



City Area Committee (Planning)

16 December, 2004

Author : Sarah Hughes
Planning Officer
(01722) 434674

shughes@salisbury.gov.uk

REPORT

Planning & Econ Dev. Portfolio Holder - Cllr. J Noeken

DRAFT DEVELOPMENT BRIEF: LAND AT DOWNTON ROAD SALISBURY

1. Purpose of the Report

Policy H2F of the Adopted Local Plan (June 2003) allocates land for residential development at Downton Road, Salisbury. This site was allocated to meet the district's overall housing requirement for the period up until 2011. The Local Plan indicates that in order to guide and control development of the site, a development brief will be prepared.

Following a lengthy preparation process, a draft development brief was released for consultation for an extended period on the 29th of July for a period of 8 weeks ending on the 24th September.

This report now considers the issues raised in the consultation period and highlights changes to the development brief where it is appropriate and reasonable to do so. Subject to members acceptance that all the raised issues have been satisfactorily addressed and that the changes made are appropriate, the report concludes by seeking a recommendation from this Committee to the Cabinet that the revised brief be adopted which will be used to assess planning applications relating to the site.

A copy of the brief is attached to the agenda for Members information, and a colour copy has been placed in the Members room. For members of the public, the revised brief is available to view at The Planning Office reception at Wyndham Road during office hours and online at www.salisbury.gov.uk/planning/downton-road.

2. Background to Development Brief Exercise

Policy H2F of the adopted Local Plan allocates land at Downton Road for residential development. Members will recall that the Local Plan Inspector in his 2001 report recommended this site. It is a requirement of Policy H2F that a development brief be prepared for the site. The purpose of a Development Brief is to provide a broad framework for the development of a site in accordance with the requirements of the Local Plan and to take into account more detailed local conditions. In short, the development brief is a bridge between the Local Plan policy and future Planning Applications.

A key part of the development brief preparation process is that appropriate public consultation is undertaken to inform those with interests and gain views, which can be taken into account in shaping the final brief. The ultimate goal is to identify a development solution, which optimises the benefits of the development and minimises any negative impacts.

When the Development Brief proposals have been subjected to consultation, and the views from that consultation exercise have been assimilated back into the brief (where it is reasonable and appropriate to do so) it is expected that the document is adopted as supplementary planning guidance, and whilst having

no statutory status in its own right, represents a significant material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Work on the Downton Road Development Brief began in March 2004 with a series of meetings between agents for the developer and officers. By July 2004, following a number of meetings with the developers, and other key individuals, draft proposals were ready for release for public consultation. In order to ensure that the proposals were exposed to as much public scrutiny as possible, officers and the developers' agent prepared a range of publicity materials which included the delivery of leaflets to over 100 local households, and held two public exhibition days at Harnham Free Church. In all over 100 people attended the exhibitions, which enabled them to see and question the proposals.

3. Results of the Public Consultation Exercise.

A formal period of public consultation was undertaken in respect of the draft Development Brief between 29th July and 24th September 2004. As summarised above, every effort was made to ensure that local people were informed of this opportunity. Furthermore, some 20 other consultee organisations (including English Nature, the Environment Agency, Wilts & Dorset Bus Co, etc) were sent a copy of the brief to ensure that operational issues were taken account of.

At the close of the consultation period, 55 responses had been received. Of the responses received 6 were in support of the proposals, 33 were in objection, and 16 were neutral. Officers have welcomed the inputs of all respondents to this exercise, which has improved the quality of the brief in a number of areas.

A full summary of all the issues raised by respondents is set out in the table at Appendix I of this report. Minor changes to the brief are set out in the appendix and have been incorporated into the version that is now presented to members.

The following sections now go on to examine key subject areas that warrant more careful consideration.

a) Affordable Housing

The District Council has highlighted the need for affordable housing on a district wide basis in light of increasing evidence of the inability of local people to afford their own home. With regard to this development site, Members of the City Area committee and local people supported the proposals to include at least 25% affordable housing. In light of the adopted Supplementary Planning guidance the brief has been adjusted to indicate that a proportion of not less than 33% affordable housing will be provided on the site. In reality this should provide about 40 affordable homes that will be split between rented properties and homes for purchase under a shared ownership scheme.

Action – Development Principle 9 DP9 of the original brief will be amended to read

DP9 - Provide a range of house types and sizes including at least 33% affordable housing.

Policy H2F of the adopted Local Plan requires that at least 25% of the housing provided should be affordable housing. In line with the District Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on affordable housing, which is underpinned by a Housing Needs Survey and local Council waiting list figures, it is appropriate that not less than 33% of the total number of units provided on the site should be affordable housing. This housing will be made available in the first instance to those in identified need in Salisbury. The precise type, tenure and location will be negotiated with the District Council as part of the Section 106 legal agreement that accompanies the planning application.

b) Height of the buildings

Many of the representations concerned the height of the buildings and their impact on the landscape. The City Area Committee and others wanted to have a maximum height imposed (no development above the 72m contour line)

It is important to look back at the Inspectors report, to see how he envisaged development on the site. He stated

*I therefore propose, in the light of my findings above, that development should be generally restricted to below the 72m contour as suggested by the Council in closing. Moreover, I consider that the south easterly development limit should not extend beyond the line of existing development on the northern side of Downton Road. This will in my estimation reduce the **developable** area to about 4.0ha, which, with the minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare advocated in PPG3, will give rise to approximately 120 dwellings on the land. (Authors emphasis)*

There have been many discussions between officers and Westbury homes on this issue. If we were to preclude development from protruding above the existing 72m contour line, then only about 1/4 of the site would be able to be developed, which would only provide about 30 dwellings. This was not what the inspector envisaged, as along with the height restriction, he also stated a developable area of about 4ha and 120 dwellings, which is the minimum density as set out in PPG3. It is therefore apparent that the inspector envisaged that the built development, including dwellings and their gardens would not exceed this line, which is what the local plan map shows when allocating the site.

