CITY AREA COMMITTEE - 17/02/05 SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

Planslist Item No.

1. S/2004/1239 - EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO FOOD STORE, COMPRISING 2002M2 GROSS FLOOR AREA (1465M2 NET SALES FLOOR AREA) INCLUDING INTERNET SHOPPING FACILITY, BULK STORAGE, MEZZANINE FLOOR CAFÉ, EXTENSION OF EASTERN SITE BOUNDARY, ALTERATIONS TO CAR PARK LAYOUT, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY WORKS.

Letter from Agent - Attached in full as appendix 1

This letter confirms a revision to the highway proposals as a result of negotiations with the Highway Authority.

<u>HDS Note</u>: A representative from the Highway Authority should be attending the meeting to advise Members on any issues arising.

Section 106

To reflect changes in the highway proposal, there may be a requirement to adjust the Heads of Terms for the Section 106 Agreement, as currently set out in the officer's report. However, it is recommended that as a point of detail, this be delegated to the HDS following further detailed consideration.

As a result of legal advice, it is recommended that an additional clause should be added to the Section 106 Agreement as follows:-

(g) a requirement not to implement the Certificate of Lawfulness for the Mezzanine Floor granted under Ref S/03/1352 granted on 23/09/0

Conditions

In the list of conditions there is a standard condition regarding tree protection. The submitted Arboricultural report contains more specific guidance and proposals to protect trees adjacent the eastern boundary. It is therefore suggested that the condition be amended as follows:-

(5) Before any development is commenced on the site, including site works of any description, all the existing trees to be retained shall be protected by a fence, of a type and in a position to be approved by the Local Planning Authority, erected around each tree or group of trees. Within the areas so fenced, the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon. If any trenches for services are required within the fenced areas, they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 2 inches (50mm) or more shall be left unsevered (See British Standard BS 5837:1991, entitled 'Trees in relation to Construction'. In addition the trees adjacent the eastern boundary of the site shall be protected in accordance with the proposals set out in the report entitled "Arboricultural Report" by Epcad dated May 2004 including the "Arboricultural Method Statement" (Appendix1) by Simon R.M.Jones, Dip Arb. (RFS), F.Arbor. Details of the proposed retaining walls /structures in this area shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local

CITY AREA COMMITTEE - 17/02/05 SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

Planning Authority as part of the tree protection works, carried out in accordance wit the approved details, and maintained thereafter.

Reason: 0042 In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

The following additional condition is recommended:-

17) No development shall take place until details of the treatment to all hard surfaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall accord with the details as so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (G21A)

Reason: 0042 In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

3. S/2004/2667 - CONVERSION OF EXISTING HOUSE TO THREE FLATS CONSTRUCTION OF TWO FLATS AND NINE HOUSES FORMATION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS ONTO FAIRVIEW ROAD NEW PEDESTRIAN ACCESS ONTO WAIN-A-LONG ROAD AND DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDINGS AND PART OF EXISTING HOUSE

<u>Letter from agent</u> – a number of points made regards letters of objections including:

- a) There are only 4 objections regards this scheme allowing for duplication of letters
- b) The site is not visible from St Marks Roundabout
- The rear accesses are intended to sole the problem of access to rear gardens in terraced dwellings
- d) On site parking is in excess of LPA requirements
- e) The density of the proposal at approx 40 dwellings per hectare are within government guidelines
- f) There will be no lost of tree numbers.

Letter from Third Party -

- a) Very little change to previous scheme
- b) Density not reduced at all
- c) Reduction in height not noticeable
- d) Too many dwellings
- e) Too tall and dominant terrace
- f) Create more comings and goings

Appendicies (1)

15.FEB.2005 18:20

Reference: 300498/L0067ca

15th February 2005

Mr T Pizzey Salisbury District Council Development Services Planning Office 61 Wyndham Road Salisbury Wiltshire SP1 3AH

DPP BEDFORD HC - APIENDIX INO. 436

/LO067ca

Uncil



21 The Crescent Bedfard MK40 2RT Tel 01234 358 883 Direct 01234 321 141 Fax 01234 271 210

Dear Tim,

Tesco Store Extension, Southampton Road, Salisbury

Following our conversation this afternoon, I am writing to confirm the extent of the contribution to highways and accessibility improvements being offered by Tesco in connection to the store extension scheme. Essentially the extent of the contribution has been set out by Pinnade in their e-mail to the Highways Agency, dated the 11th February, which I believe was copied to you.

In summary the contribution being offered is as follows:

- Financial contribution of £100,000 to fund the development of proposals to deliver bus priority or link capacity improvements along the Southampton Road corridor. A small proportion of this sum (possibly 10-15%) may be targeted towards the investigation of options for introducing traffic calming or management measures in the Petersfinger Road area that is attracting extraneous traffic due to congestion along the A36.
- Financial contribution of £10,000 for the implementation (by the Highway Authority) of new bus stops, shelters and pedestrian crossing infrastructure close to the function of Bourne Way/Southampton Road. The proposed provision will upgrade the existing infrastructure and enable these stops to include real time passenger information in due course.
- Financial contribution of £17,500 to fund the widening (by the Highway Authority) of the northern footway along Southampton Road from Bourne Way to a point consistent with the location of the proposed Petersfinger Park and Ride Access junction.
- Financial contribution of £7,500 towards the provision (by the Local Planning/Highway Authority) of a 3.5m footway/cycleway along the western side of the proposed Petersfinger Park & Ride Spine Road from the end of the proposed footway/cycleway along Southampton



DIPIP

Road to the access to the Tesco store (Implemented by Tesco). The level of the financial contribution offered is based on a valuation of the works using an all-inclusive rate of £100 per linear metre (for 45m, i.e. £4,500) and also includes an additional sum of £3,000 to allow for the upgrading of the proposed signal controlled pedestrian crossing of the Spine Road at its junction with Southampton Road to a 'Toucan'-type (pedestrian/cyclist) crossing and the provision of an uncontrolled pedestrian/cyclist crossing of the Spine Road between the proposed roundabout junction with the car park access and Petersfinger Road.

- It has also been agreed with the County Council that Tesco will implement a section of the pedestrian and cycle route between the Tesco store access and Petersfinger Road (between the store and the P&R site) before the P&R site comes forward. The estimated cost of this element of the work is £20,000. It has been agreed that the value of these works can be deducted from the contribution indicated above.
- The total contribution therefore equates to £135,000 (£155,000 minus £20,000 as indicated in the paragraph above) to be delivered through a section 106 Agreement.
- In addition to the above £135,000, there would be a further 'uplift' contribution of up to £310,000 following the sale of the Tesco owned land at Petersfinger for future use as a park and ride site, giving a maximum overall contribution of £445,000. The precise timing of the contribution will be negotiated through the legal agreement.

As I mentioned to you, Tesco have not agreed to the provision of an off site bus service (as referred to in the committee report) and that has not formed part of the discussions between Pinnacle and the County Council to date. Should such a bus service ultimately be a requirement then the cost would have to be deducted from the 'upiff' contribution following the sale of the park and ride site.

I trust that this clarifies the position with regard to the contribution being offered. Should there be any further details required at this stage then please do not hesitate to come back to me.

Yours sincerely

Chris Akrill

THE DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PARTNERSHIP

mailto:chrls.akrill@devolanning.com

Chy Ahm

œ

Mr T G Robinson

Tesco Stores Limited

Mr J Clarke

Pinnacle