

Minutes

Meeting of : City Area Planning Committee
Meeting held in : Alamein Suite, City Hall, Salisbury
Date : Thursday 14 September 2006
Commencing at : 6.00 pm

Present:

District Councillors:

Councillor Ms S C Mallory (Chairman) in the Chair
Councillor J M Collier (*Vice-Chair*)

Councillors Mrs P J Brown, K A Cardy, Mrs E A Chettleburgh, D A Culver, B E Dalton, Mrs I M Evans, S R Fear, S J Howarth, J R L Nettle M J Osment, P V H Paisey, I R Tomes, Miss M A Tomlinson, P W L Sample, J M Walsh, Mrs S A Warrander and C R Vincent.

Apologies: Councillors P M Clegg

421. Public Questions/Statement Time:
There were none.

422. Councillor Questions/Statement Time:
There were none.

423. Minutes:

Agreed: that the minutes of the meeting held on 17 August 2006 (previously circulated) be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

424. Declarations of Interest:
Councillors S R Fear declared a personal but non-prejudicial interest in planning application S/2006/1559 and Councillor S J Howarth declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application S/2006/1437, and he left the meeting during discussion thereon.



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE



CUSTOMER SERVICE EXCELLENCE

Awarded in:
Housing Services
Waste and Recycling Services



425. S/2006/1559: Site adjacent 91 Castle Road Salisbury for Space Design Solutions Ltd:

Mrs Melissa Jackson spoke on behalf of the residents in opposition to the proposed development and the agent Mr D Jay, spoke in support. Following receipt of these statements and further to a site visit earlier that afternoon and with reference to a schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated).

Resolved: that the above application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The proposed dwelling would have a narrow plot, resulting from the sub division of the garden of 91 Castle Road. The proposed two storey dwelling would be sited close to the rear boundaries of adjoining properties including 89 Castle Road. The first floor windows of the south elevation would be glazed with obscure glass, and would be 2m from the centre of the boundary hedge of No 89. The window for bedroom 3 would open to provide a means of escape, which would reduce the benefit of obscuring and enable an unacceptable degree of actual overlooking into the habitable rooms, garden and garden facilities of No 89 and obliquely into the plot of No 2 Queensberry Road. Future occupiers are realistically likely to want the south facing windows to be openable and unobscured and two of the windows form the only means of ventilation and light for a bathroom and ensuite. Therefore, it is considered that the windows, are likely to give rise to an unacceptable degree of actual overlooking into the garden of No 89 Castle Road. Coupled with the bulk of the building (about 7.5m to ridge) close to the boundary with the garden of No 89 Castle Road there would also be a detrimental impact in terms of bulk and dominance, and also the *perception* of overlooking and intrusion from the first floor windows close to the boundary, to the detriment of the occupiers of No 89 Castle Road. The construction of a dwelling of the design proposed on this narrow site would therefore result in a cramped form of development, which would be out of keeping with the spacious character and layout of development in the immediate area, to the detriment of neighbouring amenity. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies D2, G2 and H16 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, which seek to ensure that new residential development respects and enhances the existing character of the area, without detrimentally affecting neighbouring amenities.
- (2) The proposed residential development is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to Policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, as appropriate provision towards public recreational open space has not been made

And contrary to the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

Policy	Purpose
G2	General principles for development
D2	Design
H16	Housing Policy Boundary
R2	Public Open Space

INFORMATIVE:

The applicant to note that the reason given above relating to Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan could be overcome if all the relevant parties agree to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement, or if appropriate by condition, in accordance with the standard requirement for recreational public open space

426. S/2006/1427: Change of Use to Residential Care for 3 Adults at 34 Manor Road Salisbury for Mr S P Mankin:

Mrs Sarah Larsen spoke on behalf of the residents of Manor Road in opposition to the proposed development and Ms E O'Connor spoke on behalf of the applicant. Following receipt of these statements, and with reference to a schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated).

Reasons for approval:

It is considered that the proposal is appropriate to its surrounding area, and will not have any significant impact on highway safety.

Resolved: that the above application be approved subject to the following conditions:

- (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) The premises shall be used as a residential care home only and for no other purposes (including any other purpose within Class C2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over the use of the premises in the interests of regulating any alternative kinds of residential institutions which could have an adverse effect upon the amenity of neighbouring dwellings.

- (3) The maximum number of residents in care shall not exceed 3 at any one time.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority may retain planning control over the use of the premises.

