete, and when I requested further clarification, they chose **not to respond at all**.

- What is the purpose of the inclusion of a 2010 marketing report for use of the existing buildings commercially, when the author states themselves that it was evident that the buildings were derelict and not fit for such a purpose?

This report states that it was always transparently evident to all parties that the buildings were not fit for business or residential use, and required demolition and rebuilding for either project.

- The author states that they have undertaken 'marketing activities in the region'.

As a local business owner and director, I have not laid eyes on one single piece of marketing material from this or any other agent regarding a requirement for business premises in Shrewton.

- Referring to Appendix V - offered in direct response to Core Strategy 5 of the South Wiltshire Core Policy - it can only be assumed that the author of this report has got confused and submitted a report for another site, because many of the answers contained therein do not in any way relate to the Shrewton Laundry site. If this report does apply to the laundry site, it can only be assumed that it has been completed in such a way to present the worst possible illustration of the site. I would therefore request clarity on the following paragraphs:

Section 2.

e) Noise and other obvious pollutants: Poor (suggested answer: Excellent. This is self-evident due to the position of the site.)

g) Parking, internal circulation and servicing: Poor (suggested answer: Good. Please refer to Middleton and Major's own marketing material contained in this very report at Appendix I, which show photographs of numerous cars and vans parked at the site.)

h) Loading access: Poor (suggested answer: Good, as evidenced above.)

Section 3.

a) Adjacent land: Poor (suggested answer: Excellent. Pollution from adjacent firms – please can the author provide the details of these? We are unaware of a single adjacent firm).

b) Perception of the wider environmental quality: Poor (suggested answer: Excellent. Again, if the author could provide details of such problems, we would be most interested!!!)

c) Local facilities for workforce: Poor (suggested answer: Excellent. This particular answer gives the reader real concern! There is a public house directly opposite the site, and another next door but one, with a social club and a local supermarket within a few minutes' walk!)

Given the improper answers in this particular Appendix, the accuracy of the whole of this report should be called in to question.

The report from Middleton and Major includes precedents where other properties have been granted a similar change of use. The disparity of the use of these examples underlines how inappropriate this change of use would be; not one of these properties is in a similar location to Shrewton.

Shrewton Laundry employed 14 people (as per Transport Statement prepared by Stuart Michael Associates, September 2011). Although these employees are now mostly successfully re-employed, this does not detract from the fact that employment opportunities within the village have been reduced by around 30% by the closure of the business.

I also refer to Core Policy 5 of the Wiltshire Council Core Strategy:

“Proposals involving the significant net loss of employment opportunities in a town or main settlement or the loss of an employment use that is important to the rural economy will be resisted. The Council will consider making exceptions to this only where there is clear evidence that the land or premises are no longer viable for an employment generating use and/or where redevelopment of a site for a non-employment use would bring improvements to the local environment or conservation benefits that would outweigh the loss of local jobs.”

I have been seeking premises in Shrewton for my business for the past 5.5 years. There is currently nothing available. One new business in the village (the hairdressing salon on the High Street) could not find premises either and resorted to dividing floor space with another local business.

Shrewton residents have few employment opportunities. Local businesses are nominal. Local employment opportunities (mostly offered by local amenities) are limiting.

According to data produced by Wiltshire Council's Economic Intelligence Unit, Shrewton has a parish working age population of around 1100. Local amenities offer the equivalent full-time employment to around 50 people. Consequently, over 1000 residents are already forced to commute to work from Shrewton.

Shrewton has a pitiable bus service. The earliest an employee can arrive in Salisbury by bus is 8.30, the latest they can leave Salisbury is 5.40pm. Despite Shrewton being classified as coming within the economic area of Amesbury, there is one bus a day between Shrewton and Amesbury. This severely limits any employment non-driving Shrewton residents can seek; underlining their reliance on employment within their own village.

It is clear that the former Laundry premises are not suitable for employment use in their current state, but I believe that it would be deeply regrettable for the use of the site to be transferred to residential as there is a clear requirement for more employment opportunities in the village.

2. Social housing requirement

A housing needs survey for Shrewton is currently underway, the results of which will be available after 22 May 2013. Shrewton is often referred to by local estate agents as 'desirable'. The village is attractive to house purchasers. Consequently, house prices are above the national average meaning that long-standing residents are forced out of the housing market in the village because they simply cannot afford to buy a house there.

It is clear that Shrewton does not need any more luxury housing. Shrewton needs more affordable or retirement housing to prevent further driving out the current residents and their families who cannot afford to live here. Retired individuals, young single people, young families and those on low incomes are forced out of the village, resulting in Shrewton becoming a commuter village.

The dwellings being proposed for this site are imposing, luxury houses with double garages. Two of the houses include pillars in their design. I would suggest that this is not in keeping with the current outlook of the village, nor does it serve the needs of local people. In the Wiltshire Core Strategy Pre-Submission Document published in February 2012:

“People, Places and Priorities: Wiltshire Community Plan 2011 - 2026 sets an objective to: address the lack of affordable housing, including social housing and shared ownership opportunities, by building new housing, bringing empty homes back into use, and through any other means that may become available to meet housing need.

