

Schedule of Planning Applications for Consideration

In The following Order:

Part 1) Applications Recommended For Refusal

Part 2) Applications Recommended for Approval

Part 3) Applications For The Observations of the Area Committee

With respect to the undermentioned planning applications responses from bodies consulted thereon and representations received from the public thereon constitute background papers with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

ABBREVIATIONS USED THROUGHOUT THE TEXT

AHEV	- Area of High Ecological Value
AONB	- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty
CA	- Conservation Area
CLA	- County Land Agent
EHO	- Environmental Health Officer
HDS	- Head of Development Services
HPB	- Housing Policy Boundary
HRA	- Housing Restraint Area
LPA	- Local Planning Authority
LB	- Listed Building
NFHA	- New Forest Heritage Area
NPLP	- Northern Parishes Local Plan
PC	- Parish Council
PPG	- Planning Policy Guidance
SDLP	- Salisbury District Local Plan
SEPLP	- South Eastern Parishes Local Plan
SLA	- Special Landscape Area
SRA	- Special Restraint Area
SWSP	- South Wiltshire Structure Plan
TPO	- Tree Preservation Order

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE

CITY AREA COMMITTEE 17 AUGUST 2006

Note: This is a précis of the Committee report for use mainly prior to the Committee meeting and does not represent a notice of the decision

Item Page	Application No Officer Address Proposal	Parish/Ward Recommendation Ward Councillors
----------------------	--	--

1.	S/2006/0947	FISHERTON/BEM V
4 - 7	Miss L Flindell	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
	175 WILTON ROAD SALISBURY WILTS SP2 7JQ CONSTRUCTION OF 6 CAR PARKING BAYS WITH ACCESS FROM GRAMSHAW ROAD (AMENDMENT TO PLANNING APPLICATION 01/0432)	CLLR MS MALLORY CLLR WALSH
2.	S/2006/1169	BEMERTON
8 - 18	Mr R Hughes	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
SV	FORMER PEMBROKE PARK FIRST SCHOOL SITE PENRUDDOCK CLOSE SALISBURY SP2 9HH REDEVELOPMENT FOR 57 RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO INCLUDE A NEW ACCESS TO PEMBROKE ROAD AND THE REALIGNMENT OF EXISTING FOUL AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE, AND INCLUDING PUBLIC OPEN SPACE	CLLR MRS EVANS CLLR OSMENT CLLR VINCENT

Part 1
Applications recommended for Refusal

No Refusals

Part 2

Applications recommended for Approval

Applicant/ Agent:	MR G AYMES		
Location:	175 WILTON ROAD SALISBURY SP2 7JQ		
Proposal:	CONSTRUCTION OF 6 CAR PARKING BAYS WITH ACCESS FROM GRAMSHAW ROAD (AMENDMENT TO PLANNING APPLICATION 01/0432)		
Parish/ Ward	FISHERTON/BEM V		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	9 May 2006	Expiry Date	4 July 2006
Case Officer:	Miss L Flindell	Contact Number:	

1.

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

This application was deferred at the last City Area Committee for Officers to ascertain:

- 1) Whether the previous consent was implemented within the 5 year period and
 - 2) Whether there are any highway parking schemes for the area around the site in liaison with WCC Highways
- 1) In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the previous consent has not been implemented.
 - 2) WCC Highways have confirmed that there is no residents parking scheme in Gramshaw Road or Wilton Road.

They have also confirmed that the Joint Transportation Team is not proposing any policy changes/review concerning off street parking within residents parking zones and that the site is not within any existing or proposed zone.

For member's information, the previous report to committee (with changes since the last agenda in bold) is reproduced below.

THE PROPOSAL

Planning permission was granted under S/2001/432 for the erection of a single garage and four parking spaces in the rear garden with dropped kerb and access from Gramshaw Road. This application is to accommodate 6 parking spaces without the garage.

PLANNING HISTORY

S/2001/432 Full application – construction of single garage and four car parking bays with access from Gramshaw Road, 175 Wilton Road, Salisbury – Approved with conditions 29th May 2001

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - Recommend no highway objection be raised subject to the following condition:
The parking area shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel) in accordance with details, which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

There is no residents parking scheme in Gramshaw Road or Wilton Road.

There is no policy change proposed concerning off-street parking within residents parking zones and this location is not within any existing or proposed zone.

The loss of 2-3 on street spaces has to be weighed up with the gain of up to 6 off-street spaces. Although the 6 spaces are for a private property, without those six spaces taken off-street there would be even more pressure for on-street parking.

On-street parking will not be available along the frontage of the six spaces, on both sides of the road (to enable vehicles to manoeuvre into and out of the spaces).