However, the concerns over the landscape impact are still valid. In order to overcome this concern the text has been amended in DP2 to state that development shall not be expected to exceed the equivalent height to the ridge of a two-storey dwelling in those locations on existing ground levels, subject to the landscape evaluation that will be carried out as part of the Environmental Statement. As part of the planning application that will be submitted in due course, there will be a design statement and an Environmental Statement that will address the issues of any landscape impact of the scheme, and any ways in which the impact will be mitigated.

Members of the public will have another opportunity to comment on the height and impact of the buildings at the planning application stage. Members will also have the opportunity to comment, and if the application is called to committee, any outstanding concerns will be able to be debated and the item deferred for further information, approved, or refused.

Therefore, as the landscape impact will be assessed fully as part of the planning application, when the detail of the individual dwellings will be known, it is acceptable for this matter to be dealt with at during this process. DP2 in the brief relates to development fitting in with its surroundings, and the wording is amended to address the concerns.

Action – The final paragraph of Development Principle 2 DP2 of the original brief will have the following text added

DP2 - Make the development fit in with its surroundings.

In order for this to be achieved, on the upper parts of the site dwellings will not be expected to exceed the equivalent height to the ridge of a two-storey dwelling in those locations on existing ground levels. The ways in which this will be achieved will be addressed in detail in the Design Statement and Environmental Statement to be submitted as part of the planning application.

Community facilities

c) Shop

Development Principle 12 in the consultation brief stated that the council and Westbury were commissioning an independent consultant to assess whether a shop is financially viable in this location. The response from the consultant is that a shop is financially viable, and that the preferred location for the shop would be the location of the proposed community hall. This location makes sense in commercial terms, as it will be a prominent location for passing trade. The community hall land was transferred to SDC as part of the previous development on Rowbarrow, and can only be used for community purposes. In order for the shop to be located on the site of the community hall, lengthy discussions have taken place between the community association, officers of the council and Westbury. The result of these discussions are that there should be a land swap between SDC and Westbury, so that the part of the community hall land will be transferred back to Westbury, and an equivalent piece of land will be given back to SDC for community purposes.

Action – Development Principle 12 (DP12) of the original brief will be amended to read

DP12 Provide a shop and other community facilities where there is an established need for them

Policy H2F of the adopted Local Plan requires that community facilities in the form of a shop and doctors surgery will be provided where they are established as being necessary. An independent agent has concluded that a neighbourhood shop located on land adjacent to Rowbarrow would be commercially viable. That view has yet, however, to be tested through market assessment. As part of the proposed re-arrangement of community facilities, a suitable site will accordingly be identified. The District Council and the developer will agree the methodology for the marketing of the site. It will then be marketed by the developer as the location for a shop. If, within 18 months of the shop being marketed, terms have not been agreed with a retailer, this obligation will cease and the site will become available for residential development, including 33% affordable units.

Paragraph 4.3 will also be amended to reflect the need for a shop.

d) Community hall

As a result of the above, the community hall has now been relocated onto where the car park for the community hall was proposed. This also has benefits to the hall, as the community association was keen that the hall has access to open land that they would be able to hold summer fetes on etc. Moving the hall to this location would meet this objective. However, although it is acceptable in planning terms to move the hall, it may still not be possible for this to be achieved. Firstly, the City area (community) committee will need to agree to the land transfer, as they are the body responsible for the existing land. If they do agree to the transfer, then because the original land transfer was dealt with under the Section 106 for Rowbarrow gardens, this will have to be amended. If for whatever reason the 106 cannot be varied then the community hall would have remain on the original site, and the shop would have to be located as near as possible to this prime site. If this were to happen, then the masterplan on the brief would be amended to reflect this and the brief would be brought back to committee for approval.

Action – Development Principle 8 (DP8) of the original brief will be amended to read

DP8 Integrate the proposed community hall with the development:

To enable the shop to be sited in the best commercial location, it may be necessary to relocate the community hall. The proposed locations of the shop and the community hall are shown on the masterplan. For information purposes, the location of the community hall as currently approved, is shown on Figure 6.

e) Doctors Surgery

The Primary care trust has confirmed that a surgery in this location is not required. Therefore, as there is no need for this facility, it would be unfair to expect the development to provide it. Any reference to a doctors surgery will therefore be removed from the text

DPI2 and paragraph 4.4 will also be amended to reflect that the surgery is not required.

4. Next Steps

Subject to the agreement of the changes set out in this report and the attached table at Appendix I, members are asked to recommend that the Cabinet at its January meeting formally adopts the brief as Supplementary Planning Guidance. Subject to this agreement by the Cabinet it is likely that a planning application will then be submitted for the development of the site.

5. Recommendation

That Members accept the proposed changes as set out in this report and in the revised Development Brief attached to the report and recommend to the Cabinet that the Brief be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance.

Background Papers:

Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003)

Land off Downton road Salisbury (Consultation Draft) July 2004

Both available at www.salisbury.gov.uk/planning via the Forward Planning web page.

