

APPENDIX 1

Draft Development Brief, The Old Swimming Pool, College Street, Salisbury – Summary of consultation and resultant amendments.

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
1	Mrs A Hillier	Object	Land should be turned into parkland with possible tennis court and other sporting facilities.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. New text will be inserted to reflect preference for community facility.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
2	M G Watson	Neutral	Exhibition in Salisbury library should be on a Saturday. There is traffic congestion in City centre in midday and midweek	The exhibition was held on two Tuesdays, which are busy market day in Salisbury. It was open from 12 – 8pm in order that the maximum number of people could attend, including people after work.	NO CHANGE
3	J A Armstrong	Object	Area should be returned to its original status before construction of the swimming pool. Area should be an urban space and used for sport. Its current use shows a genuine need for the area. No additional development needed, just remove current eye-sore	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. Redevelopment of the site is an opportunity to remove the eyesore with a better form of development.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
4	Antony Makepeace-Warne	Object	Site was originally for benefit and enjoyment for the public, potential uses do not meet these criterions. Proposed development cannot 'stitch into historic pattern' and 'complement the office centralisation redevelopment', these are mutually exclusive. There will be unsuitable construction over the footprint of the building like the communal amenity space and off street surface parking.	Points noted.	NO CHANGE
5	Allan Francis	Neutral	Footpath 53 passes on west side of the park and will not be affected by the development	Point noted	NO CHANGE
6	M S Bird	Support	Will staff/visitor parking be allowed in Park Street and Collage Street? Staff should use Park & Ride or pay £2,000 p.a. for parking next to their work. Vacated buildings/houses returned to housing use.	Any commercial development would need a travel plan showing how staff would travel to work. As this is a central location with good transport links, then this would be taken into account. The parking on college street and park street are subject to residents parking permits and any development on the site will be able to provide its own parking within the existing site.	Add new text at the end of DP20 to state 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
7	Helena Cave-Penney. Assistant Archaeologist, Wiltshire County Council	Neutral	Archaeological assessments may need to include excavation of trenches. This will depend on the extent and nature of the proposed development	Point noted. New text added to reflect this.	New Development Principle added to highlight the archaeological assessments: 'An archaeological assessment will need to be carried out before any application for the site can be determined. If any archaeological remains are found, the applicant must demonstrate how this will be dealt with.'
8	Miss E E McCarthy	Support	Development Brief doesn't state how tall the building would be. Small houses at the bottom of Queen's Rd would be over-shadowed in spring, summer and winter.	The indicative layout on page 11 does give an indication of the number of storeys that the building will be. The brief does not go into the precise detail of how tall they will be, as this will form part of any planning application submitted.	NO CHANGE
9	Wendy English	Object	Young people currently use it. Premises should be used for community facilities: table tennis, badminton, coffee bar, recreation area or bowling alley. It will prevent vandalism. The swimming pool cost the council to maintain and brought no revenue, so there should be no need for the redeveloped site to do so. Preventing vandalism is money saved.	The brief does state that a community use will be a potentially acceptable use for the site. New text will be added to reflect preference for community facilities.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
10	William C Dickinson	Object	Site should be exclusively for community use with element of 'commercialism', such as coffee shop, sandwich bar, burger bar, Cyber Café. There is nothing of much interest for pre-teens and teenagers. A safe place that is smoke and alcohol free would be well received by kids and parents. Area could be a swimming complex with community rooms for hire. Costa coffee, Starbucks, etc could pay operating costs. No need for parking as College St car park is close Lockable bicycle stands could be near the building.	Points noted. The brief does acknowledge that community uses may be appropriate on the site. New text will be added to support the preference for community use.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
11	Mr J A Osmond	Support	Layout 1 favoured. Area has lost Post Office/General Store and Grocers in the area. With the council redevelopment, there could be potential for a convenience store (not supermarket). Meat and Green groceries (fresh) should not be available because it would disadvantage Butcher in Park St. Shop could be on ground floor, two stories of offices or housing and other areas for housing/retirement housing. Or offices on 1 or 2 floors, residential above and remainder for housing or retirement housing.	Points noted, and support welcomed. The uses recommended are all stated in the Brief as potentially acceptable uses.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
12	Mrs L Walker	Neutral	Retirement housing with low boundary hedge not possible because restrictions may be placed and what can be played or done in an area used by children and students. Architectural plans should be discussed when the time comes.	Points noted and agreement that any planning application will have to demonstrate how the potential conflict between the sites use and activities in the recreation ground, such as ball games will be overcome.	In section 4 add new text under Design and Access Statement stating 'Design - how will the proposed design of the development deal with any potential conflicts between the proposed use on the site and the activities taking place in the recreation ground? It must also be ensured that development will not unreasonably affect the current recreational activities enjoyed by the community'
13	Mrs J R Purchase	Neutral	Support scheme 1 Object scheme 2 College St already very congested with parked cars without surface car park and access coming into that road	Points noted	NO CHANGE
14	R J Purchase	Neutral	Support scheme 1, subject to north boundary being a high brick wall covered in planting, due to ball games on grass. A single access off spur road only sensible solution to access. Object scheme 2, do not agree to surface parking and this would not be practical with the difference in levels at the access.	Points noted	NO CHANGE
15	John Clark, Garden History Society	No Comment	No comment because the proposal does not appear to affect historic park or garden.	Points noted	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
16	Peter Brown, South West Regional Assembly	N/A	Consultation letter acknowledged but no response.	None	NO CHANGE
17	Colin Bird. Highways Agency	Support	Section 3 Development Strategy – DP2. We support retirement housing as this will have least impact in road network. Section 4 Planning Application – wish an additional statement be included, requiring applicants to provide a transport assessment, scope of which to be agreed with Local Highways Authority and Highways Agency.	Points noted and text to be amended to highlight the need for a transport assessment.	Add new text at the end of DP20 to state ‘Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.’