Highways Agency – Please note that the A36 is a virtually de-trunked route. The Highways Agency will still comment, advise and direct on planning applications. However it is appropriate that the inheriting highway authority should comment and advise on non-safety matters. We confirm that the Highways Agency has not received any non-safety comments or advice from WCC. We have no comments to make on this application. The Highways Agency does not propose to give a direction restricting the grant of planning permission.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement No

Site Notice displayed Yes, expiry date 8th June 2006

Departure No

Neighbour notification Yes, expiry date 31st May 2006

Third Party responses Yes, five letters of objection summarised as follows:

Gramshaw Road is a narrow cul-de-sac with 16 houses and parking is limited to one side of the road, residents already have extreme difficulties with parking and residents of Wilton Road use the road for parking.

Requests for the inclusion of Gramshaw Road in residents parking restriction scheme has been rejected on the grounds of limited amount of parking space available in comparison with the number of residents

Proposal will result in loss of 3-6 on-street car parking spaces (30-40%)

Loss of on-street car parking spaces will disadvantage occupiers of dwellings in Gramshaw Road and have a negative impact on property values

Increase in traffic using Gramshaw Road will cause danger in gaining access and exiting to and from the busy A36 Wilton Road trunk road.

Proposal will increase hazard to pedestrians (loss of footpath)

Loss of on-street car parking spaces will force residents to park in Wilton Road and subsequent danger to pedestrians and local residents

Only people to benefit will be casual tenants and an absentee landlord to the detriment of long standing local resident/tax payers

Plan does not show new dwelling (Gramshaw House) built in 2003 between No 1 Gramshaw Road and 175 Wilton Road which has double yellow line section outside which further restricts parking availability for residents.

Letter of support from applicant, summarised as follows:

Application if approved would result in loss of 2-3 parking spaces on Gramshaw Road but if refused would result in additional 6 cars on Gramshaw Road or in the adjacent area.

Historically the residents have parked on the East side of the road but they could park on the West side, which would probably add a further space.

There was some doubt expressed by the residents as to the accuracy of my plan as they thought I had not allowed for the new dwelling that was constructed during 2003 in Gramshaw Road, on the South side of my boundary. I can assure the meeting that I have shown the boundary in the correct position on my plan.

I have been working at 175 Wilton Road for some time now and have not experienced parking problems on Gramshaw Road. In fact for most of the day there is usually one or more parking spaces available for visitors.

Increase in traffic should not cause highway safety hazard (there is good visibility to the east and west with junction with Gramshaw Road and Wilton Road)

Whilst inconvenient to not be able to park outside your house, no individual has the right to a parking space on the Highway.

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on parking/highway safety

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, G2 (General)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Planning permission was granted in 2001 for the construction of a single garage and four car-parking bays with access from Gramshaw Road.

Gramshaw Road is of restricted width and vehicles are only able to park on one side of the road. Furthermore most of the terraced dwellings in the road have no off street parking facilities and therefore have to park on the road.

The new access at 16m wide (as scaled from the proposed plans) will restrict the on-street parking facilities available to residents. Working on the basis of Local Plan guidelines and dimension, end to end style parking would require a minimum length of 6 metres in order to enable adequate vehicular movements. As a consequence, in this instance, the creation of the new access of approximately 16 metres in length would theoretically result in the loss of two to three on street car parking spaces.

Objections have been raised to the application (summarised above) including on the grounds that the proposal will result in the loss of on-street car parking spaces.

The revised proposal will provide six off street car parking spaces and will not result in any additional loss of road space for the existing parking in Gramshaw Road than the 2001 consent. As measured from the applicants plans, the area of potential on street parking affected by the splayed dropped kerb associated with the new parking area is 16 metres (measured from the edge of the dropped kerb with the road). In the 2001 proposal, the area affected measures off at 16.5m.

Members should note that since 2001, a new dwelling at No1 Gramshaw Road to the immediate south of the application site has been constructed and as part of that scheme, some land may possibly have been transferred from the southern end of 175 Wilton Road, thus reducing the size of the application site (from 17.5 metres, as scaled in 2001, to 17m now). As a result of this apparent reduction in size a direct comparison between the impact of the two schemes is not straightforward. In officer's opinion, the area of on street parking affected by the two schemes is broadly similar, with the 2006 scheme not affecting any more on street parking than the 2001 scheme (i.e. 2 or 3 car parking spaces would still theoretically be affected based on 6m long spaces per car).

Reference has been made to parking requirements increasing since the 2001 consent. However, the 2001 consent was judged against Salisbury District Local Plan Adopted March 1996. Appendix V referred to minimum parking standards where a total of 1.5 spaces were required per flat.

