

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 PLANNING 2 AUGUST 2007

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 Case Officer Site Address Proposal	Parish/Ward Officer Recommendation Ward Councillors
1.	S/2007/0715	ST ED & MILFORD
4-15	Mrs B Jones	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
SV: 5 PM	MILFORD HALL HOTEL & RESTAURANT 206 CASTLE STREET SALISBURY. SP1 3TE. ERECTION OF A PART GROUND AND PART FIRST STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING MODERN HOTEL ANNEX TO CREATE 11 HOTEL BEDROOM SUITES AT THE REAR OF HOTEL	CLLR MRS CHETTLEBURGH CLLR SAMPLE
2.	S/2007/0716	ST ED & MILFORD
16-20	Mrs B Jones	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
SV: 5 PM	MILFORD HALL HOTEL & RESTAURANT 206 CASTLE STREET SALISBURY. SP1 3TE. ERECTION OF A PART GROUND AND PART FIRST STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING MODERN HOTEL ANNEX TO CREATE 11 HOTEL BEDROOM SUITES AT THE REAR OF HOTEL	CLLR MRS CHETTLEBURGH CLLR SAMPLE
3.	S/2007/1152	BEMERTON
21-32	Mr R Hughes	APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS
SV: 4 PM	FORMER PEMBROKE PARK SCHOOL PENRUDDOCK CLOSE SALISBURY. SP2 9HH. REDEVELOPMENT FOR 65 RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO INCLUDE A VEHICULAR ACCESS AT PEMBROKE ROAD & EMERGENCY ACCESS ONTO PENRUDDOCK CLOSE AND ASSORTED DRAINAGE WORKS	CLLR MRS EVANS CLLR OSMENT CLLR VINCENT

Part 1
Applications recommended for Refusal

No Refusals

Part 2

Applications recommended for Approval

1

Application Number:	S/2007/0715		
Applicant/ Agent:	WGDP		
Location:	MILFORD HALL HOTEL & RESTAURANT 206 CASTLE STREET SALISBURY SP1 3TE		
Proposal:	ERECTION OF A PART GROUND AND PART FIRST STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING MODERN HOTEL ANNEX TO CREATE 11 HOTEL BEDROOM SUITES AT THE REAR OF HOTEL ST ED & MILFORD		
Parish/ Ward	ST ED & MILFORD		
Conservation Area:	LB Grade:	II*	
Date Valid:	3 April 2007	Expiry Date:	29 May 2007
Case Officer:	Mrs B Jones	Contact Number:	01722 434388

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

The City Area Committee deferred the item and the accompanying listed building application at the meeting on 7th June 2007.

Members considered that the following matters needed to be looked at and reported back to CAC:

That a green travel plan be provided which provided current (baseline) information about the current levels and types of usage of the car park on site, and which provided a scheme to limit the likelihood of users of the hotel parking outside the site within the surrounding residential streets. The central car park should be utilised for any overflow parking, including provision being made during construction works for the extension.

Confirmation whether there is any missing evidence or plans which had not been submitted to the Local Planning Authority

That the various submitted plans, in particular the sectional drawings and relationship with other adjacent buildings be checked for accuracy

That Wiltshire County Council Highways be reconsulted about the above matters, and that the County be sure of its understanding of the existing parking regime which exists around the site

To explore the possibility of any additional replacement parking being provided on site (near the entrance)

Members' attention is drawn to the Appendix, which contains the previous committee report and sets out the proposal, previous responses to consultations, and consideration of the planning issues. Members should consider the issues raised in the previous report as well as any additional issues raised by this supplemental report.

FURTHER CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - No objection. Please refer to the Highway Authority's full response in the Appendix.

FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Re-notification to neighbours who responded to original consultation: Expiry 14/7/07
City Area Committee 02/08/2007

Third Party responses Yes 4 letters of objection on the following planning grounds:

Concerned that only neighbours who previously responded to the application consultation were reconsulted.

The combined size of all the new buildings would diminish the significance of the original house, and would not be carefully integrated with development in the surrounding residential area. Lack of garden space for the hotel, which is out of keeping with the character of the area. Would be forward of building line in King's Road, reducing the space between the hotel and Wyndham Road properties.

Overlooking, encroachment, increased noise and disturbance

No tourism case for the development, overdevelopment of site. Conflicts with Policy G2, D3.

Poor design and detailing and too dense. Buildings already oversized

The hotel requires parking for guests, occasions, brasserie, conference centre etc. Car park is already full of cars and coaches. Survey was inadequate as it was for one week during November. A resident's April survey indicates 62-65% usage. A July survey at 11am shows the car park to be double parked, and coaches parking across bays. Residents consider this shows a lack of responsible car parking and feel let down by hotel. Why can't coaches use coach park? Decisions regarding travel plan need to be taken now, before construction begins and in consultation with local residents. Residents have to live in the area permanently, unlike guests. Not all the suggestions are practical or viable eg few guests would arrive by cycle or public transport, valet service to public car park and car sharing unlikely to work. Schemes are likely to be dropped.

How many car parking spaces are there? What are the contingency plans?

Residents returning late do not have first call on spaces in Wyndham Road

Car park causes undue disturbance to neighbours, and further loss of spaces would cause greater disturbance.

Do any of the other hotels have a travel plan? Parking problems would apply anywhere in the city.

Why have plans been redrawn unless there was a discrepancy? What property does 530-20-21 refer to? Daylight lines do not line up with the sun. Need to calculate for winter months. Photos have not been submitted showing bad light levels.

Discrepancy between 530-2-17 and 19 showing stairwell position, showing it behind 26 Hamilton Road, then behind 30/32 Hamilton Road. Plans are not accurate. What is approx rearmost line of No 32, written on plot No 34? (**Note from HDS:** See report below).

ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOLLOWING DEFERRAL

Green Travel Plan, reconsultation with WCC Highways and additional parking provision.
Accuracy and content of plans

ADDITIONAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS FOLLOWING DEFERRAL

1. Green Travel Plan, Reconsultation with WCC Highways and Additional Parking Provision.

The latest Government guidance contained in PPG13 seeks to reduce the reliance on the car, and the applicant had previously submitted a car parking survey, which has been disputed by third parties.

The Highway Authority previously considered the proposals, which would see a reduction in the number of on site spaces by 4. The site is, however, close to all the city centre's public transport facilities and car parks. Highways considered that given the close proximity of the hotel and restaurant to the city centre, no objection should be raised and a travel plan was not requested. In the previous report, Members were advised to consider whether given the hotel's central position, this may be a situation where a reduced level of parking is acceptable, in compliance with PPG13.

In deferring the application, Members requested that a green travel plan should be provided with current (baseline) information about the current levels and types of usage of the car park on site, and a scheme to limit the likelihood of users of the hotel parking outside the site within the surrounding residential streets. The central car park should be utilised for any overflow parking,

including provision being made during construction works for the extension. Members also asked for the WCC Highways position to be clarified.

