

City Area Committee

Planning & Licensing

Minutes

18 November 2004 6.00 pm
Alamein Suite
City Hall
Salisbury

**These minutes should be kept for use by District Councillors
at the next Council meeting**

Present

Chairman: Councillor Ms S C Mallory

Vice Chairman: Councillor Mrs P J Brown

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

Apologies: Councillor P M Clegg

MINUTES NOT REQUIRING COUNCIL APPROVAL

202. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no announcements by the Chairman.

203. PUBLIC STATEMENT / QUESTION TIME

There were no statements by, or questions from, members of the public.

204. COUNCILLOR STATEMENT / QUESTION TIME

There were no statements by, or questions from, Councillors.

205. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Fear declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Planning Application S/2004/1736 since the proposed development could affect his view of Salisbury Cathedral and withdrew from the meeting during consideration thereof.

Councillor Sample declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Planning Application S/2004/1953 since he had had previous correspondence with the architect in connection with this application and withdrew from the meeting during consideration thereof.

206. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2004 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

207. S/2004/2008 – FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITE WITH 8 APARTMENTS AND 16 HOUSES AT TINTOMETER LTD WATERLOO ROAD SALISBURY FOR PERSIMMON HOMES (SOUTH COAST) LTD

A representative from Goadsby and Harding, acting as the agent for the applicant spoke in support of the above proposal. A nearby resident spoke in objection to the application. Following the receipt of the above statements and further to a site visit conducted earlier that afternoon, the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated) together with the schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting.

RESOLVED – that the above application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The proposal would involve the replacement of an existing employment site, and the relocation of the existing commercial user (Tintometer Ltd) to a settlement 10 miles from Salisbury. Given the lack of a convincing argument relating to the loss of the employment site, combined with the poor design of the scheme and the likely impacts on adjacent amenity, the proposal fails to demonstrate any significant environmental or conservation benefits which would outweigh the loss of an employment site, and fails to demonstrate why the proposed relocation is sustainable. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policy E16 and H22 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.
- (2) The proposal seeks to remove a number of industrial buildings, two of which whilst not listed or otherwise protected appear to be of interest due to their links to the historic development of the area. They are therefore part of the cultural heritage of the District. However, the submitted residential scheme is considered to be of a poor design which is not sympathetic to or in keeping with the traditional architectural vernacular or built form of the surrounding area. Consequently, and in the absence of an adequate Design Statement which indicates otherwise, it is considered that the proposal is not of a sufficiently high quality to justify the removal of the existing historical buildings, and therefore, the scheme is considered contrary to policy G1 and policy D1 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.
- (3) The proposal due to a combination of the large bulk and scale of the dwellings, the positioning of windows, and the close proximity with adjacent existing dwellings, would be likely to have a dominant and adverse impact on adjacent residential amenities, contrary to policy G2 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.
- (4) The site is located within close proximity to a number of commercial uses. However, the Environmental Health officer has reservations regarding the use of a passive ventilation system, and only limited details have been submitted with regards to the proposed acoustic fencing. In the absence of an agreed acoustic scheme, it is considered that the scheme would be likely to have an adverse impact on the amenities enjoyed by future occupiers of the site, and furthermore, any boundary treatment may also have an adverse impact on the character of the area and its visual amenities, due to its specialist design and size. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy G2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.
- (5) Whilst an on site play space has been shown on the submitted plans, the proposal conflicts with policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan in that no provision is made for a contribution towards off site public open space and towards the maintenance of on site space.
- (6) The proposal is contrary to policy G9 in that no provision is made for a contribution towards off site educational facilities.

208. S/2004/2175 – FULL APPLICATION – DEMOLITION OF NO.20 NORTH STREET AND EXISTING YARD BUILDINGS ERECTION OF 7 HOUSES AND 2 FLATS + ALTERATION OF EXISTING ACCESS + CAR PARKING (AMENDED WARD) AT 20 NORTH STREET (ADJOINING GROUNDS AND BARN TO THE REAR) SALISBURY FOR BAYVIEW DEVELOPMENTS LTD

An agent on behalf of the applicant spoke in support of the above proposal and a nearby resident spoke in objection to the application. Following the receipt of these statements and further to a site visit conducted earlier that afternoon, the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated) together with the schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting.