INFORMATIVE:

The applicant be informed that this decision has been in accordance with the following policy/policies of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:G2 (General), D3 (Design), PS1 & PS2 (Community Facilities)

427. S/2006/1437: Demolition of existing Church Hall and Erection of 10 No 2 Bedroom Apartments with Associated Parking at St Martin's Church Hall Eyres Way Salisbury for C Crawley:

Mrs Cowson spoke in opposition to the proposed development and the agent's representative spoke in support. Following receipt of these statements the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated).

Resolved: that the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- (1) The proposed development would be contrary to Policies D1, D2 (i) and G2 (vi) of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan that seek to ensure that development is acceptable in the context of the character and appearance of the area and preserves the amenities of the neighbouring residents. In this instance, the proposed development by virtue of the overall scale and massing of the building, the size of the building footprint and its forward siting within the site would represent an overdevelopment of the site that would constitute an intrusive form of development to the detriment of the street scene and character and appearance of the area and would be harmful to the residential amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring properties.
- (2) The proposed development fails to make provision towards recreational open space contrary to the requirements of Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003). As such, it would put an additional demand on existing recreational facilities and would set a precedent that would make it difficult for the Council to implement this policy effectively in the future.

428. S/2006/1418: Extend and Convert 177-181 Wilton Road to 9 Flats at 177-181 Wilton Road Salisbury for T P Treichel:

Mr Gale, representing the residents of Gramshaw Road spoke in opposition to the proposed development and Mr Hull, adviser to the applicant, spoke in support. Following receipt of these statements and further to a site visit earlier that afternoon the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated).

Resolved: that the application be refused for the following reasons:-

- (1) The scheme proposes the creation of 9 flats, involving the erection of three storey rear extensions to 177-181 Wilton Road and the creation of parking for 6 cars on the existing garden areas.

The design of the proposed extensions, due to a combination of their general massing, differing projections, and unusual roof configurations, would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the more uniform design and appearance of the existing dwellings. Furthermore, the proposed parking area, by reason of the loss of enclosures to the existing gardens of 177-181 Wilton Road, and through the creation of a large area of hardstanding taking up the majority of the garden areas, would significantly alter the visual appearance of the site.

In addition, the intensified use of the rear gardens as a parking area for 9 flats including the utilization of the narrow Gramshaw Road would be likely to result in additional pedestrian and vehicular movements in and around the site, and hence, an increase in additional noise and disturbance.

Consequently, as a result of the harm likely to be caused to the character of the area and the amenities of residents, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to aims of policies G2 and D3 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.

- (2) The proposed residential development is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan because appropriate provision towards public recreational open space has not been made.

INFORMATIVE:

It should be noted that the reason given above relating to Policy R2 of the adopted Local Plan could be overcome if all the relevant parties can agree with a Section 106 Agreement, or, if appropriate by a condition, in accordance with the standard requirement of public recreational open space.

429. S/2006/1598: Erection of 31 Dwellings including ancillary open space landscaping and car parking and new vehicular access onto Queen Alexandra Road following demolition of No.45 Queen Alexandra Road at Land to the rear of 45 Queen Alexandra Road, Bemerton, Salisbury for The Luken Beck Partnership Ltd:

The Chairman used her discretion to allow two objectors to address the meeting for a total of 5 minutes and duly offered the same amount of time to the agent acting for the applicant. Accordingly, Mrs Bunsee of Alexandra Close and Mr McCoombe of Queen Alexandra Road spoke on behalf of the residents in opposition to the proposed development. Mr Mark Luken, agent for the applicant, spoke in support. Following receipt of these statements and with reference to a schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated).

Resolved: that the above application be refused for the following reasons:

The development of the site as proposed, due to a combination of the number of dwellings and the overall design and layout, and the close proximity to adjacent dwellings and garden areas, would be unsympathetic to the character of the area, and would have an adverse impact on the amenities of occupiers of adjacent dwellings. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies G2 (vi), and D1 & D2 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.

430. Urgent Business – SWAG Recommendations Tranche 2:

The Chairman agreed to the above item being considered under urgent business in order to give Members time to consider the papers which should have been included with this Committee's agenda.

Resolved: that the SWAG Recommendations Tranche 2 from the Panel's meeting on 29 August be determined by the City Area Committee (Community) meeting on 19 September.

431. Extension of Meeting:

In compliance with Council Policy, as the Committee could not conclude its business within 3 hours, it resolved to extend the meeting by 15 minutes (during which time the matters recorded under minute 428 and 430 were considered).

*Meeting ended at 9.15 pm
Number of public present 90*