A draft *schedule* for a Green Travel Plan was submitted by the applicant, and informal comments were received from WCC Highways suggesting ways to improve the draft, which have been fully incorporated. Please refer to the Appendix for the full version of the latest draft schedule, which is summarised below:

Encouragement of greater use of public transport, cycling and walking and measures to secure the cessation of on street parking outside the site.

Appointment of travel co-ordinator within 3 months of start of development

Submission of site users survey within 6 months of development coming into use

Submission of Green Transport Plan within 6 months of development coming into use and approval by SDC

No more than 39 parking spaces to be provided on the site from completion of development

Car Park Management – car sharing register and lift guarantee scheme to be drawn up with staff (16 of the 29 staff currently walk, 4 use private car, and 3 lift or car share), guest valet service to public car parks, designated spaces to encourage staff to use car share and hotel minibus during busy periods

Cycle facilities - provision of on site changing facilities for cyclists and storage facilities

Public Transport – Leaflet for all site users registering on site. Display of information on site.

Encouragement of guests to use park and ride, public transport and existing city car parks

Scheme for flexible working for staff

Targets – aim to reduce number of journeys to the site by site users by private car (after completion of development) by 10% within 3 years from commencement of Transport Plan and a further 10% over the subsequent 5 years (ie over 8 years).

Monitoring – review within 12 months of development occupation, and annual reviews.

Subsequent performance – on and from the review date. The owners will continue to observe and be bound by the provisions of the Green Travel Plan.

The applicant has also responded to the committee's request for further parking provision to be considered. There is some limited scope for increasing the number of car parking spaces on site, but the applicant is hesitant to propose this, as PPG13 promotes less car usage in sustainable locations such as this site. In any event, the Highway Authority are content with the car park capacity and the applicant is not convinced that it is necessary to increase the proposed car park capacity of 39, particularly given the current support for the scheme by the Highway Authority.

Residents have been re-consulted, and their comments on the Travel Plan are summarised above. The feasibility and practicality of some of the initiatives has been questioned. For example, would guests realistically be happy for their cars to be driven to and left in the public car park, and how would periods of high demand be managed (eg many guests and vehicles arriving at once)? There also seems to be little point in promoting the use of public transport through the leaflet once guests have arrived and registered on the site.

WCC Highways has also been reconsulted, and their letter is contained in full in the Appendix. In summary, the Highway Authority feel that on balance, the proposal is not considered to present any local highway safety concerns, and it is reconfirmed that no highway objection is recommended and that a travel plan is not required for this location.

2. Accuracy and content of plans.

The previous committee report recognised that the proposal may result in a reduction in the levels of direct sunlight to the rear gardens. The applicant had submitted critical sunlight and daylight protection lines in accordance with "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – The Building Research Establishment, and the submission demonstrated that the development was well within the limits set by the guidance. Officers did not raise an objection on this ground. However, Members asked officers to seek clarification on the accuracy and content of the plans, following criticism by local residents at the meeting that the submitted application plans showed discrepancies.

Objections were also made on the grounds that the proposal would lead to a detrimental loss of light to the surrounding properties, particularly in winter months. Concern was raised that the

daylight and sunlight information did not represent the winter months, or show the effect of the existing hotel buildings on existing light levels reaching the rear of Hamilton Road properties.

Officers do not generally use daylight/sunlight calculations to ascertain the possible impacts of a development on adjacent amenity, and therefore whether or not these calculations are accurate is not considered by officers to be a requirement in this case to assess the impacts of this development. If the daylight/sunlight calculations are discounted, and reliance is placed on the elevations and sectional drawings as submitted, officers have no reason to doubt the architect's written assertion (see Appendix) that the elevational drawings of the extension are properly scaled, and that the distances shown between the new development and the gardens/dwellings adjacent to the site are accurate for the purposes of planning.

Members will see from the previous attached report to Committee that officers do not wish to raise an objection to the development on the grounds of overshadowing or over dominance.

One resident queried plan ref 530-20-21, suggesting that the note which relates to No 32 Hamilton Road is written on plot 34. However, this plan clearly show an orthographic projection line level with No 32 and projected upwards to site Section B-B. The projection line is labelled as the rearmost line of No 32, and its position on the plan is therefore irrelevant, as the building line to which it refers to on the plan correlates.

Additional plan ref no 21 as submitted also states that the plan of houses along Hamilton Road, "Is a direct transcription of the ordnance survey map made under license." Therefore, officers have no reason to question the accuracy of the plan for planning purposes.

One resident also queried the accuracy of 530-20-17, showing the roof profile for Hamilton Road, and 530-20-19, in relation to the proposed stairwell and the apparent alleyway. However, it is not considered that the background illustration on Plan No 17 is intended to accurately show the position of the alleyway, and is intended instead to show the relative heights of the buildings. Again, officers have no reason to question the accuracy of the plans submitted by Favonius for planning purposes, as the properties in Hamilton Road do not form part of the proposed development, and their inclusion on the drawings is considered to be an illustrative guide only.

CONCLUSION

The conclusions for the application do not differ from the previous officer report attached. The impact of the development on the Grade 2* listed building is considered to be acceptable, and would not harm its character or setting. Furthermore, the development is considered to be beneficial in terms of meeting the hotel bed space needs of the city, and the proposal would also satisfy the broader objectives of PPS6 for hotel development in town and city centres. No highway objection has been raised, given the sustainable city centre location of the hotel. The impact of the development on neighbouring amenities of 32 Kings Road and Hamilton Road is still considered to be finely balanced, but for the reasons set out in the report, Members may feel that the leisure and tourism benefits of the development and the objectives set out in PPS6 outweigh the potential harm.

Members may also wish to consider the benefits of a Green Travel Plan for the site, although this is not a requirement of the Highway Authority, and in officers' opinion, would be extremely difficult to enforce in practice, given the Highway Authority's stance that it is not required.

RECOMMENDATION: (as per previous officer report) APPROVE

For the following reasons:

The proposed single and two storey extensions to an existing hotel on a brownfield site within the Salisbury Central Area would be in accordance with the adopted policy provisions of the Salisbury District Local Plan and the guidance for tourism and hotel development in PPS6, and would not have such a significant impact as to unduly disturb neighbouring amenities, or harm the character or setting of the listed building, or be detrimental to highway safety.

And 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. Before development is commenced, a schedule and sample panel of materials and finishes (to include natural slate and matching bricks), to be used for the external wall[s] and roof[s] of the extensions hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D04A)

Reason: To secure a harmonious form of development

3. No deliveries of building materials, operation of plant or construction work shall take place outside the following hours:

Monday to Friday: 08:00 hrs to 19:00 hrs

Saturday: 08:00 hrs to 13:00 hrs

Sunday and Bank Holidays: No work.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenities

4. There shall be no installation of any air conditioning plant, extraction systems, boilers, flues or similar equipment on the extensions hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority upon submission of a planning application in that behalf.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenities and to enable the Local Planning Authority to maintain control over the character of extensions to the listed building.