18	Colonel M A Thorne	Object	Site could be returned to a green field, as it was bequeathed for. This was also promised by Mr Donald Arthur Culver at the Council meeting of 26 July 2006	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government’s aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community.	NO CHANGE
19	Mrs J M Brown	Support	Do not agree with parking or commercial use below development. Below ground car parks attract younger people taking drugs and drink.	Any application for the site will have to demonstrate how any underground parking is safe and secure. Using underground parking will allow a greater area of the site to be landscaped and left undeveloped.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
20	John H F Brown	Support	Layout 2 is best. Salisbury needs more starter and retirement homes. Office/shop would not be economically viable. Protection from recreational activities essential, in the form of a tall wire fence.	Points noted. The brief states that retirement housing is a potentially acceptable use on the site. The detailed matters of fencing will be dealt with by any subsequent planning application.	NO CHANGE
21	S Browning	Object	Should be returned to grass for recreational use. If it was needed for the council, it should have been in the council office proposal, not an extra build. Office use at site is not suitable as it is a residential area. Car access and parking should not be built into proposal as Council is supposed to be promoting park & ride.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. Points noted about office use on the site. Any application for commercial use on the site would need to include a travel plan demonstrating how employees and customers would access the site. Text will be inserted to reflect the preference for a community use.	Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.' The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
22	Mrs S Brown	Support	Prefer layout 1. Underground parking is an excellent proposal. If Council office building will not be big enough, can the 'commercial' use be used for extra council offices?	Support is welcomed. The application for the new Council offices at Bourne Hill have been designed to accommodate all staff so there will be no requirement for extra office space.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
23	R N Mander	Object	Should be converted to a sports outdoor/indoor facility. Youth need sports facilities. Should not be converted to sheltered accommodation or car parks. Should use park & ride.	Points noted. The brief does acknowledge that community uses may be appropriate on the site. Text will be inserted to reflect preference for community use. The site will not be converted to a car park, although some uses will require an element of parking, which will be agreed in any planning application on the site.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
24	Steve Hannath	Object	Could the Council office extension have taken place here? Site could be returned to a green space, instead of redevelopment to raise money. There should be no new road construction; policy should be for fewer roads to encourage park & ride.	The site was looked at as part of the sequential test for redevelopment of the offices, but the site was discounted, as it was not big enough. The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. There are no new roads to be constructed as part of the indicative layouts, only access from existing roads.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
25	John M English. WCC Councillor	Object	A return to green space or an alternative leisure facility should be an option. The land was historically for leisure use. This development will maximise income and policy should not be governed by budget. Planting trees should be careful, as it's a recreational ground. There should be cycle storage. Concept of underground car park and one-way system is good. CCTV should only be for 'reasonable use'. BREEAM Eco rating should be 'excellent' not 'good'. Would like to see more details regarding planning obligations and Section 106.	<p>The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The brief does state that a leisure use is a potentially acceptable use on the site. Text will be inserted to reflect preference for a community facility. Any proposals for tree planning on the site will have to be discussed with the Councils Arboricultural Officer.</p> <p>As part of any planning application the Local Plan does require new development to provide cycle storage.</p> <p>The brief does not mention the use of CCTV. The casual surveillance in DP11 is surveillance by the residents themselves and by positioning principle windows to overlook more secluded areas. The emerging Regional Spatial Strategy requires that all new development achieve the requirements of BREEAM and Eco-homes very good standard and as this is a Brownfield site, development can be expected to be of an excellent standard.</p>	<p>The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'</p> <p>Text to be amended in DP23 to state 'Covered and secure bicycle parking spaces will be provided in all new developments.'</p> <p>Amend text in DP10 to state that 'Development should aspire to meet best practice environmental sustainability standards including a BREEAM Eco homes rating of excellent.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
				Therefore BREEAM standard will be changed "Excellent".	