The current Local Plan was adopted in June 2003. Appendix V refers to car parking standards of 2 spaces per flat plus one per five flats. However, these are maximum car parking standards with the intention to reduce on-site parking provision to a level consistent with the need to minimise car use. The standards are applied having regard to the accessibility of individual development sites to alternative modes of transport. Gramshaw Road is in an accessible location with a public bus route along Wilton Road.

Whilst the parking problems in Gramshaw Road are recognised, it must be noted that Gramshaw Road forms part of the public highway, and there are no private rights for residents who live in the road to park on the site.

The revised proposal provides an additional off street car parking space for the residents of 175 Wilton Road who may otherwise park in Wilton Road or Gramshaw Road. At a loss of 2-3 on-street parking spaces, it is considered that the proposal would represent an improvement in the parking situation on Wilton and Gramshaw Road by taking up to 6 cars of the adjacent streets, and thereby resulting in the creation of three or four additional parking spaces.

Wiltshire County Council Highways Department have raised no highway safety objections to the proposal and as such it is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse impact on highway safety.

CONCLUSION

Whilst two or three on street car parking spaces would be lost, the proposal would result in the creation of six off street car parking spaces, thereby resulting in a net gain of three or four additional parking spaces. This is an improvement on the 2001 application which provided five off street car parking spaces.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

REASON FOR APPROVAL:

Whilst two or three on street car parking spaces would be lost, the proposal would result in the creation of six off street car parking spaces, thereby resulting in a net gain of three or four additional parking spaces. This is an improvement on the 2001 application which provided five off street car parking spaces.

And subject to the following Conditions and Reasons:

- (1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. (A07B)

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. AS amended by section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (0004 AMENDED)

- (2) No work shall start on site until details of the surfacing of the new hardstanding have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

- (3) The six parking spaces hereby permitted shall be used solely as off street parking for the existing property (known as 175 Wilton Road) and shall not be sold, leased, rented or otherwise disposed of separately, nor shall be used for any commercial or business purposes whatsoever unless otherwise agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure the retention of adequate off-street car parking provision.

Informatives: - Policy

This decision has been in accordance with the following policy/policies of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan: G2 (general).

Application Number:	S/2006/1169		
Applicant/ Agent:	TERENCE O ROURKE		
Location:	FORMER PEMBROKE PARK COUNTY FIRST SCHOOL PENRUDDOCK CLOSE SALISBURY SP2 9HH		
Proposal:	REDEVELOPMENT FOR 57 RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO INCLUDE A NEW ACCESS TO PEMBROKE ROAD AND THE REALIGNMENT OF EXISTING FOUL AND SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE, AND INCLUDING PUBLIC OPEN SPACE		
Parish/ Ward	BEMERTON		
Conservation Area:	LB Grade:		
Date Valid:	8 June 2006	Expiry Date	3 August 2006
Case Officer:	Mr R Hughes	Contact Number:	01722 434382

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Osment has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:

- the prominent nature of the site
- the interest shown in the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site was the former location of Pembroke Park School and school grounds. The school buildings have now been removed following the relocation of the school use. The site is currently accessed off Penruddock Close.

The site is bounded on three sides with housing development, and to the south by Pembroke Road, one of the main roads serving the adjacent housing areas. The majority of the site is flat, but the contours change significantly to the east, west and southern boundary, where the land rises up several metres. There are existing trees and other flora along these boundaries, and there are also some semi-mature trees situated in the middle of the site.

THE PROPOSAL

This is an outline planning application with all matters reserved, except in relation to the vehicular access details, which the applicants have requested be submitted for detailed approval.

The application relates to the construction of up to 57 dwellings on the site, which would consist of a mixture of detached, semi-detached, and terraced housing and flats. Two vehicular access points would be created, the main one being the new access way off Pembroke Road to the south. The secondary access would reuse the existing vehicular access driveway off Penruddock Close, although the submitted plans indicate this being used for emergency use only.

A significant embankment is required on the southern boundary of the site to bring the access road up to the level of Pembroke Road.

The submitted layout plan is only indicative and is not submitted for approval as part of this application. However, it is useful in determining roughly how 57 dwellings can be achieved on the site. The indicative layout is predicated on the basis of 1.5 parking spaces per unit, of which some will be on street parking including a parking courtyard for residents of the flats, with other parking accommodated on the forecourts of houses.

PLANNING HISTORY

None of direct relevance relating to the application site, although members are obviously aware of the residential redevelopment of the adjacent Dairy site to the immediate west, which provided for 88 dwellings in total. Members will also be aware of the recent application for 41 houses on land to the immediate east of this former school site at 45 Queen Alexandra Road.

