

SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 16 OCTOBER 2014 AT ALAMEIN SUITE - CITY HALL, MALTHOUSE LANE, SALISBURY, SP2 7TU.

Present:

Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Richard Clewer, Cllr Peter Edge (Substitute), Cllr Jose Green, Cllr Mike Hewitt, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr Ian McLennan, Cllr John Smale (Substitute), Cllr Ian Tomes, Cllr Fred Westmoreland (Chairman) and Cllr Ian West

Also Present:

Cllr Julian Johnson, Cllr Bill Moss and Cllr Bridget Wayman

99 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Brian Dalton and Chris Devine.

Councillor Devine was substituted by Councillor John Smale.

Councillor Dalton was substituted by Councillor Peter Edge.

100 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 September were presented for consideration, and it was,

Resolved:

That subject to the inclusion of Councillor Ian McLennan as having given his apologies for the meeting, and a correction to Minute 97a to read “Councillor Richard Britton requested his dissent to the approval be recorded”, to approve as a correct record and sign the minutes.

Councillor Britton was also permitted to make a brief statement clarifying his dissent to the decision and why he felt it necessary to have his vote recorded.

101 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations.

102 **Chairman's Announcements**

There were no announcements.

103 **Public Participation and Councillors' Questions**

The Chairman explained the meeting procedure to the members of the public and noted the rules on public participation.

104 **Planning Appeals**

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

105 **Planning Applications**

Attention was drawn to the late list of representations and observations, which would be subsequently published.

106 **14/06864/FUL - Land to the west of Bake Farm Buildings, Salisbury Road, Coombe Bissett, SP5 4JT**

Public Participation

Mr Aster Crawshaw spoke in objection to the application.

Mrs Jennifer Epworth spoke in objection to the application.

Mrs Linda Buckley spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Richard Jowett spoke in support of the application.

Mr Angus MacDonald, applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Andrew Fido, agent, spoke in support of the application.

Mr Richard Burden, National Association for Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), spoke in objection to the application.

Cllr Gerald Bundy, Coome Bissett Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application.

The Area Development Manager presented the report which recommended that permission be approved. Key issues were stated to include the visual impact on the adjoining Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the surrounding area and on the existing agricultural land. National and local planning policy regarding solar farms was provided along with details of the mitigation measures to be included as part of the application.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Details were sought on the scale of the proposed development, the number of inverter stations on the site, and the quality grade of the land.

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

The local Unitary Division Member, Councillor Julian Johnson, then spoke regarding the application. Although he took a neutral view, he highlighted the concerns raised by the local community and the importance that in accordance with policy the Committee needed to determine whether the need for renewable energy would be overriding the need to protect the environment should the application be approved.

A debate followed, where members discussed the level of impact of the proposals on the site itself and in particular on the AONB, and whether the scale of the proposals could be sufficiently mitigated through the screening proposed at short and longer distances. It was also raised that the quality grade of the land was unclear, and whether it was at a level where additional uses other than arable farming was encouraged. Members also raised whether the site would become permanent in future, although it was noted that grazing could continue on the site if solar panels were installed.

At the conclusion of debate, it was,

Resolved:

To REFUSE the application for the following reason:

The site lies in open countryside within the setting of, and visible from, the Cranbourne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal, by reason of its siting, scale and resulting prominence in views both from, and to, the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, would not achieve the fundamental aim of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which is to conserve its landscape and natural beauty.

Although the proposal includes mitigation in the form of new hedge planting, this is considered insufficient to reduce the adverse impacts on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Those adverse impacts are, in particular, the visual impact of the closely arranged ranks of solar arrays which spread across a significant area of farmland on higher ground, and which would 'read' as a man-made, almost industrial intrusion in the otherwise natural landscape from which the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be experienced and which can be experienced from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

This is contrary to Core Policy 51 of the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy which specifically refers to the relevance of the setting of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, the spirit of 'saved' Policy C4 of the

Salisbury District Local Plan, and Central Government planning policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 115).

The Committee took a recess from 1930-1935.

107 14/07557/FUL - 10 Ventry Close, Salisbury, SP1 3ES

Public Participation

Mr Tony Allen spoke in objection to the application.

Mrs Elizabeth Bec spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Bob Law spoke in objection to the application.

Mr Damian Thursby spoke in support of the application.

Mr Peter Hughes spoke in support of the application.

Cllr John Lindley, Chairman of the Salisbury City Council Planning and Transportation Committee, spoke in objection to the application.

The Area Development Manager presented a report which recommended that planning permission be approved. Key issues were stated to include the principal of development, particularly in lights of permitted development rights for some development in the garden of the existing property, the impact on residential amenity and the siting, scale and design of the proposal. It was confirmed that trees of sufficient height to screen views from the neighbouring Tower Mews development, were included as part of the application details.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer, and clarification was sought on the height and orientation of the application.