26	Jill Browning	Object	Site should be open green space with ball wall. Dogs should not be allowed in order to protect children and keep it clean.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. Issues of dogs on the site will be dealt with at the planning application stage.	NO CHANGE
27	Jon and Camilla Barlow	Object	Object to: all commercial (inc offices), housing (except retirement), all uses that will increase traffic and all development for which adequate car parking is not made. Supporting: all parking should be underground, no increase to footprint now or in the future, site should be used for community or retirement homes. The flat site is suitable for retirement homes, will require less parking, there is flat access to city centre and parkland or will least disturb residential area, particularly as effect of new council office is unknown.	Points noted. The brief acknowledges the sites potential for community uses and retirement homes. Text will be inserted to reflect the preference for a community use. The indicative layouts do allow for underground parking.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
28	Maggie Shepherd	Object	<p>The site was originally left to the people of Salisbury for their use and enjoyment. Offices and housing will not benefit the public. Councillor Britton suggested grassing over the site would be possible in the Guildhall on July 26 2006. Councillor Culver also stated it might be grassed over. Is the site being sold so fast to pay for the council's offices? Object to above ground parking. 3 storey tower will devastate views. It cannot fit in with houses on Queens Rd and the new council offices.</p>	<p>The Council offices and the swimming pool site are separate sites and applications for each site will therefore be dealt with separately.</p> <p>The site is a Brownfield site within the city and as such there is presumption in favour of redevelopment. The brief is seeking to put a framework into place to guide future development to ensure it is sympathetic to and can add benefit to the area. Finance and land deals are not a planning consideration.</p> <p>The development brief acknowledges the issue of views and DP8 addresses the points raised with the stepping down of the development from 3 to 1 storey.</p>	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
29	Dr Andrew N Trethewey	Object	<p>Why was this development and the Bourne House development not coordinated? There is a blind spot at the only entrance into College car park and traffic may block these roads. Bell Vue Road or Swaynes Close will be more used, how will this be managed? Rather than car parks in the development, could there be parking permits for the College road car park. What will happen to the redundant spur road? How will development traffic enter the site? Are there plans for the ally running from Swaynes Close to the car park? The underground car park may affect mature trees. More definition is needed on the 'sympathetic boundary treatment'. The bank is at least 10ft difference in height, from where are the 1, 2 and 3 stories measured from? Will the development be sold or rented out by the council? Housing would be better, but if there are businesses they should not involve delivery trucks. There should be a barrier between the car park and the recreational area. The development should be stitched to surrounding housing, not the new council offices.</p>	<p>The site was looked at as part of the sequential test for redevelopment of the offices, but the site was discounted, as it was not large enough. Any applications for the site will have to deal with traffic and justify how it will enter the site without causing problems to the surrounding area. The brief does propose to have a limited amount of car parking, which could be accommodated under the development, and this is considered a better design solution than to cause congestion by allowing more cars to park along the surrounding roads. As part of any application on the site, the applicant will be required to submit a transport assessment to deal with such issues as parking. The Councils Arboricultural Officer will be consulted on any proposal, which may affect mature trees. The height of the building will be determined at the planning application stage. The Council will market the site and this will not form part of the planning process.</p>	<p>Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'</p> <p>Add new text in DP4 to state 'Development must respect and 'stitch' into the historic patterns of Bourne Hill and the existing housing.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
30	B MacKechnie-Javis	Object	Could the Council Offices be housed at this site and save huge costs?	The site was looked at as part of the sequential test for redevelopment of the offices, but the site was discounted, as it was not big enough.	NO CHANGE
31	Salisbury Conservation Advisory Panel	Neutral	<p>Jim Humberstone: Concerned it will be a commercial development and a missed opportunity to reinstate parkland.</p> <p>Paul Stevens: It should remain in public ownership and not be sold off.</p> <p>Committee view: Site should remain in public ownership and ideally parkland would be restored. If this not possible then site should remain in recreational use.</p>	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. The site is currently owned by Salisbury District Council and not the public. The brief allows for the development of a recreation use and text will be inserted to reflect this preference.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
32	Fred Kemp Wiltshire Fire & Rescue Service	Neutral	Comments regarding fire safety. The site should ensure access for fire fighting. Consultation should be undertaken with developer to provide adequate water supplies for Fire Service. Domestic & commercial sprinkler installation should be considered.	Points noted. The appropriate stage for such detailed discussions will be at the planning application stage.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
33	Jonathon Boddy	Object	<p>Recreational ground is well used. Development into housing (particularly retirement housing) and the lack of a suitable boundary, will cause conflict between residents and the public, and may 'demonise' young people. How will you ensure properties are protected from balls, noise and dogs? The SDC Youth Strategy says young people ask for more facilities, this site has the potential for a safe green space. Footprint has increased for landscaping, reducing access. Residents assumed land was left in Trust to the council for the local community. More consideration for business or leisure facilities.</p>	<p>There may be conflicts between residential development and the open space. Any developer would have to demonstrate how these conflicts could be overcome, before planning permission is recommended for approval. Salisbury District Council owns the land, and although there is a covenant on the site, there is no legal requirement that the site should be used for any particular purpose. It is up to Salisbury District Council to decide whether the site can be used for a different purpose and public notice will be given before deciding to use the site for any alternative use. Text will be inserted to reflect a preference for community facilities.</p>	<p>In section 4 add new text under Design and Access Statement stating 'Design - how will the proposed design of the development deal with any potential conflicts between the proposed use on the site and the activities taking place in the recreation ground? It must also be ensured that development will not unreasonably affect the current recreational activities enjoyed by the community</p> <p>The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