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - No objections subject to conditions and contributions
Housing & Health Officer - No objections, subject to conditions related to construction times, and a scheme to protect adjacent properties from noise pollution during development. No historical evidence regards contamination.
Wessex Water Authority - Awaited
Environment Agency - No objections subject to conditions
Highways Agency - No comments
Sport England - On the basis that the site does not contain a delineated playing pitch, then no objections.
SDC Parks -the woodland area is currently one enormous impenetrable green barrier. It has no public value as it is completely inaccessible! In this context it cannot therefore be taken into account when assessing public open space requirements. It does however have a landscape value within the area and should therefore be protected. The area could however be opened up as part of a redevelopment with walkways, paths etc but we must accept it will never be anything other than a wooded area. If this happens then I would suggest an additional public access / egress point is also made at the northern point by the existing bungalow (Pembroke Park bungalow?), otherwise the woodland is a dead end at the Penruddock Close end. The formal open space area shown on the plan appears small in relation to the rest of the estate, though if linked to the adjoining tidied and opened up woodland it would be ok. I don't see any problems with adopting the relevant boundary areas etc subject to the commuted sums being paid.
SDC Community Initiatives - No response
SDC Housing - Up to 40 percent affordable housing provision could be achieved in this area.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement Yes. Expiry 6/7/06
Site Notice displayed Yes. Expiry 6/7/06
Departure No
Neighbour notification Yes. Expiry 29/6/06
Third Party responses Yes. 7 letters raising the following issues:

- a) Scheme will cause too much traffic
- b) Development will cause stability issues with adjacent properties
- c) Speeding issue in area will be made worse
- d) An education facility should be replaced on site
- e) Larger play area needed for youths
- f) Drainage issues on site
- g) No indication of sustainable features given
- h) Will significantly reduce open space in area
- i) Layout of estate would be dangerous
- j) Concern about privacy and boundary issues
- k) How will emergency access be operated ?
- l) Will affect wildlife on site
- m) Will new scheme include recycling facilities ?
- n) Will there be old peoples accommodation on site?
- o) Wooded area will become a dumping ground
- p) Crime issues

Salisbury Transport 2000 - Scheme contains a number of sustainable ideas, which we approve of.

MAIN ISSUES

1. Principle and policy
2. Impact on open space provision
3. Impact on adjacent amenities
4. Impact on highway safety
5. Ecology/trees
6. Contributions/planning gains

POLICY CONTEXT

PPG3 PPG17

G1,G2,D1,R2, R5 PS1 SDLP

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

a) Principle and policy

The school site is located outside the defined HPB (which is carefully defined around the adjacent housing developments, which surround the site. The southern section of the site is also covered by policy R5, which relates to the location of the former playing fields of the school. (By contrast the northern part of the site is not covered by this or any other protective policy).

However, whilst the site is located outside the HPB, it is clearly located within a built up residential area. Secondly, the previous school use has now clearly ceased, and the site of the buildings on the northern section of the application site has been reduced to a large area of hard surfacing and rubble. As a result, part of the application site is clearly a redundant site in a relatively sustainable location, which can be described as previously developed brown-field land in accordance with the guidance given in PPG3.

With regards the southern half of the site, PPG3 indicates that where a particular site may consist of an area of open land, it is for the LPA to judge whether all the land within such sites can be developed on, even though it may be surplus to requirements. However, this matter is complicated by PPG3 (Annex C) confirming that land in built up areas, which has not been developed previously such as parks, recreation grounds, playing fields and allotments should not be regarded as previously developed land. Furthermore, the southern part of the site (the former school playing fields) is covered by policy R5 of the Local Plan, (which is based on guidance given in PPG17), which states that:

Development which would lead to the loss of public or private sports fields, other recreational open space, or school playing fields, will not be permitted, unless:

- i) *sports and recreation facilities can be best retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site; or*
- ii) *alternative equivalent provision is made available in the locality; or*
- iii) *there is an excess of sports pitch provision and public open space in the area, taking account of the recreation and amenity value of such provision.*

The supporting text for the above policy expands slightly on the wording above, stating that the redevelopment of private sites will only be allowed where the sports and recreation facilities can be best retained, and improved (including greater access for the public where appropriate) through the redevelopment of part of the site.

In this instance, the playing fields are now disused following the relocation of the school use, and the school site fenced off. It is therefore clear that from County's point of view, the playing fields are surplus to requirements. Members should also note that whilst the indicative layout plan suggests that the area of open space will be significantly reduced by the new housing development, the newly created area on site will at least have the advantage of being publically available, whereas the existing open space is private and might never be available for use.

Sport England, whose role it is to restrict and limit playing field loss through guidance such as PPG17, has indicated that it would have no objection to the loss of the playing fields, provided there were no delineated pitches on site (which there were not).