Implications:

- **Financial:** None
- **Legal:** As set out in the report
- **Human Rights:** Article 6 (the right to a fair hearing) may apply. The consultation process contributes to compliance with this.
- **Personnel:** None at this stage
- **Community Safety:** None at this stage
- **Council's Core Values:** Excellent service, thriving economy, fairness & equality, open council & willing partner, communicating with the public, supporting the disadvantaged, protecting the environment.
- **Ward(s) Affected:** East Harnham

APPENDIX I Downton Road Development Brief: Summary of consultation issues raised, responses and proposed actions

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
1	J H F Brown	Neutral	<p>a) Maximum height of buildings should be included</p> <p>b) Confirm that community centre and doctors will be built.</p> <p>C) Confirm provision of shop with Post Office if possible</p> <p>d) Pedestrian link to the Park and Ride inside the trees is essential</p> <p>e) the plan doesn't state how many houses are to be built.</p> <p>f) The plan should indicate what education provision is being made.</p> <p>g) The public open space needs to be formally designated.</p> <p>h) Previous developments are demarcated by lines of trees, a further stand of trees on the southern limit would continue this theme and be an enhancement.</p>	<p>a) The site has varying levels; therefore different height buildings will be acceptable on different parts of the site. One of the aims of the development is to respect the skyline (Development Principle 2. Page15). The text in DP2 has been amended to ensure that no buildings will be higher than a 2 storey building at the 72m contour line.</p> <p>b) The implementation of the community centre is outside the scope of this brief, as the East Harnham Community Association is putting it forward. However as part of the land swap to facilitate the shop, Westbury have indicated that they will assist the Community Association to move the project forward. The PCT have said that a surgery is not required in this location, and the text of DP12 has been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>c) An independent study into the viability of a shop has confirmed that a shop will be viable in this location. The text of DP12 and the masterplan have been amended to reflect this.</p> <p>d) The purpose of the park and ride is not for local residents to walk and use it, as they should use the existing bus service. However these comments will be passed on to the Salisbury Joint Transportation Team for consideration.</p> <p>e) Para 2.1 of the brief states that approximately 120 houses will be provided</p> <p>f) Contributions to education are set out in DP11 on page 20 of the brief</p> <p>g) This is a detailed matter that will be dealt with on submission of the planning application, but the comments are noted.</p> <p>h) DP 5 on page 17 of the brief deals with structure planting. It may not be appropriate to have large trees planted on the boundary as it may give the impression that the site is turning its back on the countryside, which this development is trying not to do.</p>	<p>ACTIONS</p> <p>a) The text of DP2 to be amended .See section 3b in the attached report.</p> <p>b) The text of DP12 to be amended. See section 3 b & d of the attached report.</p> <p>c) The text of DP12 to be amended. See section 3c of the attached report.</p>

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
2	P Rouquette	Support	<p>a) Overall philosophy can only be commended</p> <p>b) Overall design is interesting, but remain to be convinced that it will fit in.</p> <p>c) Energy supply - passive solar heating should be possible. Does each property have an aspect that benefits from sunlight.</p> <p>D) Road layout - are 3 access point really needed. The open space is accessed by crossing a road which is not ideal</p> <p>e) Amenity area. Can it be relocated or redesign the road layout so that it does not have to be crossed.</p> <p>f) 20mph is too high - 10mph is recommended in Europe. The ideas of visual calming are excellent.</p> <p>g) Car parking - be radical and reduce the number of spaces - perhaps one part of the village could be car free. Community hall has a large car park.</p> <p>h) Courtyard design and street space. The needs of younger people could be met within the courtyard areas - detailed design should be left to occupiers.</p> <p>i) Cycle routes and parking. The new paths on Rowbarrow need to link safely with existing routes. All units should have undercover storage for all the residents, and giving each property a bike would be an incentive.</p> <p>j) Drainage and water. SUDS wording could be stronger. Grey water and butts should be standard.</p>	<p>a & b) comments are noted</p> <p>c) the development brief does not go into the detail of the design / orientation of the individual dwellings. This detail will be in the planning application. However, these comments will be passed on to the developer for them to consider as part of their detailed design.</p> <p>d) The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan.</p> <p>e) The road will be designed in such a way that will encourage cars to drive carefully. A pedestrian crossing could be included to give safe access to the area – this will be passed on for the developer to consider further</p> <p>f) The development will be subject to a 20mph speed limit and design to achieve speeds of this order. Some elements of the development could be designed with 10mph limit.</p> <p>g) The theory of reducing car spaces is excellent, but it would be very difficult in practice. The dwellings will have a maximum of 1.5 spaces per unit, which some argue is insufficient as most households have 2 cars. If there is insufficient parking spaces, this will lead to cars being parked on pavements, or obstructing roads, which could lead to difficulties with access for emergency services. As for the community hall parking, this has already been granted planning consent, and is only included on the plan for the complete picture. However, there may be scope for reducing the community hall parking when a revised layout is submitted in the new location.</p> <p>h) It may be difficult to gain the consensus of the occupiers on what they may want.</p> <p>i) The cycle parking guidelines in the local plan state that all dwellings should have 2 covered spaces. The suggestion of giving each property a bike is good and will be passed on to the developers.</p> <p>j) The SUDS wording reflects the practicalities of providing them depending on the ground conditions. Westbury have experience of providing SUDS on other developments. Water butts may be possible on some</p>	<p>ACTION</p> <p>d) the masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points</p>

