

**SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE 03th JULY 2014
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Agenda Item 7a

**Plan List Item 1 13/00636/FUL – Erection of 3 x 2 bed dwellings and 1 x 3 bed dwelling
At Brook Cottage, Gasper Street, Gasper, Stourton, Warminster.
BA12 6PY**

Policy update with regards to 13/00636/FUL: The construction of three two bedroom affordable houses; one three bedroom affordable house and a structure which would provide garaging for eight vehicles and bike and bin storage at Brook Cottages Gasper Stourton Warminster Wiltshire BA12 6PY
-Section 106 agreements should be necessary, directly related to the development and fairly related in scale and kind to the development.

- The proposed development is contrary to policy, in that it does not fulfil the criteria for an exception site because of its remote location, and also that the type of housing proposed as 'affordable' would not function as affordable housing as defined in Wiltshire because it would not comply with the Council's allocations policy.
- A section 106 agreement relating to the provision of affordable housing on the proposal site would not meet the requirements of a Section 106 agreement
- If the tests are not met the Committee's decision could be challenged as unlawful by way of an application to the high court for judicial review.
- If any challenge was successful the applicant could provide open market housing in the countryside.
- Any approval by Committee would effectively approve open market houses in the countryside.
- If the application is approved it would have to be advertised as a departure from the development plan, meaning that a decision could not be issued for a period of 21 days following the date of the advert.

Third party representations – See Appendix 1

Appendix 1

John & Jane Parfitt
Top Lane Farm House Top Lane Stourton Wiltshire BA12 6QA

Wiltshire Council
Development South
Borne Hill
Salisbury
SP1 3UZ

1st July 2014

Application No. 13/00636/FUL

Dear Sirs

I understand one issue with the above application was the applicants desire to administer the lettings of the dwellings themselves.

My wife and I have been tenants of the applicants for nearly 9 years and our experience has been that they are exemplary landlords. Extremely fair and reasonable in every regard. We could wish for no better.

For the benefit of any doubt, I have not been asked to write this, nor are the applicants aware that I have done so. I merely wish to convey our experience of them as landlords.

Yours faithfully

John Parfitt

Planning Application 13/00636/FUL Gasper

Previously we have indicated our support for this venture but would like to make two further points.

- o we feel that four houses at one time might be over-ambitious in light of the stringent tenancy criteria.
- o there has been some reasonable local concern about the potential dangers of the difficult exit from the site onto Gasper Street.

If building two houses show these concerns to be unjustified then the construction of two further houses would be reasonable.

Yours faithfully,

Michael & Hilary Younger

Shephards,
Gasper,
BA12 6PY

Application no. 13/00636/FUL

Dear Mr. Guest,

We are unable to attend the meeting on 3rd July to consider the above planning application but would like to register our support and approval for this worthy proposal.

We live about 200 yds away.

Please let us know if we need to write a letter or if this email will suffice.

Many thanks,

Neil and Jane Joyce

Old School Cottage
Gasper
Stourton
Wiltshire
BA12 6PY

Agenda Item 7b

Plan List Item 2 14/02315/FUL – Demolish part of existing store and extend remaining to create garage/car port and erect single storey 2 bed dwelling At Newlands, Boar Street, Mere, Warminster. BA12 6DD

The following correspondence has been received since the writing of the Committee Report:

Third party representations: - See Appendix 2

Appendix 2

The Old Bakery
The Square
Mere
Wilts
BA12 6DJ
1st of July 2014

Application:14/02315/FUL

As I am unable to attend the councils committee meeting this Thursday to express my views on the above planning application in person:

I note the above application has been recommended for approval and has still not addressed my and other neighbours concerns regarding the proposed new build. It must be noted that the development proposed will have an impact on highway safety that has not been addressed. Barns place is an extremely narrow cul de sac and currently provides access to 13 properties. These properties have some parking provision but the road is not adequate to absorb the additional traffic and parking generated by family and friends visiting these properties currently. An additional house would exasperate this situation , is this not a highway safety issue? Having witnessed the parking problem for the last forty years accessing my own property in Barns Place I feel as qualified as anyone to speak on this matter of congestion and safety.

Any proposed alterations to the current garage to 'improve visibility' could have easily been carried out by the current owner at any time without the need to build a house there.

I note that in answer to the previous refused building applications on this site that it was a 'significantly larger two story full height dwelling' yes it was higher, however the ground area of the refused build and the new application are very similar. Despite reading the report to the area planning committee I still cannot see how it is possible for the conservation officer and traffic highways to have a completely different view to the original ones who recommended refusal. How can you condone the building of a house in the gardens of a 17th century terraced house that will be totally out of character in a conservation area and destroy the symmetry of the two buildings and also cause additional traffic problems to an already overused narrow road?

Yours sincerely