The Council's policy team has indicated that the proposal is generally acceptable in policy terms and indeed provides a relatively rare opportunity for significant housing development in a sustainable location and environmentally acceptable location within the existing urban envelope. However, the policy team has suggested that given that the current open space audit of the District is now 6 years old, and is currently being updated, it could be premature to approve the scheme before the outcome of the new survey is known. However, the open space report survey will not be ready until late 2006, and even then will not form part of adopted Local Plan policy, but simply be a supporting document.

In this regard however, the advice of SDC's legal team is that in terms of refusing a scheme on prematurity grounds, it is normally only a valid reason for refusal when the development plan has reached a reasonably advanced stage ie at the very least a consultation draft has been published and consultation commenced. In addition, refusal is only justified where approval would have a significant impact on a range of sites or policies. The legal advice in this case is that the commissioning of an open space survey is far too early a stage to refuse unless the circumstances were truly exceptional.

As a result of the above, particularly given the support of Sport England, it is considered that the loss and redevelopment of the now disused open space on the site in this instance, would not contravene the guidance given in policy R5 or PPG17, given the replacement on site of publicly available open space.

With regard to the issues surrounding the loss of the school – (a community facility), policy PS3 cannot be applied to this site given its location within the main settlement of Salisbury. Therefore the loss and retention of building or land for future community use instead of housing cannot be argued in this instance, however regrettable. No new community facility has been offered as part of the development, and no contribution offered or requested.

b) Impact on character of area

This application is in outline only, and details of siting, external appearance and design have been reserved until a later application. As a consequence, the indicative layout shown on the submitted site plan should only be used as a general indication as to how 57 dwellings may be arranged on site, and is helpful in clarifying matters in this regard.

In your officer's opinion, the indicative layout plan illustrates that a mixture of two and three storey building/dwellings could be arranged on site, with suitable areas of garden/amenity space, and suitable numbers of parking spaces.

However, the indicative layout plan also suggests that 57 dwellings and parking can only be achieved by utilising the existing former school playing fields on the southern section of the site, (and hence suggests that it would appear that 57 dwellings may not be achievable on this site without the use of this land). Therefore, the issue of whether the existing open land to the south is visually important and therefore should be retained, needs to be considered as part of this application.

In officer's opinion, in visual terms, the loss of the large area of open space occupying the southern section of the application site is very regrettable. Several of the letters received from residents express similar regrets. It would indeed seem a more straight forward approach would have been to retain the former playing field land as open space and simply build houses on the northern part of the site (or similar proportion). However, judging from the indicative plans, it is unlikely that 57 dwellings could not be fitted into the northern portion of the site, and hence, a new application would need to be submitted for fewer dwellings). Therefore, Members must determine the application as submitted for 57 dwellings.

However, notwithstanding the above, the 57 dwelling scheme as suggested is fairly spacious, and also offers the opportunity to retain and enhance the existing wooded area located on the eastern boundary of the site. Therefore, a similar scheme on the site would not be unduly cramped, and would generally be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area, which is urban in character.

Consequently, in officer's opinion, whilst the scheme would indeed alter the character of the existing site, the redevelopment of the site for 57 dwellings as suggested would result in a scheme sympathetic to the character of the wider area.

c) Impact on amenities

As this is an outline application relating to access details only, no detailed elevations have been submitted with the application, and the layout shown is only indicative, and can therefore be altered.

In officers opinion, the indicative layout plan indicates in the main that most of the dwellings could be located so as to have a minimal or no impact on adjacent dwellings, and the indicative sectional information also confirms that due to the sunken nature of the site with regards adjacent

development, even tall, three storey style properties would be unlikely to have any adverse impacts in terms of loss of privacy or overshadowing.

In particular, the sections indicate that the new access road for which detailed approval is sought, would be unlikely to have an adverse impact on the occupier or amenities of 54 Pembroke Road, a bungalow to the immediate east of the site and the proposed access driveway. The new access roadway would be brought into the site at a height lower than the floor level of the bungalow, and would be located some metres from the boundary with that property.

The only area of concern highlighted by the layout plan, is the close proximity of some proposed dwellings to the former caretakers bungalow, which sits directly adjacent to the northern part of the site. The combination of the siting and bulk of the proposed dwellings would have an adverse impact on the amenities of the adjacent property. However, this is a matter that can be resolved at the reserved matters stage when consent is sought for detailed approval of the siting, design, and external appearance of the buildings.