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
			<p>k) Recycled aggregates should be used in the construction and paper insulation should be explored.</p> <p>l) Only native trees and shrubs should be planted and some areas left as natural green space.</p> <p>m) East Harnham needs a shop but this might not be the right location.</p>	<p>plots</p> <p>k) It is Westbury's practice to use brick and block waste in the construction of plot slabs and drives. The suggestion that paper insulations should be used will be passed to the developer.</p> <p>l) This is addressed in DP5, which states that native trees and shrubs will be used.</p> <p>M) This may not be the best location for the shop, but the local plan states that a shop will be provided as part of this development.</p>	
3	Environment Agency	Support	<p>a) DP5 is supported but a net gain should be achieved in biodiversity. b) Sustainable urban drainage systems should be changed to sustainable drainage systems to accord with the change in terminology. C) new wording to include provision for the maintenance of the SUDS, which would be covered by a legal agreement. 4.3 needs to be amended to reflect this.</p>	<p>a) This point is noted and the wording will be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>B) This point is notes and the text is amended to reflect the change in terminology c) This point is noted and the text is amended to include SUDS in para 4.3</p>	<p>a) The text in DP5 has been amended to include a net gain in biodiversity. See page 17 of the brief.</p> <p>B) The text where appropriate has been amended to reflect the change in terminology</p> <p>c) The text has been amended to include SUDS in para 4.3</p>
4	Details withheld	Support	<p>a) Design has been carefully and sympathetically considered by the architect</p> <p>b) affordable housing is needed. The shop community centre and doctors surgery are essential to the project.</p>	The support is welcomed	No Action
5	Wiltshire Fire Brigade	Neutral	<p>a) Recommends the inclusion of domestic sprinklers</p> <p>b) Fire appliance access and adequate water supplies for fire fighting should also be provided.</p>	<p>a) the inclusion of domestic sprinklers is outside the scope of building regulations, however this will be passed on to the developers for them to take into account</p> <p>b) This is outside the scope of planning and building regulations. It will be for the developer and fire brigade / water authority to decide where they are located</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
6	Details withheld	Objection	a) 3 accesses not required b) Object to access opposite 9,10 & 11 Millennium Close c) Visible speed restrictions on Rowbarrow d) Support for the cycle path e) No need for the shop - magnet for teenagers f) Would like to see a post box g) Already play areas in the vicinity h) Keep the development discreet - don't want another Bishopdown Farm	a&b) The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan. C) Speed restrictions have been discussed with the highway authority. As Rowbarrow is an important route for access to the hospital, physical measures such as speed humps and chicanes are inappropriate. e) this is not a planning justification for there not being a shop f) This is a matter for Royal Mail g) Although there are play areas in the locality, it is only fair that the residents and children on this development have facility on the development. This is in accordance with the local plan policies h) point noted.	A & b) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points
7	Wiltshire County Council - Education	Neutral	No comment on education set out in DP11, but it may be desirable to start firming up on costs involved.	Comments are noted	No Action
8	Mrs Frost	Neutral	a) How many houses / apartments are envisaged b) Can you confirm the details of the community hall parking / whether it will be lit - if so can there be trees planted.	a) paragraph 2.1 states that approximately 120 houses will be provided b) b) The community hall has already been granted consent, with a condition that the details of any exterior lighting needs to be submitted to the planning department, before the hall is occupied. However as part of the land swap to facilitate the shop, location of the hall and its parking are likely to move, and these comments will be passed on to the community association for when they are considering the design of the new hall.	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
9	Details withheld	Neutral	<p>a) Build houses with gardens not rabbit hatches</p> <p>b) A secure garage is a must for all domestic property even at the expense of additional land cost.</p> <p>C) Cycle way is supported</p> <p>d) the development should be called Warren Rise</p>	<p>a) The government how insist on certain densities of housing developments, and in order for developers to fulfil these requirements, it is inevitable that garden size will be reduced.</p> <p>b) this is a detailed design matter. In recent years it had become an option to have "car barns" instead of garages. Research has shown that the majority of households do not park cars in garages, but it is counted as one of the parking spaces. This can then lead to cars having to park on the road, causing problems. If open car barns or other open parking spaces are used, residents are more likely to use them for parking, thus alleviating some of the car parking problem</p> <p>c) Support is welcomed on cycle way.</p> <p>d) The naming of the development is a matter for the developer, the local Councillor and the Post Office, however, the suggestion will be passed on to the developer.</p>	No Action
10	English Heritage	Neutral	<p>a) site is close to little Woodbury SAM, and may affect the setting of Salisbury and the Cathedral. All these need to be considered as part of the EIA.</p>	<p>a) the setting of the SAM will be part of the EIA</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
11	R Bryder	Neutral	<p>a) Opportunity to enhance tree planting along north west boundary, but will the developer take it?</p> <p>B) Para 3.16 suggest that "should" is replaced by must</p> <p>c) More emphasis should be placed on and funding demanded for cycling provision.</p> <p>D) Is the additional footway to Downton Road the potential pedestrian route in fig 7? is another crossing point planned?</p> <p>e) The S106 contribution towards a "cycle lane " is less than generous.</p> <p>f) Residents should be able to walk and use the park and ride site</p> <p>g) The cost of the bus lane should be met by higher centre car parking charges not the developer, who should use the money for cycle provision</p> <p>h) The country estate analogy is not relevant or useful in this context.</p> <p>i) 20 dwellings per hectare is consistent with PPG3 and is acceptable in this location.</p> <p>j) If the site is the 4ha bounded by the 72 metre contour, the text in DP4 states that the bulk of the development will be on the northern part of the site, when fig 12 shows it uniformly distributed.</p> <p>k) Is a 20mph vehicle design speed the same as a 20mph limit? Will it be a home zone?</p> <p>l) Does the 1.5 car spaces refer to off street provision. Will on street parking be severely restricted to encourage rear court parking? m) DP5 does this refer to only the 4ha or to the open area to the south and west? Who will maintain the</p>	<p>a) The developer has indicated that they are willing to strengthen this planting, although it is outside the site boundary.</p> <p>B) This wording is accepted and will be changed accordingly.</p> <p>c & e) The development will have to make a contribution towards cycle provision, but only what is reasonably related to the development as set down on Government Guidance on planning obligations.</p> <p>d) Reference to the pedestrian route to Downton Road has been removed from text and the plans. Another crossing point is not planned.</p> <p>f) The purpose of the park and ride is not for local residents to walk and use it, as they should use the existing bus service. However these comments will be passed on to the Salisbury Joint Transportation Team for consideration.</p> <p>g) The developer will only be paying for a part of the bus lane, the rest is being funded by the Salisbury transport plan.</p> <p>h) This is the approach that Westbury considers addresses all the development principles</p> <p>i) the minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve</p> <p>j) Point noted. The text will be amended to remove this reference</p> <p>k) Home zones tend to be done retrospectively on older style housing. The current highways standards and urban design ensure that the principles of home zones are used in in road design. The development will be subject to a 20mph speed limit and designed to achieve speeds of this order. Some elements of the development could be designed to home zone with 10mph</p> <p>l) Yes the car parking standards are for off street provision, and although on street parking may be restricted, there will need to be some parking opportunities for visitors</p>	<p>b) Para 3.16 "should" has been replaced by must. Reference to the pedestrian route to Downton Road has been removed from text and the plans.</p> <p>j) Text amended in DP2 to remove the reference to the bulk of development being on the northern part of the site.</p>