6.40 This means building the right homes in the right places at the right time in order to develop more balanced communities where people can live and work locally. It's also critical that new housing developments provide for the necessary services and infrastructure to create thriving communities, and that they are built to high environmental standards and are well designed. It is also vital that a significant proportion of new housing is affordable. New jobs must be aligned to the delivery of new homes otherwise we are in danger of encouraging more commuting and congestion on roads and consequential environmental harm, as well as increased maintenance on Wiltshire's highway network leading to increased liability for the council and the taxpayer. Only by delivering both homes at the right price and a range of job opportunities can young people in Wiltshire be retained and the long term development of the economy supported. At the same time, the right kind of housing is needed for the ageing population."

<http://www.wiltshire.gov.uk/wiltshire-core-strategy-pre-submission-document-with-bookmarks-february-2012> (accessed 22.04.2013)

3. Flood risk assessment

The Environment Agency website states that the area of the laundry is:

What is the likelihood of flooding from rivers or the sea in my area?



View current flood warnings in this area

What does 'significant' mean for me?

Very Important: Be prepared!

The location you have selected is in an area that has a significant chance of flooding. The chance of flooding each year is greater than 1.3% (1 in 75). This takes into account the effect of any flood defences that may be in this area, whether or not these are currently illustrated on the Flood Map.

Flood defences reduce but do not completely remove the likelihood of flooding and can be over topped or fail in extreme weather conditions.

As per the site: <http://maps.environment-agency.gov.uk/wiyby/wiybyController?ep=query&floodrisk=1.4&lang=e&topic=floodmap&floodX=406944&floodY=144439> Accessed 22.01.2013.

Despite the lengthy document attached to the plans regarding flooding, it must be highlighted that therein, at paragraph 3.2.1 Fluvial Flood Risk: "The EA does not hold modelled flood data for the River Till and there is no gauged data available within the catchment".

Shrewton's flood warden has provided the following table as illustration of the unreliability of the River Till's flow:

Year	Start flow	Dry up	Month													
			Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec		
2008	Nov 28	-														
2009	Dec 13	June														
2010	-	July														
2011	Mar 02	June														
2012	May 31	-														
2013																

<http://www.shrewton.com/parish-council/flooding-in-shrewton/ups-and-downs-of-the-river-till/> Accessed 22.04.2013.

Unless accurate data is used for the models suggested, the flood risk assessment cannot be taken seriously. Can I also draw your attention to the flood marker at the boundary of the proposed development which shows a flood height roughly equal to the ceiling height of the ground floor of the adjacent property?

The pictures of the water courses contained in the report show the water course as being empty. These should be compared with photographs of the area in January 2013, when the river burst its banks and Elston Lane was filled with over a meter of flood water at worst, and impassable at times to vehicles. Flood warning signs are still evident in this area on 23rd April 2013.

The report accessed as above, also states: "It cannot however accurately calculate or map what happens to the water when it comes out of banks (i.e. a flood event resulting in overland flow)". Much of the water in this area of the River Till is derived from overland flow from existing higher ground, particularly around the Elston area, which is not mentioned in the report.... further underlining the guesswork on which this report is based.

4. Overlooking of existing properties

With regard to the plans that have now been drawn, I would like to underline the differences between the plans submitted in 2011 and the current submission and also the apparent anomalies contained therein. The original Design and Access Statement stated in paragraph 4.47 " Given the distance between the site boundary and the facing elevation of Winterbourne House, it is unlikely that the scheme would give rise to any overlooking of the private amenity space, provided any elevation facing Winterbourne House is located over 20m away from the existing building. In addition, should windows be proposed above the 1st floor, these should ideally be roof lights".

The plans pay no regard to this and currently, as per paragraph 4.20 of the new access statement, Winterbourne House will be overlooked by the new properties. A window is clearly shown on the current plans, directly overlooking Winterbourne House, in contradiction to the statement at paragraph 5.16 which 'anticipates' that Winterbourne House will not be overlooked. Are design plans not an exact science? The agent did not answer my question on this subject, and these newly submitted plans actually show an even higher level of overlook to our property and others.

The application makes no reference to the fact that the existing buildings form our garden boundary wall. The demolition of these buildings will have a massive impact on our property and will destroy the

vegetation which has been lovingly tended in this border. We would like to know what proposals will be made to minimise our inconvenience.

5/ Anomalies in the application form

The design statement states that "The northern elevation of the building is approximately 10m from the intervening boundary of the site, which is formed by either the end elevation to buildings on the application site or a 2.4m high larch-lap panel fence". The drawn plans actually show a 1.8m high fence. The planners refused to answer the question as to how high they actually intend the fence to be. It is also interesting to note that on the application form the net loss of full time employees is stated as 3, not the true figure of 14. I questioned the planners about this anomaly, but they chose not to reply. It is of great concern that, even at this early stage, the detail in the documentation is incorrect. In conclusion, the application as submitted is fundamentally flawed and should be withdrawn or refused planning consent.