34	Paul Kirk	Object	Seconds objections raised in Rep No.4. Why was the swimming pool not in the Vision for Salisbury?	The Vision project focuses on 4 main areas within Salisbury and will also provide more overarching policies for the whole central area. The Swimming Pool site is very specific and requires a more detailed planning brief to ensure appropriate and high quality development occurs on the site.	NO CHANGE
35	Ellie Challans Environment Agency	Support	<p>Suggested amendments:</p> <p>Ground conditions & utilities: should include reference to Planning Policy Statement 23 – Planning & Pollution Control (PPS23), and Policy & Practice for the Protection of Groundwater (Environ. Agency). Site overlies a groundwater Source Protection Zone 1, as it is near a highly vulnerable drinking water borehole.</p> <p>DP3 High quality architecture: Building design should be robust enough for increased frequency and intensity of storms and extreme temperatures.</p> <p>DP10 Energy efficiency: A BREEAM grade ‘excellent’ should be specified.</p>	Point noted and text will be inserted or amended to reflect the comments.	<p>Text inserted in ground conditions and utilities section to read ‘Further information about ground conditions and utilities can be obtained from Planning Policy Statement 23 – Planning and Pollution Control and also Policy and Practice for the protection of groundwater produced by the Environment Agency.</p> <p>Add text to DP3 to state ‘Building design should be robust enough for increased frequency and intensity of storms and extreme temperatures.’</p> <p>Amend text in DP10 to state that ‘Development should aspire to meet best practice environmental sustainability standards including a BREEAM Eco homes rating of excellent.’</p>
36			No representation		

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
37	Olwen Tanner	Object	Site could benefit local people if it was a community centre, and also used as a youth club, and ground outside for football and possibly a skateboard ramp. Both layouts plant too many trees outside the site, reducing amenity space.	The brief acknowledges that the site can potentially be used for a community use. Text will be inserted to reflect this view. Any planting will aim to use as little space as possible, but a certain amount will be necessary to separate the development from the recreation ground and avoid any overlooking or conflict between activities.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
38	Mr I D Grant	Neutral	Vehicular route east of council offices is not acceptable. Council grounds should not include vehicular access or parking. May be prudent to consider layout 1 as more council offices.	The vehicular access arrangements for the redevelopment of Bourne Hill are outside the scope of this brief, and have been granted planning permission. The site was looked at as part of the sequential test for redevelopment of the offices, but the site was discounted, as it was not big enough. The current application for the Bourne Hill council offices will accommodate all staff.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
39	Ralph Bryder Salisbury Civic Society	Object	<p>Part of ground floor of any new development could form 'sports pavilion' facilities (equipment storage, catering facilities, shelter from rain). Rather than the crude and arbitrary 40ft rule in policy D6, no building should extend above height of mature trees to the south or the view of the cathedral. Can it be assumed that any new building will not be constrained to having only pitched roofs clad in traditional materials? Rather than a taller element on the College St corner, the southern end of the historic wall could be demolished; this will also help 'balance' development with existing 3-storey buildings. An apartment block is preferred to a mix of 2 & 3 storey town houses. Topography suits underground parking and surface parking should be avoided. Building should be high density & high quality. 'Retirement housing' will require as much parking as 'housing'. Offices or shops would create unacceptable parking pressure. Favour layout 1, but without surface parking, could the footprint be bigger? Does the communal space need to be so large? Access to underground parking only possible from the spur road. Secure, covered cycle storage must be provided.</p>	<p>The brief does state that Community uses could be located on the ground floor of a development. Text will be inserted to reflect this preference. The Brief acknowledges the importance of the view of the cathedral and the trees (page 5) and DP8 states that development must not rise above the existing skyline formed by the trees. The brief does not go into the detail of the roofing types or covering, but does acknowledge that as the site lies within the conservation area and materials appropriate to the CA will be preferred. The more specific issues concerned with the type of materials to be used in any development will be discussed at the planning application stage. Any development on the site will be expected to fit in with surrounding areas, and it is considered that the demolition of the historic wall will have a negative impact on an important feature. The communal space is required to ensure that there is enough space between development on the site and the existing uses on the recreation ground to avoid conflict.</p>	<p>The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'</p> <p>Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'</p> <p>Text to be amended in DP23 to state 'Covered and secure bicycle parking spaces will be provided in all new developments.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			Due to good bus services in the area, the number of parking spaces can be reduced. Cars will create additional traffic in the narrow streets. A Travel Plan should form part of any planning application.	Text to be amended to state cycle storage must be provided. A travel plan will be required with any application on the site. The two layouts shown are indicative and therefore there is scope for a planning application to propose to enlarge the built area, as long as this stays within the existing footprint of the old swimming pool building. Other points about uses on the site have been noted.	