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
11	R Bryder	Neutral	<p>open spaces and play areas once the development is a community?</p> <p>n) DP7 Surely the developer will take SDC's guidance on sustainability into account</p> <p>o) DP8 should the completion of the community hall be a condition before phase 2 is started?</p> <p>p) More than 25% affordable housing is needed, and should be fully integrated into the development</p> <p>q) DP11 - is the additional costs of school facilities for teachers salaries in perpetuity</p> <p>r) What criteria are the PCT using to determine the need for a surgery?</p> <p>s) There are no nominated locations for the shop and doctors surgery, which suggests that the developers do not want to build either. Don't let it fall at the final hurdle of DP12</p>	<p>m) DP5 only refers to the 4ha site. The rest of the land will be left as agricultural land. The maintenance of the open areas will eventually be the responsibility of the Council, who will take a commuted sum from the developer so that the site can be maintained.</p> <p>n) the wording of this will be changed to "will" reflect this.</p> <p>o) the construction of the community hall the responsibility the East Harnham. Community Hall Association, and it would be unfair to delay the commencement of development on something that is outside the developer's control.</p> <p>p) it has now been agreed that 33% affordable housing will be provided, and the text will be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>q) The education costs are to provide the school facilities and not salaries</p> <p>r) We have contacted the PCT and they have confirmed that a surgery is not needed in this location.</p> <p>s) The masterplan has been amended to show the possible locations for the shop and community hall.</p>	<p>n) DP7 amended to state "will"</p> <p>p) It has now been agreed that 33% affordable housing will be provided, and the text will be amended to reflect</p> <p>s) The masterplan has been amended to show the possible locations for the shop and community hall.</p>
12	Mrs Evans	Neutral	<p>a) Flats need lifts to them</p> <p>b) Need to have parking area for the mobile library</p> <p>c) Garaging is required e.g. underground.</p> <p>D) Front doors shouldn't open onto the street</p> <p>e) Need storage for dustbins and recyclables</p> <p>f) What about a mini recycling centre?</p> <p>G) What measures are being taken to reduce water consumption, eg, grey water recycling?</p>	<p>a) This is a detailed design matter for the developer but the comment will be passed to them.</p> <p>b) This could be accommodated in the Community hall car park</p> <p>c) For garaging to be provided underground with access for cars, the dwellings would have to be taller than usual, which may have landscape impact implications. There would be issues of access from the rooms to the gardens.</p> <p>d) Many houses open onto the street - it is not a requirement to have front gardens.</p> <p>e & f) DP7 covers waste recycling. The emerging waste local plan has a policy (14), which concerns storage for recyclables and mini recycling centres, which this development will have to take into account</p> <p>g) all the properties will have a water meter, and modern toilets use less water to flush than standard</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
			h) Will all meters be accessible from the outside i) Will the flats have an entry phone system? j) Will they have the best security / fire alarm devices? k) Will only local people be able to buy the properties? l) Will the street lighting be non-light polluting m) Will there be sufficient telephone capacity for internet connections, and cable tv. Will there be restrictions on satellite dishes?	types. It may be possible for some grey water recycling on site – this comment will be passed to the developer h, i & j) These are detailed design matters, which will be passed on to the developer to consider k) no, however the affordable housing will be offered to local residents in the first instance. l) New street lighting is designed not to be non-polluting. m) This is detail that the developer will need to discuss with BT and the cable providers.	
13	Mrs Rockett	Objection	a) Inappropriate development on an environmentally sensitive site in an area of high ecological value b) 3 storey country house is out of keeping and will devalue the setting of the cathedral. C) Impossible to develop without impact on the SAM d) Destruction of the protected tree belt is unacceptable	a) The Local Plan Inspector looked at the designations on the site. It is not environmentally sensitive nor is it in an area of high ecological value. B) DP2 addresses the issues of the setting of the cathedral. The 3-storey country house is an approach that ensures that the density of the development conforms to Government guidance. c) The environmental impact assessment will be dealing with the SAM issues. English Heritage were also consulted as part of the development brief process, and will be consulted again as part of the planning application process d) There are no plans as part of this development to destroy the trees	No Action
14	Odstock Primary School	Support	The school is due to expand with a planned new build classroom, which would enable the developers to place primary children at the school. Would the developers like to be involved with the expansion plans?	We will forward these comments to the developer	No Action
15	C Perry	Objection	a) Not in keeping with the environment. Should be constructed and landscaped the same as the Rowbarrow Estate. The building of 3 storey flats does not do this	a) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
			and will be detrimental to the value of existing properties. B) It is not acceptable to have 2 new accesses onto Rowbarrow. They should either be onto the Odstock or Downton Road. Rowbarrow is used as a short cut, with traffic travelling too fast. A speed limit on claming restrictions should be enforced.	devaluing of properties is not a planning consideration. b) Access onto Downton Road and Odstock Road is not acceptable. Access on to Downton Road would affect the tree belt and would also give rise to two junctions being close together, which would not be acceptable in highways terms. Site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road. Rowbarrow is not used as a short cut, it is a link road specifically designed to allow access to the hospital as well as access to the existing residential development.	
16	Details withheld	Objection	a) Concern regarding the volume and speed of traffic on Rowbarrow b) Height of the proposed buildings c) Style and quantity of the households with 1 or 2 cars each in a small area d) Number of accesses onto Rowbarrow (will be 5 with the existing 2)	a) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital. B) The design of the scheme has set the buildings back from the Rowbarrow, with an area of landscaping in front. This is to lessen the impact of the buildings on neighbouring properties. c) The illustrative masterplan is in accordance with government guidance on density and will be able to meet the maximum parking guidelines. d) The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan.	d) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points
17	Details withheld	Objection	a) Height of the proposed buildings b) Densely packed nature of the dwellings c) Road safety and access d) That Westbury is to be the developer.	a) The design of the scheme has set the buildings back from the Rowbarrow, with an area of landscaping in front. This is to lessen the impact of the buildings on neighbouring properties. b) The illustrative masterplan is in accordance with government guidance on density and will be able to meet the maximum parking guidelines. c) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
				hospital. D) this is not a planning matter, but the comments will be passed to Westbury.	