I have faith in the fact you will appreciate these vital discrepancies and trust in Wiltshire Council's policies to ensure they will not be overlooked. I look forward to your comments and remain at your disposal should you wish to discuss any of the above points.

Agenda Item 7f

Plan List Item 4 13/01220/OUT - Outline Application for proposed new cemetery with vehicular access from The Avenue (resubmission of S/2012/0815) At Land North West of The Avenue, Salisbury, Wiltshire. SP2 9PS

Dear Sir/Madam.

REF: PLANNING APPLICATIONS: 13/01220/OUT AND 13/01223/OUT

We hope you will place the below before the Planning Committee as we are one of the principal users of this facility.

I refer to Application 13/01223/OUT and 13/01220/OUT in respect of the two proposed sites for a new cemetery to serve Salisbury and Wilton.

The situation with regard to Cemetery land is becoming desperate for Salisbury, there being little space available in either Salisbury cemeteries or the cemetery in Wilton.

Of the two sites, the one to the East of The Avenue would seem to us to be the better of the two, it being closer to the Park & Ride site and facilities available at Wilton. If, however, this site does not prove to be acceptable then we would welcome the second site, i.e. land to the North West of The Avenue. With the exception of access by public transport, there is little to segregate the two sites in our opinion.

We very much hope that the Planning Committee will be able to approve one, or both, of these sites in order that plans may be undertaken as rapidly as possible so that we may have a new cemetery, certainly by the middle of 2014.

Yours sincerely,

IAN NEWMAN
I N NEWMAN LTD

Funeral Directors
55 Winchester St
Salisbury
SP1 1HL

Agenda Item 7g

Plan List Item 5 13/01223/OUT - Outline Application for proposed new cemetery with vehicular access from The Avenue At Land East of the Avenue, Salisbury, SP2 9PS

Applicant's comments

The table below shows the trees to be removed:

Tree Number	Category	Reason
T15, T17, T18, T19	A	To facilitate visibility splay
T16, T20 – Part of G27 and G29	B	To facilitate visibility splay
H23, Part of G22, Part of G21	C	To facilitate visibility splay

This totals 6 x trees for removal, 4 x trees for removal in part and 1 x hedge to be removed in part.

Some of the trees present have been considered as groups notably G27, G29, G22 and G21 which are to be removed in part. G27,29,22 and 21 been considered as a group in accordance with BS5387:2012 *Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction*, which states:

4.4.2.3 Trees growing as groups or woodland should be identified and assessed as such where the arboriculturist determines that this is appropriate. However, an assessment of individuals within any group should still be undertaken if there is a need to differentiate between them, e.g. in order to highlight significant variation in attributes (including physiological or structural condition).

NOTE The term "group" is intended to identify trees that form cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically (e.g. trees that provide companion shelter), visually (e.g. avenues or screens) or culturally, including for biodiversity (e.g. parkland or wood pasture), in respect of each of the three subcategories (see 4.5).

It is of the opinion of our arboriculture consultant that recording trees as 'individuals' within these groups and recording the exact number of trees to be removed has no real benefit as the trees are relatively young, therefore the Root Protection Areas are pretty much the same throughout, with no real variation in attributes within the groups (see BS detail above). The value is of the group itself as "a cohesive arboricultural feature", we therefore propose that mitigation for its partial loss will be provided through the provision of a cohesive arboricultural feature elsewhere within the site rather than on a tree for tree basis, negating the need to identify each individual tree within the groups to be lost.

Councils Tree's officers comments

I visited site this afternoon.

The groups of trees are generally young or poor quality and could be replaced relatively easily by new planting (electricity cables run through the avenue at this point and pruning has taken its toll). I do not see any real merit in requesting further information regarding the exact number to be removed – provided new planting is secured by condition to provide further screening/a new avenue.

The mature Beech and Oak to the south of the entrance, which are shown to be removed, will be a significant loss to the amenity of the area. However, one of the Oaks is poor quality and all the Beech have significant defects or poor form. Many of the mature Beech in this avenue are in fairly poor condition and several seem to fall or lose large limbs in high winds each year.

One Oak is a fine specimen and it appears to be in good condition (T19) – although covered in Ivy (which prevented a thorough inspection). It would be a shame to lose this tree but I don't think it warrants a refusal for the whole scheme.

Agenda Item 7h

**Plan List Item 6 13/01284/FUL - Conversion of existing end of terrace 4 bedroom house to form 2 dwellings (1 x 2 bed terrace house and 1 x 1 bed end of terrace house)
At 12 Middleton Road, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP2 7AY**

Members should note that the informative included in the report has been put on in error and does not form part of the officer recommendation for this application.