5. Before development is commenced, large scale details (not less than 1:20 scale) of the: windows and recesses, doors, circular wall detailing and eaves (all to confirm detailing, means and degree of obscure glazing, methods of restricted opening and materials) of the extensions hereby approved, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority, and the development shall thereafter accord with the approved scheme.

Reason – To secure a harmonious form development.

6. Replacement trees for the existing courtyard and the eastern site boundary (of a number, species, size and in a position to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall be planted within one month of the implementation of any felling necessitated by the development hereby approved. If within a period of five years from the date of planting any replacement tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To comply with the duties indicated in Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, so as to ensure that the amenity value of the existing trees is maintained by the provision of adequate replacement.

7. The proposed east elevation first floor windows shall be glazed with obscure glazing and shall be fitted with a restricted opening mechanism, in accordance with full details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The windows shall be maintained accordance with the agreed details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenities and to prevent undue overlooking.

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

Policy	Purpose
G2	General Principles for Development
D3	Extensions
D6	Height of new buildings
T1	Tourist facilities
T6	Hotel extensions
CN3, CN5	Listed Buildings

And the guidance in
 PPG15 "Planning and the Historic Environment"
 PPS6 "Planning for Town Centres"
 PPG13 Transport

And reference to A Tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire

APPENDIX

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

The Head of Development Services does not consider it prudent to exercise delegated powers.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Milford Hall Hotel is a Grade II* listed building that has been significantly enlarged with more recent and modern single and two storey extensions to the rear. The site has a vehicular access from Castle Street with existing on site parking facilities to the southern side of the hotel buildings and extending into the full depth of the site. The original two-storey house that dates from about 1800 occupies the front of the site and is set back from the road by a garden area, while the existing single storey accommodation block to which this application relates is to the rear of the site. This single storey block is connected by a single storey link to the adjacent two-storey accommodation block that is of the same general design and finished in a similar brick.

The residential properties in Wyndham Road and Hamilton Road adjoin the side boundaries of the site to the south and north respectively and are separated from it by their rear gardens. To the east, the site is adjoined at relatively close proximity by the residential dwelling at No 32 King's Road that is "side on" to the site and is separated from the boundary by a driveway. The boundaries of the site with the surrounding properties are predominantly formed by a high brick wall and there are also some existing leylandii trees on the boundary with Kings Road.

THE PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission to erect a part ground and part first floor extension to the existing modern hotel annex to create 11 hotel bedroom suites at the rear of the hotel. The supporting statement indicates that 4 parking spaces would be lost. A curved internal staircase would be provided in the existing courtyard to serve the new extension. Materials would be natural slate for the roof, render and bricks to match the existing.

The proposal differs from a previously submitted scheme for 12 beds as follows:

The roofline has been dropped by 0.7m

Removal of oriel windows and Juliet balconies from east and north elevations

No windows or high ridge line facing Hamilton Road

One recessed (restricted and obscured) window for Bed 5 and one restricted/obscured window for Bed 4

Submission of sunlight and daylight studies

First floor of north elevation as extended would be approx 6m from boundary wall with Hamilton Road properties, previously proposed to be 4m, and 6.5m in height, previously proposed to be more than 7m.

PLANNING HISTORY

This site has been the subject of an extensive planning history. However, of particular relevance to the current proposal are the following applications:

2006/1758 and 1759 Ground and first floor extensions to create 12 additional bedrooms
Withdrawn

2005/360 and 361 First floor extension to create 8 en suite bedrooms and external staircase R
The proposed development, by virtue of the overall scale, massing and generally poor design, would have an adverse impact upon the character and setting of the Grade II listed building and would adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring residents due to its resultant dominance and overlooking. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies G2, D3, CN3 and CN5 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003).*

2003/432 Conversion/extension of former coachhouse to create fitness suite including spa pool
AC

2005/1723 and 1724 Extension to provide a new dining area AC

1998/299 and 300 Internal alterations to provide foyer kitchen and toilets, single storey extension to provide conference room and canopy porch to main entrance AC

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways -	No objection
Tourism Officer -	Support, see below
Wessex Water Authority-	Points of connection and any easements to be agreed
English Heritage -	No objection/comments
Conservation -	No objection
Archaeology -	No objection
Environmental Health Officer -	No objection subject to condition to restrict construction hours and sound insulation of any future plant.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes	Expiry 10/5/07
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expiry 10/5/07
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expiry 26/4/07

Third Party responses Yes 6 letters of objection on the following grounds:

Proximity of extension to Hamilton Rd properties	extension already oversized and unattractive	closer to Wyndham Rd properties than existing building line
Loss of privacy and overlooking	ugly outlook	out of scale with dwellings
Loss of light (survey is not accurate) especially in winter minimal contribution to tourism as hotel has primarily a business function.	design and access statement misleading	precedent for more extensions
cannot compare relative heights	extension unnecessary	Overcrowded, densely packed development and lack of greenspace
increased noise levels	intrusive	loss of trees
built form and layout of hotel contrary to character of Victorian style of residential area	pressure on parking in residential areas	would not be subservient lack of space for large vehicles such as coaches
loss of already insufficient parking spaces	conflicts with G2 and D3	

would windows be obscured (Note from HDS – amended plans have been requested to confirm obscure glazing and restriction on first floor east windows),
site notice put up on 19th April so not enough time to comment (Note from HDS – this is the correct target date for the site notice, expiring 10/5)

1 letter of no objection.

Transport 2000 Pleased to note demand in central Salisbury for hotel accommodation, but car park survey did not take place at peak time (in July on Saturday for example). Concerned proposal will put pressure on Resident's Parking in Zone A, especially during evening. A conference venue for up to 100 people should be required to produce a Green Travel Plan.

MAIN ISSUES

Principle: Hotels and Tourism in the City Centre
Scale, Design, Impact on Listed Building and its setting
Residential amenity
Highway Safety
Impact on Trees

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan Policies G2, D3, D6, T1, T6, D3, CN3, CN5, TR11.
A Tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire
PPG15 "Planning and the Historic Environment"
PPS6 "Planning for Town Centres"
PPG13 Transport

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Principle: Hotels and Tourism in the City Centre

The application relates to an existing hotel and Policy T1 states that the development of new tourist facilities, or the improvement of existing tourist facilities will be permitted within the physical limits of the settlement. The tourism officer considers that strategic objective 1 of the new tourism strategy (A Tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire) aims to, "Continue to provide a quality tourism product and where appropriate introduce new products with the aim of continuously improving the overall visitor experience." More specifically it talks of increasing the number of hotel bedspaces and aims to increase the number of 3* and above hotels from 58% of the current bedstock to 80%. The development is therefore considered to assist in achieving these aims. Tourism currently accounts for 8% of all jobs locally. For Salisbury and South Wiltshire to maintain a viable tourism industry, the strategy aims to encourage the development of more accommodation establishments to suit all tastes and pockets so that visitors to the region will be encouraged to stay longer and spend more. A larger hotel would also support the need for accommodation that would suit the groups market.