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
18	Mr & Mrs Mullen	Objection	<p>Safety a) Vehicles using Rowbarrow as a rat run travelling at excessive speed b) Traffic calming is required along with a 20mph speed limit, but we acknowledge that access by emergency vehicles will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Access C) The building of a link road, as outlined in the local plan must be a pre requisite. d) It is not acceptable to have 2 accesses off Rowbarrow. Access should be from the community hall, or a new access of Odstock Road.</p> <p>Proposed structures e) They are not in keeping with the local character or the local countryside. Object to the 3-storey element - they should either be reduced in height or the site excavated to lower the overall elevation. f) The density is too great and needs to be reassessed.</p> <p>Aspect g) More planting and vegetation is needed including evergreen trees to screen the development. Account must be taken of the interests of existing residents in maintaining their aspect.</p> <p>Proposed developer h) It is questionable whether Westbury should be allowed to develop this site. If they are not the owners (if not who does own the site) we oppose their involvement in any way Specific points on the brief i) 3.2 new plan does not take adequate account of the slope of the land. -ie 3 storey development j) 3.6 - new planting on the north west</p>	<p>a & b) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital c & d) The link road has been built as part of the previous development – Rowbarrow. The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road, and discussions are ongoing with the community association about possible use of their junction for access. e & f) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. Parts of the site will have to be excavated in order for the houses to be built – issues of visual impact will be covered in the environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application. g) There will be landscaping for this development, but this detailed issue will be covered as part of the planning application - DP 5 covers planting and states that native species should be used. The right to a view is not a planning consideration. h) this is not a planning matter, but the comments will be passed to Westbury. i) the slope of the land has been taken into account: this is why the development has been limited to around the 72m contour. J) the developers have indicated a willingness to strengthen the planting, although it is outside the site boundary</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
18	Mr & Mrs Mullen	Objection	<p>boundary needs to be enhanced - parts need replacement .</p> <p>k) 3.9 - view of existing residents must also be taken into account, not just the views across the city.l) 3.10 - Old Sarum and the Cathedral SHOULD NOT be factors in determining the aspect of this development m) 3.13 - existing residents find the inference here insulting.</p> <p>n) 3.15 - this development does not achieve harmony with villa, estates and the open countryside. This is a high density money grab by the developer</p> <p>o) 3.20 &3.21 - the proposed access solution is not viable nor in the interests of the residents of Rowbarrow</p> <p>p) DP1 -not met by the proposed development, DP2, not even close, DP3, in whose view?, DP4, what about safety, DP5 not met, DP6 this is not illustrated, DP7 do not see this, DP8 if this is to be done, why has not access been shared. DP9 perhaps met</p> <p>.r) 5.00 - the verbiage of this entire section is contrived and self-serving.</p>	<p>k & l) there is no right to a view – the development will be assessed to ensure that the landscape impact will be as minimal.</p> <p>m) Comments are noted</p> <p>n) The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. It is not driven by the wants of the developer. O) the proposed access is acceptable to Wiltshire County Highways. p – r) points noted.</p>	No Action
19	Mr & Mrs Burns	Objection	<p>a) 3 storey buildings are not in keeping with the character</p> <p>b) Too many access roads onto Rowbarrow. There should be a new road between Downton Road and Odstock Road</p> <p>c) the density of the buildings is too high and unacceptable</p>	<p>a) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines.</p> <p>b) The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road. The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan.</p> <p>c)The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve</p>	The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points
20	V L Haywood	Objection	<p>a) The development does not meet the expectations in terms of character for the location. Traffic along Rowbarrow will increase greatly by the development</p>	<p>Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The traffic impact</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
				will be assessed as part of the Environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application.	
21	P Holloway	Objection	a) Object to the community centre being built in such close proximity b) Object to 3 storey blocks of flats - not in keeping with the existing homes c) We disagree entirely with the proposed development	a) The community hall already has the benefit of planning permission, however, in order to facilitate the shop, it is likely that the community hall will be relocated, as shown on the masterplan. b) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. c) Comments are noted	a) The masterplan has been amended to show possible locations for the shop and community hall.
22	S & P O'Shea	Objection	a) Traffic safety - 2 more junctions will add to the existing problems b) 3 storey buildings are out of character and should not be allowed to adversely affect the skyline	a) Traffic issues were considered by the local plan inspector who allocated this site. Traffic issues will be dealt with in the Environmental impact assessment. B) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The impact on the skyline will be dealt with in the Environmental statement that will accompany the planning application.	No Action
23	Mr & Mrs Ramm	Objection	a) Object to 3 storey blocks of flats - not in keeping with the existing homes b) access should be from the proposed community centre and Odstock road	a) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines b) The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road and discussions are ongoing with the community association about possible use of their junction for access	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
24	Mr & Mrs Rogers	Objection	<p>a) New link road is needed.</p> <p>B) Not acceptable to have 2 roads off Rowbarrow</p> <p>c) height of the apartments is not acceptable.</p> <p>d) extension at the hospital will create more traffic.</p> <p>E) Cycle tracks will not help with traffic and they will not be used.</p> <p>f) Flats are not suitable for families.</p> <p>g) Will need pedestrian crossings and traffic lights</p> <p>h) why cant there be an access from the community hall or a direct road onto Downton Road?</p> <p>i) Why cant we have traffic calming to stop speeding traffic</p>	<p>A, b & h) The link road has been built as part of the previous development – Rowbarrow. The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road, The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan. Access on to Downton Road would affect the tree belt and would also give rise to two junctions being close together, which would not be acceptable in highways terms</p> <p>c) Visual impact issues will be dealt with in the Environmental Impact assessment that will accompany the planning application</p> <p>d) This is outside the scope of this brief.</p> <p>e) If cycle paths are not included they will not be able to be used – people need the options of alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>f) Having flats on the development gives a choice of types of dwellings. There are not enough smaller dwellings in the area, the provision of flats helps to address this imbalance.</p> <p>g) The proposed accesses from Rowbarrow do not require traffic signals to accommodate pedestrian or traffic movements on capacity or safety grounds. There is a refuge on Rowbarrow to help with crossing the road. The possibility of incorporating a pedestrian crossing with the existing Downton Road/Rowbarrow signals was discussed with the highway authority and rejected.</p> <p>i) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital</p>	<p>b) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points</p>