However, the introduction of 57 houses will radically affect the general amenities of existing residents, by replacing the open and pleasantly spacious character of the existing site, with a more congested suburban layout. Furthermore, the noise and general disturbance emanating from the site will differ dramatically from that generated by the primary school, which for the most part would have been a quiet neighbour. It is however considered that the likely level of increased disturbance resulting from the redevelopment would not be so significant as to warrant refusal of the application on that basis alone.

d) Impact on highway safety

The application is accompanied by a transport report which basically indicates that compared to the traffic generated by (an average) primary school, the traffic generated by the housing development is likely to be roughly half of that generated by the school. The calculated (average) figures indicate that whilst the school may have generated in the region of 150 vehicle trips per day, the residential scheme may generate roughly 63 trips a day. Members should however note that such calculations appear to have been generated using national average trip statistics, and not based on the actual movements associated with the school in reality, which could have generated more or less traffic than suggested. On this point members will have to apply their local knowledge to this assessment when comparing likely traffic generation figures.

However, the housing would effectively redirect any new traffic generated onto Pembroke Road via the new southern access, as opposed to the previous school use, which generated vehicular traffic at the entrance to Penruddock Close. The housing scheme would significantly reduce traffic movements in this area, due to the use of a revised northern access point intended only for pedestrian and cycle traffic, and for emergency vehicles only.

The other advantage of the housing scheme is the creation of pedestrian and cycle links between Pembroke Road and Penruddock Close, thus the significant shortening of walking and cycle distances for local residents.

WCC Highways has made the following comments on the application. "The proposal was the subject of a pre-application meeting with the agent for the applicant and the submitted details follow those matters which were discussed and agreed. This Authority is therefore satisfied that the proposed main access point onto Pembroke Road will meet the requirements for safe and satisfactory access to the development. Therefore most traffic will enter and leave the development via Pembroke Road (east) where the road network is of a satisfactory standard. I note that no traffic calming work has been undertaken on Festival Road as a result of previous development but some calming work was carried out on Gainsborough Close. Every property on the development will have easy access to existing real time information bus stops on Gainsborough Close and pedestrian and cycle links within the development will be provided. Because the site could provide a short through link for pedestrians and cyclists (a route that is shorter than the vehicular routes through the site), I recommend that a short dedicated cycle and pedestrian link is provided within the development, not as shown on the sketch scheme, where shared use roads are proposed. The internal road layout is therefore not approved and I would wish to condition that further details are submitted for subsequent approval of internal road layout and shared cycle and pedestrian links.

This Authority considers that the development should be subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure additional contributions towards a sustainable package of measures to encourage residents to use alternatives to the car and promote and encourage children to walk or cycle to school. In line with negotiations on the recent development at Queen Alexandra Road for 44 dwellings (subsequently refused consent), an overall package of measures to the sum of £45,000 should be sought which will be used on a pro rata basis to provide bus passes for each household, cycle vouchers per household and contributions to facilities at local school, including an administration charge by this Authority. The package can be finalised at an appropriate time bearing in mind that the application is submitted in outline and you may consider that an appropriate negative condition would secure the necessary requirements at this outline stage or that a Section 106 Agreement should be entered to secure the package of measures.

There are no local highway improvement schemes or otherwise identified improvements which this development could justifiably contribute and so no further off-site infrastructure requirements are required by this Authority. I confirm that subject to the above recommended condition and the developer entering into an appropriate Agreement (or the use of an appropriate negative condition), there are no highway objections to the development.”

As a result of the above, it is considered that a refusal of the application on highway grounds would be difficult to justify on appeal. Therefore, Members are advised that if they are minded to approve this scheme, an appropriate financial contribution be secured towards the provision of a package of off site sustainable transport measures. A suitable condition can be imposed relating to the provision of an on site dedicated cycle route.

e) Contributions and “planning gains”

As a result of the issues and the issues raised as part of the application process, the following planning gains can be achieved from this development:

- At least 40 percent affordable housing
- Provision of small open space on site
- Contribution towards off site open space
- Cycle and pedestrian way through site

Furthermore, Members will note that a sum of £45,000 pounds can be secured to improve the sustainable nature of the site by providing new households on the site with bus and cycle vouchers to encourage residents to use alternative, more sustainable means of transport.

There is no specific provision for an education provision, as the applicants, the County Council, have indicated that the proceeds from the sale of this land will be ploughed back into educational provision in the area.

Whilst members should note that this Council would therefore have no mechanism for ensuring that the proceeds do go towards such education provision, WCC Education have been consulted but have not replied on this issue, although members will recall that WCC education department did not ask for such a contribution regards the recently proposed redevelopment at Queen Alexandra Road. As a result, it is considered that on this occasion no contribution is required towards education provision.

The applicants have made no reference in their submitted documentation regards any commitment to achieve an Ecohomes Rating, which is a national system which ensures that new buildings meet more stringent environmental and sustainable targets in their construction. It is now the norm for more recent housing developments to achieve at least a “Good” rating, and in some cases a “Very Good” rating (50 house scheme at Wick Lane, Downton).