40	J E Bradley	Neutral	Adequate parking within the development is essential, as there is a general shortage of parking space in the area. There is a need for shops, since the decline of shops in Escort Rd. Serious consideration should be given to a commercial use combined with residential, providing shops do not effect viability of remaining shops in Escort Rd. Consideration needs to be given to young people who currently use site to meet. Any newly planted trees should not prevent use of play area in the centre of the ground.	The site does allow for car parking and the exact number of spaces to be provided will be agreed at the planning application stage. The brief acknowledges that commercial or community uses on the site may be appropriate. Any new planting will be added to ensure that activities on the recreation ground and development on the site are separate and do not conflict.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
41	June E Doughty-Stapleton	Object	Suggest the Council renew and recycle this site for its offices, and save money.	The site was looked at as part of the sequential test for redevelopment of the offices, but the site was discounted, as it was not big enough.	NO CHANGE
42	Harry Stephens	Object	If sold for housing, it will conflict with playing field. Trees must not be planted at back of site, if a barrier is needed it should be on site. Assumes that development will provide it's own parking and permits won't be allowed.	There may be conflicts between residential development and the open space. Any developer would have to demonstrate how these conflicts could be overcome, before a decision can be made. The site does allow for car parking and the exact number of spaces to be provided will be agreed at the application stage.	In section 4 add new text under Design and Access Statement stating 'Design - how will the proposed design of the development deal with any potential conflicts between the proposed use on the site and the activities taking place in the recreation ground? It must also be ensured that development will not unreasonably affect the current recreational activities enjoyed by the community
43	Mrs Cynthia Munro	Object	Site should be an extension of present open space. Recreational areas should not be curtailed and 'walking places' should be preserved and enhanced.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
44	Robin and Valerie Clarke	Object	<p>Land was given to the people of Salisbury for recreation, though there's no proof of this, the site should be true to the spirit of the gift. The site should be grassed over. Will the development use toughened glass, as mentioned by Councillor Sheila Warrander? There should be no further encroachment into the open space, as it is important to local children and young people. There are not enough facilities for the young and this contributes to vandalism. Relieved building will not be above 3 stories and there's underground parking. Any development should be residential.</p>	<p>Salisbury District Council owns the land, and although there is a covenant on the site, there is no legal requirement that the site should only be used for any particular purpose. Any application on the site will have to demonstrate how conflicts between uses in the recreation ground and development on the site will be overcome, before a decision can be made. The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land and the government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. Text will be inserted to reflect the view of a need for more facilities for young people.</p>	<p>In section 4 add new text under Design and Access Statement stating 'Design - how will the proposed design of the development deal with any potential conflicts between the proposed use on the site and the activities taking place in the recreation ground? It must also be ensured that development will not unreasonably affect the current recreational activities enjoyed by the community</p> <p>The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
45	Conservation Officer, Salisbury District Council	Observation	This is identified as an important site with a Conservation Area. The relationship of building to open space is a critical one. Any replacement building in such a sensitive location needs to be justified and demonstrated to have either a neutral or positive impact on the Conservation Area. In conclusion, it is suggested that any replacement building would need to be a high-quality modern design that reflects the high quality of the surroundings and yet makes subtle links with the adjacent historic buildings.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land and the government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. Development principle 3 does require that the site produce high quality architecture and a development of distinction. Furthermore DP4 does state that a high standard of design will be required that respects the historically sensitive context.	NO CHANGE
46	Jennifer S Hoare	Support	Prefer layout 1 because underground parking is a good use of structure and will provide spaces in an already over-used area. Prefer a single access point and the extra housing this will provide. Football is played on the open space; any housing on the upper area should be designed so that it doesn't affect kicking of balls.	Points noted and support welcomed.	In section 4 add new text under Design and Access Statement stating 'Design - how will the proposed design of the development deal with any potential conflicts between the proposed use on the site and the activities taking place in the recreation ground? It must also be ensured that development will not unreasonably affect the current recreational activities enjoyed by the community

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
47	Adrienne Isted	Support	<p>Prefer layout 1, but ground should not be used for commercial or community use, as it would require extra parking and disturb the peaceful area.</p> <p>Support underground parking, all traffic movement along the Spur Rd and the screening trees. Favour affordable or sheltered accommodation for the retired, therefore reducing parking requirements. Development should harmonise with nearby housing and have energy-saving devices. There should be no curtailment of sporting activities.</p>	<p>Any application for commercial use on the site would need to include a travel plan demonstrating how employees and customers would access the site. Points noted about the sheltered/ affordable housing. Text should be amended to state that the BREEAM standard should be excellent. There is no intention of curtailing the sporting activities on the recreation ground, and any developer would have to demonstrate how potential conflicts could be overcome, before a decision is made.</p>	<p>Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'</p> <p>Amend text in DP10 to state that 'Development should aspire to meet best practice environmental sustainability standards including a BREEAM Eco homes rating of excellent.'</p> <p>In section 4 add new text under Design and Access Statement stating 'Design - how will the proposed design of the development deal with any potential conflicts between the proposed use on the site and the activities taking place in the recreation ground? It must also be ensured that development will not unreasonably affect the current recreational activities enjoyed by the community</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