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
25	C & C Williams	Objection	<p>a) The existing access for the community centre should be used or access from the Downton / Odstock roads</p> <p>b) The 3 storey buildings are not in character with adjacent development or the countryside. The plan does not outline adequate screening from the roads or existing development.</p> <p>c) Do Westbury homes own the land? If they do strict quality controls should be enforced so that the residents are not blighted by poor management and workmanship.</p>	<p>a)The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road and discussions are ongoing with the community association about possible use of their junction for access</p> <p>b) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. There will be landscaping for this development, but this detailed issue will be covered as part of the planning application - DP 5 covers planting and states that native species should be used</p> <p>c) These comments are outside the scope of the brief, but they will be conveyed to Westbury.</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
26	Details withheld	Objection	<p>Safety</p> <p>a) Vehicles using Rowbarrow as a rat run travelling at excessive speedb) traffic calming is required along with a 20mph speed limit, but we acknowledge that access by emergency vehicles will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Access C) the building of a link road, as outlined in the local plan must be a pre requisite.d) it is not acceptable to have 2 accesses off Rowbarrow. Access should be from the community hall, or a new access of Odstock road.</p> <p>Proposed structures e) They are not in keeping with the local character or the local countryside. Object to the 3 storey element - they should wither be reduced in height or the site excavated to lower the overall elevation.f) the density to too great and needs to be reassessed.</p> <p>Aspect g) more planting and vegetation is needed including evergreen trees to screen the development. Account must be taken of the interests of existing residents in maintaining their aspect.</p> <p>Proposed developer h) it is questionable whether Westbury should be allowed to develop this site. If they are no the owners (if not who does own the site) we oppose their involvement in any way.Specific points on the brief i) 3.2 new plan does not take adequate account of the slope of the land. -i.e. 3 storey developmentj)3.6 - new planting on the north west boundary needs to be enhanced - parts need replacement / renewalk) 3.9 - view of existing residents must also be taken into account, not just</p>	<p>a & b) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital</p> <p>c& d) The link road has been built as part of the previous development – Rowbarrow. The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road, and discussions are ongoing with the community association about possible use of their junction for access.</p> <p>e& f) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. Parts of the site will have to be excavated in order for the houses to be built – issues of visual impact will be covered in the environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application.</p> <p>g) There will be landscaping for this development, but this detailed issue will be covered as part of the planning application - DP 5 covers planting and states that native species should be used. The right to a view is not a planning consideration.</p> <p>h) this is not a planning matter, but the comments will be passed to Westbury.</p> <p>i) The slope of the land has been taken onto account: this is why the development has been limited to around the 72m contour.</p> <p>J) The developers have indicated a willingness to strengthen the planting, although it is outside the site boundary</p> <p>k & l) there is no right to a view – the development will be assessed to ensure that the landscape impact will be minimal.</p> <p>m) Comments are noted</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
26	Details withheld	Objection	<p>the views across the city.</p> <p>l) 3.10 - old Sarum and the cathedral SHOULD NOT be factors in determining the aspect of this development</p> <p>m) 3.13 - existing residents find the inference here insulting.</p> <p>n) 3.15 - this development does not achieve harmony with villa, estates and the open countryside. This is a high density money grab by the developer</p> <p>o) 3.20 & 3.21 - the proposed access solution is not viable nor in the interests of the residents of Rowbarrow</p> <p>p) DP1 -not met by the proposed development, DP2, not even close, DP3, in whose view?, DP4, what about safety, DP5 not met, DP6 this is not illustrated, DP7 do not see this, DP8 if this is to be done, why has not access been shared. DP9 perhaps met.</p> <p>r) 5.00 - the verbiage of this entire section is contrived and self-serving.</p>	<p>n) The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. It is not driven by the wants of the developer.</p> <p>O) the proposed access is acceptable to Wiltshire County Highways.</p> <p>p – r) points noted.</p>	No Action
