

**CITY AREA COMMITTEE 20th January 2005
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Planslist
Item No.

1. **S/2004/2445 BAYVIEW DEVELOPMENTS (BOURNEMOUTH) LIMITED
8 COLDHARBOUR LANE, SALISBURY**

HDS notes:

Members should note that the officer report contains two typographical errors:

1. As WCC Highways comments have now been received, the first proviso after the recommendation should be omitted.

2. Secondly, the report unfortunately omitted the reasons for approval. The report should read:

“APPROVE for the following reasons:

It is considered that this scheme represents a general improvement over the previous schemes , particularly in terms of its design., and accords with the policies of the Local Plan.”

2. **S/2004/2539 – ALTERATIONS TO INTERNAL LAYOUT INCLUDING CHANGE OF USE OF FIRST FLOOR FROM STORAGE TO OFFICE USE AND ALTERATIONS TO EXTERNAL APPEARANCE INCLUDING INSERTION OF NEW WINDOWS AT CHURCHFIELDS DEPOT, STEPHENSON ROAD, CHURCHFIELDS INDUSTRIAL ESTATE**

Statutory Consultee Responses

Environment Agency: No observations to make.

Environmental Health: No observations to make.

Wessex Water: No objection in principle to the proposal.

WCC Highways: No highway objection subject to the imposition of a condition requiring the submission and implementation of a Green Travel Plan.

In accordance with the consultation comments received from WCC Highways, the HDS recommends an additional condition as follows:

“The development, hereby approved, shall not be occupied until a Green Travel Plan has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority together with a timetable for its implementation. No part of the development shall be occupied prior to the implementation of those parts identified in the approved Green Travel Plan as capable of being implemented prior to occupation. Those parts of the approved Green Travel Plan that are identified therein as being capable of implementation after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein and the approved Green Travel Plan shall continue to be implemented in its entirety as long as any part of the development is occupied.

Reason -

**CITY AREA COMMITTEE 20th January 2005
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

To minimise the number of vehicular movements associated with the change of use, hereby approved, and to reduce the total number of vehicular movements to the site in the interests of sustainable development”.

3. **S/2004/2605 – ERECTION OF A SLIMLINE TELECOMS MONOPOLE TO REPLACE EXISTING FLOODLIGHT COLUMN TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED EQUIPMENT AT SALISBURY RUGBY CLUB.**

1 e-mail and 8 letters of objection to proposal raising the following concerns: -

Concerns regarding impact on visitors to camping site
Will deter tourists from visiting Salisbury
Concerns regarding possible impact on health of users of recreational areas
Concerns re impact on health of children at Griffin School
Report last week of health problems if young children use mobiles
Concerns re impact of mast on health of child and adult rugby players
Concerns re impact on health of residents
Stewart Report suggested on precautionary principle that masts should not be near homes
Radiation from masts detrimentally affects sleep patterns.
General concerns regarding health because of cumulative impact from more than one mast
A gamble with health of residents - need to learn from experiences regarding thalidomide, asbestosis and BSE.
Lots of research suggests there could be a health problem in the future from telecommunications masts
Confirmation is required from the LPA that there will be no health risks from this telecommunications equipment.
No study shows that mobile phone mast radiation is safe, lots show that there could be as yet unknown problems
Loss of space on playing fields due to amount of equipment - particularly if there will be 3,4 or 5 masts
Where will revenue from masts go?
Devaluation of residential property
Detrimental visual impact of more than one mast
Detrimental impact on Hudson's Field
Sending videos is unnecessary, don't need more masts
Already 5 mobile phone masts in Salisbury and there are no problems with coverage, no need for more masts.

and a petition signed by 12 people with addresses in Pauls Dene Road and Castle Road

'We understand that there is another planning application to site a mobile phone mast in the Castle Road/Pauls Dene Road area. We would therefore wish to lodge our objection as we have done previously (when the application was withdrawn)
With increased world wide concerns regarding cancer brain and ear tumours, we do not want our families exposed to the radiation that would be emitted from this mast. Why would the rugby club wish to expose their young club players to these emissions when they would be susceptible from physical exhaustion?'

and a second petition signed by 34 people with addresses in Pauls Dene Road, Assisi Road, and Castle Road - some signatures are on both petitions

'We are concerned about the proposal. There have been studies and clear evidence showing health concerns associated with mobile phone masts that have been sited in residential areas.