PPS6 states that the government's key objective for town and city centres is to promote their vitality and viability by...supporting efficient, competitive and innovative tourism sectors, including hotels. Two key themes are the efficient use of land and promoting high quality design. The government is concerned to ensure efficient use of land in centres, by encouraging well designed, accessible, and where appropriate, higher density multi storey development. The proposal, in making efficient use of brownfield land within an existing city centre, is considered to meet the objectives set out in PPS6.

2. Scale, Design and Impact on the Listed Building and it's setting

Milford Hall Hotel is a late Georgian house dating from about 1800 and is a Grade II* listed building. The original building occupies the front of the site, while to the rear are a series of more recent brick extensions that have significantly enlarged the building. Some of the existing buildings, particularly the existing single storey and two-storey accommodation blocks, are of a poor quality design. In this respect, the character and setting of the listed building has already been compromised to some extent by the poor quality modern additions. More beneficially, the

existing building is single storey and therefore has a more limited impact than the existing two-storey block on the character of the surrounding area and within the site itself.

Policy CN3 states that development that would in any manner affect the character or setting of a listed building will only be permitted if the proposal respects the character of the existing building in terms of scale, design and materials and its historic form and structural integrity. Policy CN5 states that development within the curtilage of a listed building will only be permitted where it does not harm the character or setting of the building concerned. Policy T6 states that extensions to hotels should be subordinate to the existing buildings and not detract from their appearance or the quality of their surroundings. Policy D3 sets out the general criteria for extensions.

The Conservation Officer considers that the proposals relate to alterations to the modern single-storey bedroom block at the rear of the site in order to create a larger two-storey block. The block in question is some distance away from the original part of the listed building, and is not particularly visible from the road due to the fact that there are existing single and two-storey extensions on the building at present, and an approximately two-metre high wall midway down the site. This means that there is a visual separation from the historic building.

The proposed extension retains the existing subservience of the modern bedroom wings, and the resultant building would be no higher than the existing two-storey bedroom block on the site. The Conservation Officer feels that the architectural treatment would give some interest to what is a bland façade at present. The roof will be pitched, and covered with natural slates, which will respect the traditional character of the main building. Subject to suitable bricks, brick sample panels, and natural slate, it is considered that the setting of the listed building would not be harmed by the proposals. English Heritage have raised no objection and have made no comment regarding the proposals.

The applicant has submitted a full design and access statement to justify the revised design and its impact on the listed building, and the previous reasons for refusal in 2005 on the grounds of the impact on the listed building are considered to be overcome, and in accordance with Policy CN3, CN5, T6 and D3.

3. Residential Amenity

The application site is adjoined by the rear gardens of the residential properties fronting Hamilton Road and Wyndham Road to either side and by No 32 King's Road to the rear. The existing single storey structure has a negligible physical impact upon adjoining residential amenities as it is substantially screened behind the respective boundary walls with only limited views of the roof slope above.

The proposed extension, however, would substantially increase the overall scale and mass of this section of the building and given the relatively close proximity of the building to the boundaries, particularly the properties in Hamilton Road and No 32 King's Road, it is considered that it would have an additional impact on the outlook from these properties. Policy G2 states that proposals should avoid *unduly* disturbing, interfering, conflicting with or overlooking adjoining dwellings, to the detriment of existing occupiers. The *level* of harm would therefore need to be assessed.

32 Kings Road

The proposed extension would be particularly dominant in relation to the west side elevation of No 32 King's Road which is separated from the rear elevation of the proposed 2-storey flank wall by some 7 metres. The dwelling has a number of windows in the side elevation facing over the existing roof of the hotel, including a stairway, second bedroom, and side window of the south facing master bedroom. In comparison with the previously refused scheme the proposed extension would actually extend further along the boundary at the front of this property towards Kings Road. However, the south east part of the new elevation would not include a window for Bedroom 3, which has been positioned on the south elevation instead. The submitted plans show a site level difference of about 90cm between No 32 and the site and the proposed eaves would be about 4.5m above the ground level of No 32. The hotel bedroom windows would therefore be slightly lower than the west facing windows of No 32. However, the proposal would

still affect the outlook from these windows, although it is not considered that there would be any direct impact from overlooking, as the windows would be obscured and restricted. However, despite the obscured windows being at a lower level than No 32, the very presence of the windows on these elevations would result in some perception of overlooking to the occupiers of No 32.

Given the aims and objectives of PPS6 for tourism and hotel development within town and city centres, it is considered, on balance, that the revised proposals would be satisfactory on this existing hotel site, and that the applicant has made reasonable attempts to try to reduce the impact on the side elevation of No 32. Members may feel that the need for the additional hotel accommodation outweighs the potential harm to the existing amenities to the occupiers of No 32, in terms of their loss of outlook to the west, and proximity of the development to the side elevation of the house. However, officers do remain concerned about the use of obscured glazing for the amenities of guests inside the bedrooms, which could lead to future pressure on the Local Planning Authority to lift any conditions requiring the obscure glazing in the guests' interests.

Wyndham Road Properties

The proposed south elevation of the two storey extension would be about 4.5m closer to the boundary with the gardens of dwellings in Wyndham Road. Amended plans have been requested, to delete the south facing window for Bedroom 11, which could be served by the west facing window.

As extended, the south elevation would be separated from the Wyndham Road dwellings by at least 22 metres and at least 11metres from the boundary with the rear gardens. Given the guidance in PPS6, and that this is an existing brownfield site in the city centre, the proposal is not considered to give rise to sufficient impacts on the existing amenities of occupiers in Wyndham Road in terms of overlooking, loss of light, or dominance, to warrant refusal of the application.

Hamilton Road Properties

The existing two storey portion of the hotel presents a brick elevation to the gardens and terraces in Hamilton Road, with 'blind' brick recesses which present no overlooking or any perception of overlooking. The original extensions appear to have been carefully designed to minimise the impact on adjoining amenities.

The proposed extension would be particularly dominant in relation to the south side of properties 28-38, which are separated from the existing building by about 14 metres. These dwellings range between two and three storeys in height, with some south facing dormer windows. Their gardens are separated from the hotel boundary by an existing brick wall.

The first floor of north elevation as extended would be approx 6metres from the boundary wall with Hamilton Road properties and about 6.5m in height from ground level on the hotel's side, which is about 1.2m lower than the Hamilton Road properties. The proposed north elevation and the part of the west elevation closest to Hamilton Road do not contain any first floor windows, and therefore, overlooking is not considered to be material. The proposal would, however, result in some additional impact on the amenities of existing occupiers in terms of dominance and loss of outlook. However, given the proposed height and separation of the extension as described, this is not considered to be sufficient to refuse the application. Furthermore, given the aims and objectives of PPS6 for tourism and hotel development within town and city centres, and that this is an existing city centre brownfield site, it is considered, on balance, that the proposals would be acceptable and Members need to consider carefully whether the need for the additional hotel accommodation outweighs the potential harm to the existing amenities to the occupiers of Hamilton Road, in terms of their loss of outlook to the south.