Officers see no reason why this site cannot achieve at least a “Very Good” Ecohomes Rating.

Furthermore, given that this site is being built on a former educational site and a former playing field, and no financial contribution or replacement education or community facility, or any highway improvements to surrounding roadways, is being provided other than a smaller area of open space and off site contribution (which is standard), officer opinion is that the applicants should commit to not only a “Very Good” rating, but also a proportion of “Excellent” rating houses. This would produce an exemplary scheme for the district with respect to sustainable housing, and would off set the

“environmental harm” resulting from the redevelopment of the site and the loss of the large area of open space.

(Members should note however that it is difficult to state in detail which kinds of sustainable options be pursued (ie heat pumps etc), as such matters will continue to evolve, and may become outdated due to technological advances. Furthermore, the policy frame work does not exist at the current time to insist on the use of such products, and therefore it would be difficult for the LPA to insist at this time regards exactly which sustainable features can or should be used. Members should also be aware that adherence to a “Very Good” and “Excellent” Ecohomes rating may result in a design and layout of dwellings which may be of a unique/contemporary and unusual design).

It is considered that the above can be secured via a legal agreement or similar undertaking, or conditions where appropriate.

f) Ecology/Tree issues

Two protected species reports have been submitted, which indicate that the site does not contain any protected species. However, given that some time may elapse between the grant of outline consent and construction, it would seem wise that a secondary survey is undertaken at a later date before development commences in order to ensure that any protected species are not adversely affected by development. A suitable condition has been suggested below.

The Council’s Arboricultural officer has taken a look at the site, and his considered comments regards the site and the mature trees will be reported to committee when they are received. However, in officers opinion, it would still be possible to fit 57 dwellings on the site and retain a number of the existing trees on the site, not only around the edges of the site, but also others in the centre of the existing land could easily be incorporated into a revised future layout.

CONCLUSION – REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The school site is now disused and the County clearly no longer need the site to meet its educational needs. However, only some of the site can really be described as previously developed land as defined in PPG3, with the rest forming recreational/playing field type land.

The redevelopment of the site offers the opportunity to create better pedestrian linkages through the site to the surrounding area and would also provide an albeit small area of open space which would be available to the general public. The redevelopment will result in significantly more traffic generation in and around the surrounding area compared to the existing school, although there is no highway authority objection to the scheme subject to several caveats. In general design and amenity terms, the redevelopment of the site is likely to result in more general impacts than the previous low key single storey school use, although some of these impacts can be mitigated by conditions and careful design at the reserved matters stage.

Therefore, on balance, the loss of the open playing fields and the creation of residential redevelopment on the site is acceptable, subject to a number of contributions and provisions which will mitigate the harm caused by the development of this currently open site.

RECOMMENDATION: SUBJECT TO THE APPLICANT ENTERING INTO A SUITABLE SECTION 106 AGREEMENT WHEREBY PROVISION IS MADE FOR THE FOLLOWING:

- a) At least 40 percent affordable housing
- b) Provision/maintenance of open space on site
- c) Contribution towards off site open space
- d) Waste audit and recycling scheme provision
- e) Sustainable Urban Drainage system maintenance
- f) The achievement of at least a “Very good” Ecohomes rating and a proportion of “Excellent” rated Ecohomes.
- g) Maintenance scheme for retained wooded area on eastern boundary

THEN, APPROVE, subject to the following conditions:

- (1) Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of the building[s], and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.

- (2) Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition above, relating to the siting, design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected, and the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority and shall be carried out as approved. (A02A)

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.

- (3) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. (A03A)

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.

- (4) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.

- (5) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations given in the submitted Method Statement for Protected Species (Bat and Great Crested Newt Survey by Lindsay Carrington Ecological Services Ltd, April 2006), unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. As part of any future full or reserved matters application a further ecological report shall be carried out which updates the submitted report. The findings and recommendations of the report shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and English Nature, and development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In order to limit the impact of the development on the ecology of the site and protected species which may have developed since the original approval.

- (6) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a Construction Environmental Management Plan detailing methods of working to prevent construction impacts, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved programme details. The Plan should cover the use of plant and machinery, oils/chemicals and materials; the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles; the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds, the control and removal of spoil and wastes, and a wheel/vehicle wash scheme.

Reason: To limit the impact of the development on surrounding amenities and the water environment.

- (7) No development shall commence (other than the highway works hereby approved) until a scheme for water efficiency measures be used in the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable development.

- (8) Construction works shall not take place except between the hours of:-

0800hrs to 1900hrs on Mondays to Saturdays and
no work on Sundays and Public Holidays.