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

The local Unitary Division Member, Councillor Bill Moss, then spoke in objection to the application, stating that the proposed plot was not suitable for another dwelling despite the understandable personal position of the applicants.

A debate followed, where the Committee discussed whether another dwelling could be accommodated on the site, with particular attention to the amount of amenity space that would be available, or whether although the current applicants might find it acceptable, this constituted overdevelopment of the area. The character of properties in the area was assessed, with it noted that although all the properties were of a unique design, each had been designed to fit a distinct familial style, and it was considered whether the proposed dwelling was in character with that style.

At the end of debate, it was,

Resolved:

To REFUSE the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be located in the side garden of an existing two storey property in Ventry Close. The site slopes and is elevated above road level, and is prominent being close to the entry point to the Close.

The proposal, by reason of the relatively large size of the proposed dwelling on the site, its positioning close to the roadside boundary, and the relatively small areas within the site proposed to provide amenity space/garden, would amount to an over-development of the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the wider Ventry Close estate. Furthermore, the proposed dwelling, by reason of its design and appearance, would be out of keeping with the grain and style of established development in Ventry Close.

The development would therefore be contrary to 'Saved' Policies G2 and D2 of the Salisbury District Local Plan and the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework - Para 9, 56, 58 and 64.

2. The development would be contrary to saved Policy R2 of the Salisbury District Local Plan, as provision for public open space has not been made.

Informative: Reason 2 above can be overcome by the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement in respect of Policy R2.

108 **14/06726/OUT - Farmer Giles Farmstead, Teffont, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP3 5QY**

Public Participation

Mr Tony Allen spoke in support of the application.

Cllr David Wood, Chairman of Teffont Parish Council, spoke in support of the application.

The Area Development Manager presented the report which recommended that permission be delegated for approval subject to the applicant entering into planning obligation for the delivery of a financial contribution towards local recreation provision, and subject to the following conditions. Key issues were stated to include the principal of development and the sustainability of the proposal, which officers considered an improvement on the existing situation with many defunct buildings.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Details were sought on the size of the building plot and scale of the proposal, but it was stated as an outline application many details were not yet finalized, although it was around 600m². Other queries included the activity at the site, and whether the Farmer Giles attraction was ever in operation or had been wound down completely, and the number of lodges and caravans that could use the wider site. It was also confirmed that the application had been referred

to Committee under delegated powers as the applicant was a relative of a Wiltshire Councillor.

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

The local Unitary Division Member, Councillor Bridget Wayman, then spoke in objection to the application, stating that the principle of constructing a new large house in the countryside was against policy, and the trade off of the unsightly car park and a few now unused buildings being removed was not sufficient. She also stated that the original permission for the lodges and caravans had been contingent upon the Farmer Giles business being in operation and the land should be restored as it was no longer operating.

A debate followed, where the Committee discussed whether the employment land at the site was unviable and suitable for conversion to residential status, and whether the continued existence of multiple disused properties closer to the road meant that the improvement to the landscape from some removals sufficiently enhanced the area as a result. In response to queries it was also stated that the land was classified as a brownfield site, with attendant permitted development rights. Members also discussed the views of Wiltshire Councils Spatial Planning team and any traffic implications.

At the conclusion of debate, it was,

Resolved:

To REFUSE the application for the following reasons:

- 1. The application site lies in open countryside and an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Within the countryside there is effectively a presumption against new residential development except in limited circumstances not relevant to this case. This presumption is in the interests of sustainability and amenity. It follows that as a matter of principle the proposal comprises unacceptable development.**

In terms of harm, the proposal would introduce a house and its curtilage with inevitable domestic paraphernalia, and these would be visually intrusive and alien in such an isolated and rural location, distant from other residential properties or any settlement. By reason of their visibility and alien appearance, the house and its curtilage would detract from the wider appearance of the landscape, neither conserving nor enhancing its status as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. There are no exceptional circumstances which would outweigh the harm to the countryside and landscape.

The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the principles of the settlement strategy set out in Policy CP1 of the South Wiltshire Core Strategy (and Policies CP1 and CP2 of the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy) and 'Saved' Policies C2 and C4 of the Salisbury District Local Plan, and the

guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework – paragraphs 109 and 115.

- 2. The development would be contrary to saved Policy R2 of the Salisbury District Local Plan, as provision for public open space has not been made.**

Informative: Reason 2 above can be overcome by the applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement in respect of Policy R2.

109 Urgent Items

There were no urgent items.

(Duration of meeting: 6.00 - 9.15 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Kieran Elliott of Democratic Services, direct line (01225) 718504, e-mail kieran.elliott@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115