Objections have also been received on the grounds that the proposal will lead to a loss of light to the surrounding properties. Although it is recognized that the proposal may result in a reduction in the levels of direct sunlight to the rear gardens, the applicant has submitted critical sunlight and daylight protection lines in accordance with "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – The Building Research Establishment. The submission demonstrates that the development is

well within the limits set by the guidance. Therefore, officers do not propose to raise an objection on this grounds.

4. Highway Issues

The latest Government guidance contained in PPG13 seeks to reduce the reliance on the car, and the applicant has submitted a car parking survey, which has been disputed by third parties.

The Highway Authority have considered the proposals, which would see a reduction in the number of on site spaces by 4. The site is, however, close to all the city centre's public transport facilities and car parks. Highways consider that given the close proximity of the Hotel and Restaurant to the city centre, no objection is raised to the proposal and a travel plan has not been requested. Members need to consider whether given the hotel's central position, this may be a situation where a reduced level of parking is acceptable.

5. Impact on Trees

There are some large trees towards the front of the site that are important in terms of their public amenity value. However, the proposals would affect some smaller trees within the courtyard and leylandii on the eastern boundary. These trees are not currently protected and are not considered to be of sufficient merit to be worthy of protection by a Tree Preservation Order. A condition requiring a scheme of replacement planting could be attached however, in the interests of amenity.

CONCLUSION

The impact of the development on the Grade 2* listed building is considered to be acceptable, and would not harm its character or setting. Furthermore, the development is considered to be beneficial in terms of meeting the hotel bed space needs of the city, as identified by the tourism strategy, and the proposal would also satisfy the broader objectives of PPS6 for hotel development in town and city centres. No highway objection has been raised, given the sustainable city centre location of the hotel.

However, the impact of the development on neighbouring amenities of 32 Kings Road and Hamilton Road is considered to be finely balanced, but for the reasons set out in the report, Members may feel that the leisure and tourism benefits of the development and the objectives set out in PPS6 outweigh the potential harm.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

For the following reasons:

The proposed single and two storey extensions to an existing hotel on a brownfield site within the Salisbury Central Area would be in accordance with the adopted policy provisions of the Salisbury District Local Plan and the guidance for tourism and hotel development in PPS6, and would not have such a significant impact as to unduly disturb neighbouring amenities, or harm the character or setting of the listed building, or be detrimental to highway safety.

And 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. Before development is commenced, a schedule and sample panel of materials and finishes (to include natural slate and matching bricks), to be used for the external wall[s] and roof[s] of the extensions hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local

Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D04A)

Reason: To secure a harmonious form of development

3. No deliveries of building materials, operation of plant or construction work shall take place outside the following hours:

Monday to Friday: 08:00 hrs to 19:00 hrs

Saturday: 08:00 hrs to 13:00 hrs

Sunday and Bank Holidays: No work.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenities

4. There shall be no installation of any air conditioning plant, extraction systems, boilers, flues or similar equipment on the extensions hereby approved, unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority upon submission of a planning application in that behalf.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenities and to enable the Local Planning Authority to maintain control over the character of extensions to the listed building.

5. Before development is commenced, large scale details (not less than 1:20 scale) of the: windows and recesses, doors, circular wall detailing and eaves (all to confirm detailing, means and degree of obscure glazing, methods of restricted opening and materials) of the extensions hereby approved, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority, and the development shall thereafter accord with the approved scheme.

Reason – To secure a harmonious form development.

6. Replacement trees for the existing courtyard and the eastern site boundary (of a number, species, size and in a position to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority) shall be planted within one month of the implementation of any felling necessitated by the development hereby approved. If within a period of five years from the date of planting any replacement tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or defective another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To comply with the duties indicated in Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, so as to ensure that the amenity value of the existing trees is maintained by the provision of adequate replacement.

7. The proposed east elevation first floor windows shall be glazed with obscure glazing and shall be fitted with a restricted opening mechanism, in accordance with full details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. The windows shall be maintained accordance with the agreed details thereafter.

Reason: In the interests of neighbouring amenities and to prevent undue overlooking.

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

Policy	Purpose
G2	General Principles for Development
D3	Extensions
D6	Height of new buildings
T1	Tourist facilities
T6	Hotel extensions
CN3, CN5	Listed Buildings

And the guidance in

PPG15 "Planning and the Historic Environment"

PPS6 "Planning for Town Centres"

PPG13 Transport

And reference to A Tourism Strategy for South Wiltshire

2.

Application Number:	S/2007/0716		
Applicant/ Agent:	WGDP		
Location:	MILFORD HALL HOTEL & RESTAURANT 206 CASTLE STREET SALISBURY SP1 3TE		
Proposal:	ERECTION OF A PART GROUND AND PART FIRST STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING MODERN HOTEL ANNEX TO CREATE 11 HOTEL BEDROOM SUITES AT THE REAR OF HOTEL ST ED & MILFORD		
Parish/ Ward	ST ED & MILFORD		
Conservation Area:	LB Grade:	II*	
Date Valid:	3 April 2007	Expiry Date	29 May 2007
Case Officer:	Mrs B Jones	Contact Number:	01722 434388

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

The City Area Committee deferred the item and the accompanying planning application at the meeting on 7th June 2007.

Members considered that the following matters needed to be looked at and reported back to CAC:

Confirmation whether there is any missing evidence or plans which had not been submitted to the Local Planning Authority

That the various submitted plans, in particular the sectional drawings and relationship with other adjacent buildings be checked for accuracy

Members' attention is drawn to the Appendix, which contains the previous committee report and sets out the proposal, previous response to consultations, and consideration of the listed building issues. Members should consider the issues raised in the previous report as well as any additional issues raised by this supplemental report.

FURTHER REPRESENTATIONS

Re-notification to neighbours who responded to original consultation: Expiry 14/7/07

Third Party responses Yes 4 letters of objection on the following planning grounds:

Concerned that only neighbours who previously responded to the application consultation were reconsulted.

The combined size of all the new buildings would diminish the significance of the original house, and would not be carefully integrated with development in the surrounding residential area. Lack of garden space for the hotel, which is out of keeping with the character of the area. Would be forward of building line in King's Road, reducing the space between the hotel and Wyndham Road properties.

Discrepancy between 530-2-17 and 19 showing stairwell position, showing it behind 26 Hamilton Road, then behind 30/32 Hamilton Road. Plans are not accurate. (**Note from HDS:** See report below).

ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOLLOWING DEFERRAL

Accuracy and content of plans

ADDITIONAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS FOLLOWING DEFERRAL

Accuracy and content of plans.