This condition does not apply to the internal fitting out of the buildings

Reason: In order to limit the noise and disruption to adjacent neighbours during antisocial hours

- (9) No dwelling shall be occupied until a scheme to prohibit the use of the northern access to the site off Penruddock Close by non-emergency vehicles has been agreed by the Local Planning Authority and implemented satisfactorily. The agreed method of traffic restriction shall be retained in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to limit the use of the northern access by non emergency vehicles in order to reduce the level of traffic using the access to an acceptable level in the interests of amenity.

- (10) Before development commences, (other than the highway works approved) a scheme for the discharge, drainage and limitation of surface water run-off from the building(s) (maximum attenuated discharge rate 55 litres per second) hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and shall be carried out as approved. Such a scheme shall include detailed calculations based on the final layout design, further information related to ground water levels, and provisions for the future maintenance of any surface water drainage systems and shall include details of pollution prevention.

Reason: 0064 To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of surface water disposal, and to prevent the increased risk of flooding by surface water and pollution prevention of the water environment.

- (11) As part of any future reserved matters application, an Arboricultural report shall be submitted which indicates how the retained trees on the site are to be protected during the course of development. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed details.

Reason: In order to protect existing retained trees on the site in the interests of amenity.

- (12) No development shall commence until full large scale details of the highway access works onto Pembroke Road and Penruddock Close, including any engineering and other ancillary structures required have been submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, and no other development shall commence until such details have been completed and provided to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and WCC Highways. The scheme shall accord with the access details approved as part of this outline permission.

Reason: In the interests of highway and pedestrian safety and the general amenities of occupiers of the site and surrounding area.

- (13) A total maximum of 57 dwellings shall be erected on site.

Reason: 0007 For the avoidance of doubt.

- (14) The development hereby approved shall as part of the final layout of the scheme provide for a dedicated pedestrian and cycle link through the site from the access with Pembroke Road to the access with Penruddock Close.

Reason: In order to maintain and improve pedestrian linkages throughout the area in order to create a permeable and accessible development in accordance with sustainable travel initiatives.

INFORMATIVES

1. The future developer of the site should note the desire of the LPA to achieve a highly sustainable development on this site of high quality. A detailed list and description of sustainable measures to be utilised shall be submitted as part of any future application, including the consideration of the use energy efficient systems such as grass roofs, solar panels/photo voltaic cells, grey water recycling, heat pumps, mini windturbines etc and an explanation of why such features may have be discounted. Any future detailed scheme for the

site shall be discussed with the Local Planning Authority in good time, well before the submission of a planning application.

2. We do not accept any liability for the detailed calculations contained in the FRA. This letter does not constitute approval of those calculations nor does it constitute our consent or approval that may be required under any other statutory provision, byelaw, order or regulation.

Flood risk cannot be eliminated and is expected to increase over time as a result of climate change and this letter does not absolve the developer of their responsibility to ensure a safe development.

3. It is recommended that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage surface water drainage at the site. SuDS involves using a range of techniques including soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds and wetlands. As well as reducing flood risk by attenuating the rate and quantity of run-off, SuDS can also offer other benefits in terms of promoting groundwater recharge, water quality improvement and amenity enhancements. Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 sets out a hierarchy for surface water disposal which encourages a SUDS approach.

Further information on SUDS can be found in PPG25 paragraphs 40-42, PPG25 appendix E, in the CIRIA C522 document Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems -design manual for England and Wales and the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems. The Interim Code provides advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues and a full overview of other technical guidance on SUDS. It is available at: www.environment-agency.gov.uk and www.ciria.org.uk

4. The development should include water efficient appliances, fittings and systems in order to contribute to reduced water demand in the area. These should include, as a minimum, low-flush toilets, water butts, spray taps, low flow showers (no power showers) and kitchen appliances (where installed) with the maximum water efficiency rating. Greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered. The submitted scheme should consist of a detailed list and description (including capacities, water consumption rates etc. where applicable) of water saving measures to be employed within the development.
5. The proposed development is within 250 metres of a known landfill site (Thorney Down, Winterslow, licence holder: Wiltshire County Council). We recommend that all reasonable steps should be taken to investigate the possibility of gas migration affecting the development site.

Where gas migration is confirmed, or there is evidence that migration is likely to occur, remedial measures should be taken to control and manage the gas, to monitor the effectiveness of these measures and, where necessary, to incorporate adequate precautionary measures in the design and construction stages.

The Local Authority Environmental Health team should hold more detailed information on the landfill site mentioned above. They may be able to offer more guidance on the associated risks of this particular landfill site.

And in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

Policy R5 - Purpose: Retention of recreational open space

Policy D1 - Purpose: Extensive development

Policy G1 - Purpose: Sustainable Development

Policy G2 - Purpose: General principles and impacts

Policy R2 - Purpose: Recreational open space