48	Mr and Mrs Sage	Object	No objections to the removal of swimming pool. Object to mixed residential/office use. Site was originally fields before becoming a park and available to the public, site should be returned to parkland. If it will be developed it should follow existing ethos and have public leisure/sport facility or health care. Area is open and swimming pool building is low and 'undemanding'. A new tall building would change character and be intrusive.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The brief acknowledges that the site may be used for community use in DP2. New text will be inserted to reflect the preference for a community use. In assessing the heights of buildings that may be acceptable on the site, the character and impacts on the surrounding area have to be taken into account. DP112 states that the height must reflect the prevailing character in the area.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
49	Nick Burdett	Object	Site not suitable for housing, it's isolated and look out of place, residents may find noise & activity of park irritating. Not suitable for office use as it won't fit in with general leisure use of the area. Site should be retained for local community. Temptation for a financial opportunity should be resisted.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The brief acknowledges that the site may be used for community use in DP2. New text will be inserted to reflect the preference for a community use. Any potential noise impacts will have to be addressed by the application before a decision can be made.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
50	Hilary Munro	Object	Site may be an appropriate place for council offices. Site should not be sold for housing. Object to cutting down trees (particularly the walnut and sweet chestnuts). Building should not encroach onto recreational ground; planting trees will reduce open space. Object to character of area being changed. Object to proposed height of building; it will overshadow trees on the edge of the park.	The site was looked at as part of the sequential test for redevelopment of the offices, but was discounted, as it was not big enough. The Councils Arboricultural Officer will be consulted on any proposal to remove trees from the site. The site will not encroach on the recreation area, as only the footprint of the old swimming pool building can be developed. Any development on the site will have to ensure that it respects and preserves the character of the area as stated in DP3 and DP4. The height of surrounding buildings in the area will have to be taken into consideration when proposing maximum heights.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
51	Sue Wright, Green Party	Object	Land was acquired and is used by community, housing or commercial unacceptable. Housing (especially for retired) or commercial offices will conflict with sporting activities. Proposal removes land from the open public realm, as development will extend over footprint.	Points noted. There may be a conflict between the use of the recreation ground and any development on this site. Any developer would have to demonstrate how these conflicts can be overcome, before a decision is made. The development does go outside the footprint in the south eastern corner, however to the north, the proposed development is inside the footprint, so there is no overall increase in the area which can be developed.	In section 4 add new text under Design and Access Statement stating 'Design - how will the proposed design of the development deal with any potential conflicts between the proposed use on the site and the activities taking place in the recreation ground? It must also be ensured that development will not unreasonably affect the current recreational activities enjoyed by the community

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
52	Andy Watson	Object	<p>Development brief should consider designs not requiring additional buildings, such as an orchard, pond, flower garden & re-landscaping existing footprint to enjoy views of cathedral and St Edmunds.</p> <p>Development at the site will cause disruption during & post construction. It will cause trees to be felled, loss of parkland and restrictions on activities there. Why is community use linked to housing? The savings from the Council offices should be used for conservation at this site. Would like to see a brief to return site to its natural state, with environmental assessments (i.e. vehicles, noise, visual impact) and assessment of community factors (i.e. level of use by local residents, value to community).</p>	<p>The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. The Councils Arboricultural Officer will be consulted on any proposal to remove trees from the site. The government promotes mixed use development and it is considered that this type of development would be acceptable on the site.</p>	NO CHANGE
53	Jane Macy South West Regional Assembly	Neutral	<p>Please draw your attention to the Draft RSS.</p>	<p>Point noted.</p>	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
54	Mrs Yvonne Watts	Object	Site should be returned to green land with no building. Trees should not be planted as area is used for ball games. There will never be enough parking underground. Parking in College St should be for residents only.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. Any new planting will be added to ensure that activities on the recreation ground and the development on the site are separate and do not conflict. Parking will be provided on site.	NO CHANGE
55	Mr T Parkinson	Object	Land should return to grassed recreation. Development should be in a historic, sensitive context and not complement the Council centralisation. As council is allocated much of College St car park, the route along the length of the council offices should be a pedestrian walkway. Any building on the site should be low cost or sheltered housing.	The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. The brief acknowledges that the site may be suitable for retirement / affordable homes.	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
56	Ralph Bryder, Salisbury Transport 2000	Object	When car parking is removed on the southern edge of the site, it should not be re-introduced as in layout 2. Site is near city centre and (allegedly) has adequate public transport, therefore this could be a car-free development or only with 'community' cars. Site is near housing with parked cars on street and the council offices will have an unknown traffic impact, therefore there should be a minimum number of spaces. With the site's topography, parking should be underground & accessed by the spur road; however there will still be extra traffic movement. Parking may be reduced if there's retirement housing. Secure, covered cycle storage facilities must be provided, not merely encouraged. The park has no views of cars and this must be kept. There should be a Travel Plan as part of the planning application.	The layouts shown in the brief are indicative only and the amount of car parking to be provided will be agreed with the Council before a decision on an application can be made. Policies in the Local Plan do allow for car parking on new developments and it will be ensured that this is kept to a minimum. Support noted on underground car parking. Secure cycle facilities will be provided, and the text amended to reflect this. A travel plan will be required with any application submitted.	Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.' Text to be amended in DP23 to state 'Covered and secure bicycle parking spaces will be provided in all new developments.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