Members asked officers to seek clarification on the accuracy and content of the plans, following criticism by local residents at the meeting that the submitted application plans showed discrepancies. Discrepancies could clearly affect the accuracy of the listed building application.

Having reviewed the issues raised under the planning application, officers have no reason to doubt the architect's written assertion (see Appendix) that the elevational drawings of the extension which are the subject of the listed building application are properly scaled and are accurate for the purposes of planning.

CONCLUSION

The impact of the development on the Grade 2* listed building is considered to be acceptable, and would not harm its character or setting.

RECOMMENDATION: (as previous officer report) APPROVE

For the following reasons:

The proposed single and two storey extensions to the Grade 2* listed building would be in accordance with the adopted policy provisions of the Salisbury District Local Plan and would not harm the character or setting of the listed building.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. The development for which permission is hereby granted must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. (Z01B)

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. 0006 AMENDED

2. Before development is commenced, a schedule and sample panel of materials and finishes (to include natural slate and matching bricks), to be used for the external wall[s] and roof[s] of the extensions hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D04A)

Reason – To secure a harmonious form development

3. Before development is commenced, large scale details (not less than 1:20 scale) of the: windows and recesses, doors, circular wall detailing and eaves (all to confirm detailing, means and degree of obscure glazing, methods of restricted opening and materials) of the extensions hereby approved, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority, and the development shall thereafter accord with the approved scheme.

Reason – To secure a harmonious form development.

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

Policy CN3, CN5 Listed Buildings

And the guidance in
PPG15 "Planning and the Historic Environment"

APPENDIX

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

The Head of Development Services does not consider it prudent to exercise delegated powers.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Milford Hall Hotel is a Grade II* listed building that has been significantly enlarged with more recent and modern single and two storey extensions to the rear. The site has a vehicular access

from Castle Street with existing on site parking facilities to the southern side of the hotel buildings and extending into the full depth of the site. The original two-storey house that dates from about 1800 occupies the front of the site and is set back from the road by a garden area, while the existing single storey accommodation block to which this application relates is to the rear of the site. This single storey block is connected by a single storey link to the adjacent two-storey accommodation block that is of the same general design and finished in a similar brick.

THE PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission to erect a part ground and part first floor extension to the existing modern hotel annex to create 11 hotel bedroom suites at the rear of the hotel. A curved internal staircase would be provided in the existing courtyard to serve the new extension. Materials would be natural slate for the roof, render and bricks to match the existing.

The proposal differs from a previously submitted scheme for 12 beds as follows:

The roofline has been dropped by 0.7m

Removal of oriel windows and Juliet balconies from east and north elevations

No windows or high ridge line facing Hamilton Road

One recessed (restricted and obscured) window for Bed 5 and one restricted/obscured window for Bed 4

First floor of north elevation as extended would be approx 6m from boundary wall with Hamilton Road properties, previously proposed to be 4m, and 6.5m in height, previously proposed to be more than 7m.

PLANNING HISTORY

This site has been the subject of an extensive planning history. However, of particular relevance to the current proposal are the following applications:

2006/1758 and 1759 Ground and first floor extensions to create 12 additional bedrooms
Withdrawn

2005/360 and 361 First floor extension to create 8 en suite bedrooms and external staircase R
The proposed development, by virtue of the overall scale, massing and generally poor design, would have an adverse impact upon the character and setting of the Grade II listed building and would adversely affect the amenities of the neighbouring residents due to its resultant dominance and overlooking. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies G2, D3, CN3 and CN5 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003).*

2003/432 Conversion/extension of former coach house to create fitness suite including spa pool
AC

2005/1723 and 1724 Extension to provide a new dining area AC

1998/299 and 300 Internal alterations to provide foyer kitchen and toilets, single storey extension to provide conference room and canopy porch to main entrance AC

CONSULTATIONS

English Heritage - No objection/comments
Conservation - No objection

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes	Expiry 10/5/07
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expiry 10/5/07
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expiry 26/4/07

Third Party responses Yes 6 , but none specifically relate to the impact of the extension on the character or setting of the listed building. Please refer to the planning application for a full breakdown of comments.

1 letter of no objection.

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on Listed Building and its setting

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan Policies CN3, CN5
PPG15 "Planning and the Historic Environment"

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Impact on the Listed Building and it's setting

Milford Hall Hotel is a late Georgian house dating from about 1800 and is a Grade II* listed building. The original building occupies the front of the site, while to the rear are a series of more recent brick extensions that have significantly enlarged the building. Some of the existing buildings, particularly the existing single storey and two-storey accommodation blocks, are of a poor quality design. In this respect, the character and setting of the listed building has already been compromised to some extent by the poor quality modern additions. More beneficially, the existing building is single storey and therefore has a more limited impact than the existing two-storey block on the character of the surrounding area and within the site itself.

Policy CN3 states that development that would in any manner affect the character or setting of a listed building will only be permitted if the proposal respects the character of the existing building in terms of scale, design and materials and its historic form and structural integrity. Policy CN5 states that development within the curtilage of a listed building will only be permitted where it does not harm the character or setting of the building concerned.

The Conservation Officer considers that the proposals relate to alterations to the modern single-storey bedroom block at the rear of the site in order to create a larger two-storey block. The block in question is some distance away from the original part of the listed building, and is not particularly visible from the road due to the fact that there are existing single and two-storey extensions on the building at present, and an approximately two-metre high wall midway down the site. This means that there is a visual separation from the historic building.

The proposed extension retains the existing subservience of the modern bedroom wings, and the resultant building would be no higher than the existing two-storey bedroom block on the site. The Conservation Officer feels that the architectural treatment would give some interest to what is a bland façade at present. The roof will be pitched, and covered with natural slates, which will respect the traditional character of the main building. Subject to suitable bricks, brick sample panels, and natural slate, it is considered that the setting of the listed building would not be harmed by the proposals. English Heritage have raised no objection and have made no comment regarding the proposals.

The applicant has submitted a full design and access statement to justify the revised design and its impact on the listed building, and the previous reasons for refusal in 2005 on the grounds of the impact on the listed building are considered to be overcome, and in accordance with Policy CN3 and CN5.

CONCLUSION

The impact of the development on the Grade 2* listed building is considered to be acceptable, and would not harm its character or setting.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

For the following reasons:

The proposed single and two storey extensions to the Grade 2* listed building would be in accordance with the adopted policy provisions of the Salisbury District Local Plan and would not harm the character or setting of the listed building.

And subject to the following conditions:

1. The development for which permission is hereby granted must be commenced not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission. (Z01B)

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 (4) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. 0006 AMENDED

2. Before development is commenced, a schedule and sample panel of materials and finishes (to include natural slate and matching bricks), to be used for the external wall[s] and roof[s] of the extensions hereby approved shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D04A)

Reason – To secure a harmonious form development

3. Before development is commenced, large scale details (not less than 1:20 scale) of the: windows and recesses, doors, circular wall detailing and eaves (all to confirm detailing, means and degree of obscure glazing, methods of restricted opening and materials) of the extensions hereby approved, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority, and the development shall thereafter accord with the approved scheme.