RESOLVED –

- (1) That subject to the comments of the third party representatives raising no material or substantive comments not covered in the officers' report or in late correspondence, then the above application be refused for the following reasons:
 - 1. The proposed housing scheme as currently designed in terms of its bulk, massing, and architectural details is not considered to be of sufficient quality to warrant the demolition of an existing three storey building on the street frontage which is considered of some historic value to the character of the area, and would not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the scheme as currently designed would also have an adverse impact on the amenities enjoyed by adjacent existing residents and future residents of the development scheme. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy D1, G2, CN8 and CN11 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.
 - 2. WCC Archaeology has indicated that the proposal lies within the likely extent of the suburb of Fisherton which developed along one of the major routes into the Medieval city of Salisbury. The suburb developed in the 13th century and included the Dominican Friary close to Fisherton Bridge. On this basis, WCC Archaeology has indicated that it had previously advised the applicant that an archaeological evaluation would be required prior to determination of the application. Therefore, in the absence of such an archaeological evaluation, it is considered that the scheme would be likely to have an adverse impact on any archaeological remains, contrary to policy CN21 to CN23 of the Salisbury District Local Plan
 - 3. Given the nature of the proposed residential development, and the restricted nature of the existing road network surrounding the site, it is considered that the level of parking provision on site (six spaces) is likely to place an undue burden on the road network in terms further exacerbating the existing on-street parking problems to the detriment and inconvenience of residents in the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy G2 (ii) of the Salisbury District Local Plan.
 - 4. The proposal would be contrary to policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan in that it makes no provision for public open space.
- (2) That the applicant be informed that with regards to reason for refusal no.2, whilst the applicant has submitted a unilateral S106 Agreement, a commuted sum has not yet been received. Therefore, this reason could be overcome with the submission of the relevant monies. However, this should be submitted prior to

the determination of any appeal against this refusal. This matter should be discussed with the Local Planning Authority; and

- (3) That the Head of Forward Planning and Transportation be requested to prepare a report on the ways residents of new city developments can be excluded from applying for parking permits in line with the Council's sustainable parking policy, for consideration at a future meeting of the City Area Committee.

209. S/2004/1736 – O/L APPLICATION – OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CHURCH HALL BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF A BLOCK OF 10 APARTMENTS DETAILED APPROVAL SOUGHT FOR SITING AND MEANS OF ACCESS AT ST MARTINS CHURCH HALL c/o 18 EYRES WAY SALISBURY FOR ST MARTINS CHURCH HALL c/o MR SCARFE

A nearby resident spoke in objection to the above application. Following the receipt of the above statements and further to a site visit conducted earlier that afternoon, the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated).

RESOLVED – that the above application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The proposed development would be contrary to Policies D1 and D2(i) of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) that seek to ensure that development is acceptable in the context of the character and appearance of the area. In this instance, the proposed development by virtue of the overall size and forward siting of the proposed building footprint in conjunction with the resultant scale and massing of building to provide the proposed level of accommodation would constitute an intrusive form of development that would be harmful to the street scene and character of the area and would represent an overdevelopment of the site.
- (2) The proposed development fails to make provision towards recreational open space contrary to the requirements of Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003). As such, it would put an additional demand on existing recreational facilities and would set a precedent that would make it difficult for the Council to implement this policy effectively in the future.
- (3) That the applicant be informed that in respect of Reason for Refusal No2, this application had been acceptable in all other respects, a financial contribution towards recreational open space provision would have been required in accordance with Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003). This would overcome Reason for Refusal No2.

210. S/2004/1953 – FULL APPLICATION – CONVERSION OF EXISTING HOUSE TO 3 FLATS CONSTRUCTION OF 2 FLATS AND 9 HOUSES FORMATION OF NEW VEHICULAR ACCESS ONTO FAIRVIEW ROAD NEW PEDESTRIAN ACCESS ONTO WAINALONG ROAD AND DEMOLITION OF OUTBUILDINGS AND PART OF EXISTING HOUSE AT 44 MANOR ROAD SALISBURY FOR MANOR ROAD DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP

A representative from Favonius and Co, agent for the applicant spoke in support of the proposal. A nearby resident spoke in objection to the above application. Following the receipt of the above statements and further to a site visit conducted earlier that afternoon, the Committee considered the report of the Head of Development Services (previously circulated) together with the schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting.

RESOLVED – that the above application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The area surrounding the site consists of a mixture of large detached Victorian villas, semi-detached houses, three storey Victorian terraces and smaller two storey Victorian terraces. There are trees throughout the area and the grander houses are set in generous grounds. The site contains a significant Victorian house, set in enclosed grounds surrounded on all sides by trees of many varieties. The position of this house on the brow of the hill and on a main access road from the roundabout, and at a junction of two roads, means that this site is seen from a number of angles. This site is therefore a critical site within this part of the Conservation Area which is characterised by high-status Victorian houses set in spacious grounds.

Due to the juxtaposition between the elongated three storey terrace, the existing dwelling on the site, and the more domestic scale of the existing terrace in Fairview Road, and in combination with the prominence of the terrace from the adjacent street scenes of Fairview Road and Wain along Road, it is considered that the three storey terrace would detract from; and thereby have an adverse impact on, the setting of the main house and the character and appearance of surrounding Conservation Area by virtue of the overall height and massing of the proposed terrace. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy D1, D2, CN8, and CNI I of the Salisbury District Local Plan.

- (2) The proposal would be contrary to policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan in that it makes no provision for public open space.
- (3) That the applicant be informed that with regards to reason for refusal no.2, whilst the applicant has submitted a unilateral S106 Agreement, a commuted sum has not yet been received. Therefore, this reason could be overcome with the submission of the relevant monies. However, this should be submitted prior to the determination of any appeal against this refusal. This matter should be discussed with the Local Planning Authority.