57	C Ailano, Salisbury Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses	Neutral	This site could be suitable for a religious hall for Jehovah's Witnesses. The hall would be modern and well designed. The current building used, in St Marks Rd, may be sold.	Point noted. The brief does allow for community uses on the site, providing the development principles are adhered to. Text will be added in the brief to reflect a preference for such a use.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
58	Mrs V Morton	Object	Any development at the site should be a public amenity, as before. Why is parking required as it's located next to College St car park? Any developments should not be any higher than existing building. Space should return to a public park, failing that, a public amenity. If there is a building it should be 1 storey high & have no parking. Returning site to parkland would partially compensate increased footprint of new council offices.	<p>The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The open land to the rear is to stay in its present use for the community. The brief does allow for a community use and text will be added to reflect this preference.</p> <p>The layouts shown in the brief are indicative only and the amount of car parking to be provided will be agreed with the Council before a decision on an application can be made. Policies in the Local Plan do allow for car parking on new developments and it will be ensured that this is kept to a minimum.</p> <p>In order for development to fit in with the residential character of the surrounding area and meet government targets for density and reuse of Brownfield land, it would not be appropriate to only have single storey development on the site.</p>	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
59	Rev David Rogers	Neutral	Site could be suitable for a purpose built church with community facilities. The Baptist church could be relocated here.	Point noted. The brief does allow for community uses on the site, providing the development principles are adhered to. Text in the brief will be added to reflect this preference.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
60	Paul Haywood, Wessex Water	Support	There are foul and surface water sewers available for this development, where capacity is available. Surface water flows should not be discharged to the foul sewer. There are water mains in the vicinity and no issues or constraints are anticipated.	Comments noted	NO CHANGE

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
61	Sara Reeve-Tucker	Object	Site should be grassed over, replanted and used for the public, compensating for loss of secret garden and its trees, birds and animals. A 3-storey building would dwarf nearby houses and affect views. Traffic & parking will increase in a quite, narrow residential area. Council could reduce its new development at Bourne Hill and use this site for additional offices.	<p>The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites.</p> <p>There are other 3 storey houses opposite the site in College Street, and the brief does not propose to allow 3 storey's over the entire site. Development should be stepped down to keep the views towards the cathedral and this is acknowledged in the brief.</p> <p>Any application for development on the site will require a transport assessment to address any potential traffic issues.</p> <p>The design of the new council offices has been through a rigorous design process and it is considered that the proposed development at Bourn Hill provides a more acceptable site than the Swimming Pool site.</p>	Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
62	Mrs M J C Davies	Object	<p>Swimming pool was only built because it was a leisure facility for the public, the site should be used for leisure, if not then grassed over. Lord Bourne bought the land in 1815 to prevent development; SDC should keep it that way and not be a brown field site. Is the site being sold to pay for new council offices? 3 storeys will create unpleasant, gloomy corridor, affecting light and views.</p> <p>Development should not complement the new offices. Development extends over footprint, taking away public land & is 3x as high. There will not be enough parking for the 35-40 units of residential space, it will overstretch parking in the area & add pressure to the altered College St car park exit routes. Retirement housing would have less cars, therefore is more acceptable than low-cost housing & commercial use. Community use would need parking spaces, which would be reduced by the new offices, reduction of College St car park and its inaccessibility. Planting trees to screen football pitch from housing is unacceptable. NE corner is hedged off denying public right to walk. Site should be grassed over, have tennis courts, garden (to replace secret garden) or used for council offices if</p>	<p>The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land and the government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Salisbury District Council owns the land, and although there is a covenant on the site, there is no legal requirement that the site should only be used for any particular purpose. The brief does allow for a community use and text will be added to reflect this preference.</p> <p>We, as a planning authority are dealing with the future development of the site to ensure a high quality and sustainable development is produced. Any queries regarding the sale of the site should be directed to the Property Management section.</p> <p>In order for development to fit in with the residential character of the surrounding area and meet government targets for density and reuse of Brownfield land, it is necessary to have 3 storey development, although this will not be over the entire site. DP13 states that there is scope for 3 storey development, but the applicant will have to demonstrate that views and light are not affected.</p>	<p>The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'</p> <p>Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
			<p>the new development was reduced to 2 storeys and finished at the secret garden.</p>	<p>It is necessary for the development to compliment the new offices, to ensure that the historic character of the grade II* listed building is respected. Complimenting the development with the new offices will also ensure that the character of new developments fits in with existing buildings.</p> <p>The development does go outside the footprint in the south eastern corner, however to the north, the proposed development is inside the footprint, so there is no overall increase in the area which can be developed.</p> <p>Any application for development on the site will require a transport assessment to address any potential traffic issues including parking standards. Parking spaces will be kept to a minimum in line with government guidance.</p> <p>New planting is required to ensure that activities on the recreation ground and the development do not conflict.</p> <p>A community use is acknowledged in the brief as a potentially acceptable use.</p>	

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
				The site was looked at as part of the sequential test for redevelopment of the offices, but the site was discounted, as it was not big enough.	