Reason – To secure a harmonious form development.

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

Policy CN3, CN5 Listed Buildings

And the guidance in
PPG15 "Planning and the Historic Environment"

3.

Application Number:	S/2007/1152		
Applicant/ Agent:	TERENCE O'ROURKE		
Location:	FORMER PEMBROKE PARK SCHOOL PENRUDDOCK CLOSE SALISBURY SP2 9HH		
Proposal:	REDEVELOPMENT FOR 65 RESIDENTIAL UNITS TO INCLUDE A VEHICULAR ACCESS AT PEMBROKE ROAD & EMERGENCY ACCESS ONTO PENRUDDOCK CLOSE AND ASSORTED DRAINAGE WORKS		
Parish/ Ward	BEMERTON		
Conservation Area:	LB Grade:		
Date Valid:	6 June 2007	Expiry Date	5 September 2007
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 building 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

The submission of this revised proposal follows a recent public exhibition regards the matter in the Bemerton Heath area.

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.

This revised application relates to the construction of up to 65 dwellings on the site (as apposed to 57 dwellings previously), 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 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 65 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.

A significant difference between this new application and the previously refused scheme is the proposed highway works to Pembroke Road, which would incorporate speed retarding measures, and a new mini roundabout at the junction of Pembroke Road and Festival Avenue.

PLANNING HISTORY

S/06/1169 – Outline application for 57 dwellings including access and drainage works. Refused for the following reasons:

“The application in its current form is considered premature, as in the absence of a Development Brief, a detailed analysis of housing need in the area, or a detailed consultation with the local community to ascertain the requirements of local people, the application fails to adequately address a number of major issues including affordable housing need, the likely impacts on local educational establishments, the likely impacts of the proposed access arrangements on highway safety and traffic management, and the replacement of suitable and safe public open space. As a result, the proposal in its current form is considered to be contrary to the aims of policies G1, G2, D1, D7, H25, R2, R5, TR12, and TR13 of the Salisbury District Local Plan 2003, policies DP1, DP2, DP7, DP8 of the adopted Wiltshire Structure Plan, and also contrary to the aims of central government guidance given in PPS1 which encourages development which would meet the needs of the local community.”

This application decision was subsequently appealed, although that appeal was withdrawn.

b) Members will also be aware of the recent approval on appeal for 31 houses on land to the immediate east of this former school site at and to the rear of 45 Queen Alexandra Road. This development will commence shortly.

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways
Housing & Health Officer

- No objections subject to conditions and contributions.
- 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
Environment Agency
Highways Agency
Sport England

- No objections in principle.
- No objections subject to various conditions
- No comments
- On the basis that the site does not contain a delineated playing pitch, then no objections.

SDC Parks

- My comments regarding the woodland area made by email on 31 July 06 still stand really. (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).

It is currently totally impenetrable and only has one access / egress - making it in effect a cul-de-sac. I would suggest this is not an ideal situation - a further access needs to be made somewhere at the Penruddock CI end and a lot of work is required if it is to become a usable asset.

The open space areas seem a good size and should provide a good focal point for the centre of the development

I am a little concerned that the current layout will mean the estate being used as a shortcut linking Gainsborough CI and Pembroke Rd.

There is not really a good sized equipped children's playarea within about 500m and so an on-site facility may be needed.

There is however an enclosed kick about area about 500m

SDC Community Initiatives
SDC Housing

away which is in need of some work. This would make an ideal project for any off site adult contributions.
I assume the open space maintenance will come to SDC with relevant commuted sums etc
-Response awaited
- We will seek to negotiate 40% affordable housing provision based on the recent findings of the Local Housing Needs and Housing market Assessment 2006. This clearly demonstrates a shortfall of over 1,000 affordable dwellings per year. In particular the area of Salisbury itself is highlighted as having one of the greatest demands. We would seek a tenure split of 75% rent and 25% shared ownership.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement Yes. Expiry 5/7/07
Site Notice displayed Yes. Expiry 5/7/07
Departure No
Neighbour notification Yes. Expiry 28/6/07
Third Party responses Yes. 9 letters raising the following issues:

Scheme will cause traffic problems – different to school
Traffic problems will be caused in area and at Skew Bridge
Development will cause stability issues with adjacent properties
Land should be utilised for community use
Larger play area needed for youths – lack of community facilities in area
Drainage issues on and adjacent site
Will significantly reduce open space in area and loose trees
No access proposed to wooded area – welcomed due to impact on wildlife
Concern about privacy and boundary issues, previous issues not dealt with
Suggested trees will affect existing bungalow adjacent northern boundary of site
Rights of access issues to former caretakers bungalow
Will cause noise and disturbance to adjacent residents
How will emergency access be operated ?
Will affect wildlife on site – slow worms in area
Wooded area will become a dumping ground
Crime issues
Salisbury Transport 2000 – Pedestrian crossing needed in this area, although welcome in general the proposed highway works.

MAIN ISSUES

Principle and policy
Impact on open space provision
Impact on adjacent amenities
Impact on highway safety
Educational contribution
Sustainable design
Ecology/trees
Contributions/planning gains

POLICY CONTEXT

PPS3 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 Brownfield land in accordance with the guidance given in PPS3.

With regards the southern half of the site, PPS3 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 PPS3 also states 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:

sports and recreation facilities can be best retained and enhanced through the redevelopment of a small part of the site; or
alternative equivalent provision is made available in the locality; or
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 publicly available, whereas the existing open space is private and might never be available for use.

Sport England, who's 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.

Since the previous application was refused, the Council's Recreational Open Space Audit has been published, and indicates that there is some shortfall in open space within the Salisbury Area.

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.

As a result of the suggested shortfall however, our Policy team has suggested that every effort should be made to maximise the usable open space on the site, particularly as the indicative current proposals indicate a significant reduction in open space provision from 0.76ha to only 0.1 hectares. It is their opinion that if the site is developed for 65 dwellings, then there is scope on site to increase this open space to about 0.2 –0.25 ha depending on the final design of any scheme. On this basis, subject to some additional open space being provided on the site, the policy team raise no objections.

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 regards 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.

Regards the above matters, Members should note that Members of the City Area Committee did not indicate in their refusal reason that the principle of the development of the site for housing and the loss of existing open space was unacceptable. A refusal of this current application based on that principle, would conflict with the previous reason for refusal, and would not therefore be supportable on appeal. It is officers advice that given the nature and wording of the previous reason for refusal, the principle of the redevelopment of this site and the loss of much of the existing open space has been accepted, and that Members considering this revised scheme need to consider whether the previous reasons for refusal have been overcome.

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 65 dwellings may be arranged on site, and is helpful in clarifying matters in this regard.

In your officers 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 65 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 65 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.