**CITY AREA COMMITTEE 20th January 2005
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Studies have shown symptoms of fatigue, headaches and skin irritations and more severe cases such as multiple melanomas and acoustic neuromas.

We would like to know how the Council makes its decisions regarding placement of these mobile phone masts and what risks they feel are associated with them. Does the Council have any research information?

As Salisbury Council tax payers we would like to think our health interests and concerns take precedent over financial gain'.

5. **S/2004/2636 – ERECTION OF 18 No 6M HIGH STANDARD LIGHT COLUMNS, ENVIRONMENTALLY CONSCIOUS FLOODLIGHTS TO RUNNING TRACK AT LAND REAR OF SOUTH WILTS GRAMMAR SCHOOL, STRATFORD ROAD, SALISBURY**

Statutory Consultee Responses

Defence Estates: No safeguarding objections to this proposal.

Environmental Health: The lighting should not affect nearby occupiers, but in addition to a condition restricting the hours of use of the proposed floodlighting columns it is suggested that consideration be given to restricting the use of the floodlights to the athletics club for sporting purposes.

In light of the consultation comments received from Environmental Health and following further consideration, the HDS recommends that Condition No2 be varied to read as follows:

“The use of the lighting columns, hereby approved, shall be carried on only in association with the use of the athletics track and for no other purpose whatsoever and shall not be illuminated between the hours of 9:00pm and 8:00am, unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason -

In the interests of the visual amenities of the Landscape Setting of Salisbury and the adjacent Stratford Sub Castle Conservation Area and to protect the amenities of nearby properties.”

Third Party Representations

One letter of representation has been received in objection to the proposed development. This is attached as Appendix 1.

6. **S/04/2690 – CHANGE OF USE CLASS A1 – A3 AND ALTERATIONS TO FAÇADE AT147-151 FISHERTON STREET, SALISBURY.**

7 letters from objectors on the following grounds:

- Restaurant use is inappropriate beneath a dental surgery
- Restaurant should not be open at lunchtime during surgery opening hours
- Smells and hygiene issues from restaurant inappropriate beneath surgery
- Car parking, noise and vermin problems
- Lack of need for another restaurant

**CITY AREA COMMITTEE 20th January 2005
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

3 letters of objection from neighbouring occupiers of Nos 6 and 12 Windsor Road **on the following grounds:**

No 6 overlooks area for proposed duct – unpleasant smells, duct would be focal point from kitchen and back windows and garden, unsightly, noise from extraction, noise from customers at night, parking problems exacerbated, left with duct if premises closed. Duct would be eyesore, protruding above the eaves, refuse generated by kitchen would be left in courtyard and ally and attract pests and vermin, site visit required to see true position of duct in relation to property, impact on quality of life in vicinity and properties.

No 12 Flue would be visible from properties and detrimental to aesthetics, with noise and fumes created. All gardens in Egerton Place would be affected. Garden spoilt by flue. Why is another restaurant needed? Already experience noise and odours from other food outlets, and additional nuisance would be unwelcome.

Petition with 113 signatures objecting to the application. Covering letter also points out that extraction flue is outside the only window from which dental surgery occupants could escape in a fire, and therefore concerned that only fire exit may be blocked by a flue.

Note from HDS:

Building regs have advised that commercial premises such as a Dental Surgery have a duty of care under the Workplace Regulations in conjunction with the fire officer to ensure that there is an appropriate means of escape in the event of a fire. Members of the public should not normally be expected to use a first floor window as a means of escape from commercial (non domestic) premises.

The proposed extraction system would be the subject of a Building Regulations application, and the fire officer would be consulted accordingly.