63	Duncan Davies	Object	Any development should be of a traditional & historic design, not contemporary architecture such as the new council offices. The original pool development would be unacceptable today, don't compound the error with a housing development. Site should be grassed over, or used for the community (orchard, garden, pond, tennis courts). Site should remain parkland to echo its roots as a green space used commercially (cloth processing).	DP4 states that development must stitch into the historic core and a high standard of design will be required which respects the historically sensitive context. The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land and the government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites. The brief does allow for a community use and text will be inserted to reflect this preference.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'
64	Mr M Woolf	Neutral	The development should not intrude on the local residents' 'space'. No noise, not too much extra traffic & no antisocial behaviour. Area must be kept a quiet part of Salisbury.	The recreation ground will remain as open space for use by the community. Any application on the site will be required to submit a transport assessment to deal with any potential conflicts.	Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
65	Nelly Thelwall	Object	<p>Site should be returned to grass, if not it could be used for the new council office extension and save the walled garden. Housing, retirement housing, offices and community uses would increase traffic, noise & pollution, affect road safety and residents' quality of life – therefore object to all uses except community. Object to 3 storey development in SE corner, it will obstruct and darken views from Queens Rd. Development should remain in footprint and be no higher than present building. Planted trees should be on northern edge of site, not on playing fields. If the site was used for council offices traffic would remain at same level and the secret garden would be preserved.</p>	<p>The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land and the government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites.</p> <p>The brief does allow for community use and text will be added to reflect this preference.</p> <p>The site was looked at as part of the sequential test for redevelopment of the offices, but the site was discounted, as it was not big enough.</p> <p>Any application on the site will be required to submit a transport assessment to deal with any potential conflicts.</p> <p>The brief does state that a community use would be a potential acceptable use on the site.</p> <p>DP5 does state that development should be primarily located with the footprint of the existing building and the indicative layouts on page 11 of the brief support this.</p> <p>New planting is required to ensure that activities on the recreation ground and the development do not conflict.</p>	<p>Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'</p> <p>The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but can not rule out commercial uses (residential and employment) as this will clearly comply with all tiers of planning policy related to Brownfield sites.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
66	City Area committee	Neutral	That the City Area Committee considers that only leisure and recreational uses should be considered for the Old Swimming Pool site.	The Brief welcomes such a use and makes provision for this type of use on the site. However, the Brief must accord with National, Regional and Local planning policy with regard to Brownfield sites and therefore to rule out commercial uses would be unreasonable and contrary to policy. Therefore we have sought to reach a compromise in the Brief by stating that there is a local preference for leisure and recreational uses, and we would welcome such proposals, however should commercial development come forward it will be determined on its own merits and this Brief must make contingency for such an outcome. It must also be remembered that the previous leisure use on the site has not been lost, but has been replaced at the 5 Rivers Leisure centre.	The original Brief will be amended with the addition of a sub heading and text in DP2 to read 'Local Community Aspirations - There is a local preference for community and leisure uses for the site. The brief supports such uses but cannot rule out other uses including housing and employment as this will comply with all tiers of planning policy related to brownfield locations.'

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
67	Mrs V Kennard	Object	<p>Site should be returned to Greenfield and become a memorial garden with an information centre. Concern over the loss of trees in construction and building on the site will bring parking issues.</p> <p>Layout 1 the underground parking has given way to increased built area.</p> <p>2nd access in layout 2 will cause traffic problems in College St and destruction of wall.</p> <p>No housing and 2-3 storey is unacceptable.</p>	<p>The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites.</p> <p>The Council's Arboricultural Officer will be consulted on any proposals to remove trees from the site.</p> <p>Potential parking issues during construction will have to be resolved by the applicant before a decision on a planning application can be made.</p> <p>A travel plan will be required with any application submitted.</p> <p>Some houses in College Rd are 3 storey, so development at this height would reflect the local character. Any application for the site will be required to demonstrate how the development will fit in and enhance the character of the area.</p>	<p>Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'</p>

Rep No.	Name	Support or Object	Issues Raised		Change made
68	Major B V Wynn Werninok	Object	<p>The site has been given to the city for a recreation use. The area could be turned into a garden There is not sufficient room for car parking. Uses in the recreation ground could cause damage to cars. It would be too expensive to construct a new building on the site, possibly larger than the present one.</p>	<p>Salisbury District Council owns the land, and although there is a covenant on the site, there is no legal requirement that the site should only be used for a particular purpose.</p> <p>The site of the swimming pool is previously developed land. The government's aims are to reuse such land to take pressure off Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Any application for development on the site will require a transport assessment to address any potential traffic issues including parking. Parking spaces will be kept to a minimum in line with government guidance.</p> <p>There may be a conflict between the use of the recreation ground and any development on this site. Any developer would have to demonstrate how these conflicts would be overcome, before a decision is made.</p> <p>DP5 does state that development should be primarily located with the footprint of the existing building and the indicative layouts on page 11 of the brief support this.</p>	<p>Add new text at the end of DP20 stating 'Any planning application for the site will have to be accompanied by a transport assessment, the scope of which will be agreed with the Local Highways Authority.'</p> <p>In section 4 add new text under Design and Access Statement stating 'Design - how will the proposed design of the development deal with any potential conflicts between the proposed use on the site and the activities taking place in the recreation ground? It must also be ensured that development will not unreasonably affect the current recreational activities enjoyed by the community</p>