Of significant weight in this assessment is the decision of Members of the City Area Committee in 2006 to accept in principle the redevelopment of this site and the loss of the existing open land, although the reason for refusal does indicate that regards the previous 57 dwelling scheme, the actual amount of replacement open space and its precise siting and suitability was an issue.

The indicative 65 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 officers opinion, whilst the scheme would indeed alter the character of the existing site, the redevelopment of the site for 65 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 may therefore be altered by any subsequent application.

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 may 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 65 houses will significantly 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 apposed to the previous school use, which generated vehicular traffic at the entrance to Penruddock Close. The housing scheme would therefore significantly reduce traffic movements in this area, due to the use of a revised northern access point 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.

“Please refer to the comments made for S/2006/1169 made on 31st July 2006 which largely apply to the current submission, which I understand has been submitted following the withdrawal of the appeal by the applicant (County Council). My views remain very much as previously stated. However, the scheme has changed in that the applicant has now included a sketch scheme for traffic calming of Pembroke Road fronting the site and from its junction with Queen Alexandra Road to its junction with Festival Avenue. The traffic calming scheme results from the developer's public consultation exercise where concern about speeding of vehicles on Pembroke Road was raised by members of the public.

This Authority, whilst of the view that the development could proceed without these measures, is supportive of these measures being introduced at the expense of the developer. The preliminary scheme, showing a mini-roundabout at the junction with Festival Avenue and two sets of cushions, is an acceptable design but will be subject to detail approval by this Authority, including necessary public consultation and therefore may be subject to change. The works must be secured by means of a suitable Agreement. As the works have been offered by the applicant you may consider that the works should be made subject to a Section 106 Agreement or via a negative condition, requiring the works to be satisfactorily installed before first

occupation of the development. The works may include additional off road cycle facilities along the south side of Pembroke Road and the condition/Agreement must refer to the likelihood of additional cycle facilities being provided at the cost of the developer.

As previously, I wish to approve an internal layout which shows a satisfactory cycle and pedestrian route through the site and this is currently not shown on the submitted sketch scheme. I therefore wish to approve further details of the internal layout showing a through pedestrian and cycle link between Pembroke Road and Penruddock Close. As the proposal is in outline, I assume no further details are required at this stage.

Again, as previously, this Authority wishes to seek a sustainable package of measures which will encourage future residents to use alternative modes of transport to the private car. A package, similar in content to that for the recently approved development at Queen Alexandra Road should be secured via a Section 106 Agreement and the package should include bus passes for each household, cycle vouchers per household and contributions to facilities at local school(s), including an administration charge by this Authority. On a pro-rata basis the package will amount to an approximate sum of £51,000, but will depend on the final number of properties which will be developed via future reserved matters submission.

I confirm that no highway objection is raised to this development subject to conditions and/or Agreement as identified above”.

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) Affordable Housing

Members will recall that previously, Members of the City Committee indicated strongly that 40 percent of the housing on this site should be of an affordable nature. The applicants have not submitted any viability evidence to indicate that this provision is not possible, and indeed, there is some indication that 65 dwellings have been proposed in order to counter the financial affects of having to provide such provision (as apposed to the previous 57 dwellings as refused).

SDC Housing department has indicated that there is sufficient housing need in the area surrounding the site to warrant a 40 percent affordable housing request, in line with local plan policy and the affordable housing SPG.

f) Educational provision

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, 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. However WCC have stated in a formal letter to the LPA that the proceeds from the sale of the site will go into the educational provision in the area.

g) Sustainable ecofriendly design

The applicants have made no clear reference in their submitted documentation regards any commitment to achieve an eco-friendly development scheme, or achieve a high standard BREEAM 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 and/or commitment to an element of ecological/sustainable design initiatives, such as on site power/heat generation from photovoltaic cells/solar panels and similar technology. The recently

published supplementary guidance to PPS1 indicates that Planning Authorities can now request up to 10 percent of the power generation to be provided from on site sources. It is considered that such matters can be a matter of negotiation with the applicants as part of any Section 106 discussions.

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.

h) Community facility provision

At the time of writing, a response is awaited from SDC Community Initiative on this point, and therefore no formal request has been made for a financial contribution or any suggested level of that contribution. However, from recent Council business, it has been noted by planning officers that there may be a proposal for a community centre on Bemerton Heath. Therefore, officers have included in the suggested Heads of Terms a reference to a financial contribution towards said community centre provision.

Members should however note that the larger the contribution requested for such a facility, this may affect the ability of the developer to contribute to the other suggested matters. Members may wish weigh up the necessity for such a community provision against the necessity of some of the other suggested heads of terms.

i) Ecology/Tree issues

General ecology issues

One of the third party letters infers that Slow worms have been found in an adjacent site. This claim has not be backed up by evidence, and as far as the LPA are aware, no slow worms have been found on the adjacent development site at Queen Alexandra Road.

Two protected species reports have been submitted, which indicate that the site does not contain any protected species. However, these reports were the same reports submitted with the previously refused application

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.

Tree and planting issues

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 65 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.

j) Contributions and “planning gains”

Based on the above, it is considered that it may be possible to secure the following planning gains from this development:

40 percent affordable housing

Provision and maintenance of open space on site included existing wooded area

Contribution towards off site open space

Off site highway improvements/contributions, including a cycle/footway, along Pembroke Road as indicated by the submitted plans

Cycle and pedestrian way through site

Financial contribution to community centre

Minimum of 0.2 hectares of formal open space provided on site

Waste and recycling provision

Commitment to at least BREEAM Very Good for the whole of the site, with a percentage of eco-friendly homes where practicable.

However, as stated, it may or may not be possible to secure some or all of the above, particularly given a possible requirement for a financial contribution towards community facility provision, which may, in the applicants view, make the scheme financially unviable. Officers would be grateful therefore for some firm steer from Members as to exactly which contributions/provisions are the most relevant.

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, of a minimum of 0.2ha. 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) 40 percent affordable housing
- b) Provision/maintenance of open space on site. A Minimum provision on site of at least 0.2 hectare formal open space (excluding woodland area).
- c) Contribution towards off site open space
- d) Waste and recycling scheme provision
- e) Sustainable Urban Drainage system maintenance
- f) The achievement of a environmentally friendly sustainable scheme, including at least a very good BREEAM rating, and where practicable, a percent of power generation being from on site sources.
- g) Maintenance scheme for retained wooded area on eastern boundary
- h) Provision of off site highway improvements along Pembroke Road.
- i) Financial contribution towards sustainable highway measures
- j) Financial contribution to off site community centre.

THEN, APPROVE, subject to the following conditions:

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 65 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.

15 No development shall take place within the area indicated until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (X03A)

REASON: In order to secure a suitable archaeological investigation of the site.

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 wind turbines etc and an explanation of why such features may have been 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	Purpose
R5	Retention of recreational open space
D1	Extensive development
G1	Sustainable Development
G2	General principles and impacts
R2	Recreational open space