27	Mr H McMaster	Objection	<p>a) Addition of traffic influx from 120 homes will create serious problems in the absence of a re-think of the proposed additional access roads to Rowbarrow</p> <p>b) the plan with no elevations is of limited value. 3 storey buildings will create an overpowering and dominant eyesore, and no attempt has been made to match the aesthetics of the existing estate</p> <p>c) It is undesirable to have 5 feeder roads onto Rowbarrow, and as some of the new residents my work at the hospital, it would be logical to have access off Odstock road</p>	<p>a & c) The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road and the scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan.</p> <p>b) the purpose of a development brief is to set the parameters that development must conform to. It does not have elevations, as this is the detail that will form the planning application. Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The design of the scheme has set the buildings back from the Rowbarrow, with an area of landscaping in front. This is to lessen the impact of the buildings on neighbouring properties.</p>	A & c) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
28	Details withheld	Objection	<p>a) 2 additional access roads joining Rowbarrow will compromise safety and add to the problems</p> <p>b) Choice of builder</p> <p>c) height and aspect of the buildings are unacceptable.</p> <p>D) Section 5 and the leaflet says absolutely nothing but infers that the builder "may do this", but there are no promises. This allows the developer free reign, making maximum profit.</p>	<p>a) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided as shown in figure 6. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital.</p> <p>b) This is not a planning matter.</p> <p>c) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. Issues of visual impact will be covered in the environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application.</p> <p>D) The development principles in section 4 set out what the developer will have to submit in the planning application to conform to the brief. The bullet points in the leaflet have been taken from section 4, and the developer is expected to conform to these principles.</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
19	29 Mr & Mrs Slinger	Objection	<p>Safety a) vehicles using Rowbarrow as a rat run travelling at excessive speed b) traffic calming is required along with a 20mph speed limit, but we acknowledge that access by emergency vehicles will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Access c) the building of a link road, as outlined in the local plan must be a pre requisite. d) it is not acceptable to have 2 accesses off Rowbarrow. Access should be from the community hall, or a new access of Odstock road.</p> <p>Proposed structure e) They are not in keeping with the local character or the local countryside. Object to the 3 storey element - they should either be reduced in height or the site excavated to lower the overall elevation. f) The density is too great and needs to be reassessed.</p> <p>Aspect g) more planting and vegetation is needed including evergreen trees to screen the development. Account must be taken of the interests of existing residents in maintaining their aspect.</p> <p>Proposed developer h) it is questionable whether Westbury should be allowed to develop this site. If they are not the owners (if not who does own the site) we oppose their involvement in any way. Specific points on the brief i) 3.2 new plan does not take adequate account of the slope of the land. - i.e. 3 storey development j) 3.6 - new planting on the north west boundary needs to be enhanced - parts need replacement / renewalk) 3.9 - view of existing residents must also be taken into account, not just the views across the city. l) 3.10 - old Sarum and the cathedral SHOULD NOT be factors in determining the aspect of this development m) 3.13 - existing residents find the inference here insulting. n) 3.15 - achieve harmony with</p>	<p>a & b) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital</p> <p>c& d) The link road has been built as part of the previous development – Rowbarrow. The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road, and discussions are ongoing with the community association about possible use of their junction for access.</p> <p>e& f) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. Parts of the site will have to be excavated in order for the houses to be built – issues of visual impact will be covered in the environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application.</p> <p>g) There will be landscaping for this development, but this detailed issue will be covered as part of the planning application - DP 5 covers planting and states that native species should be used. The right to a view is not a planning consideration.</p> <p>h) this is not a planning matter, but the comments will be passed to Westbury.</p> <p>i) the slope of the land has been taken onto account: this is why the development has been limited to around the 72m contour.</p> <p>J) The developers have indicated a willingness to strengthen the planting, although it is outside the site boundary</p> <p>k & l) there is no right to a view – the development will be assessed to ensure that the landscape impact will be minimal.</p> <p>m) comments are noted</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
29	Mr & Mrs Slinger	Objection	. This development does not achieve harmony with villa, estates and the open countryside. This is a high density money grab by the developer o) 3.20 & 3.21 - the proposed access solution is not viable nor in the interests of the residents of Rowbarrow p) DP1 -not met by the proposed development, DP2, not even close, DP3, in whose view?, DP4, what about safety, DP5 not met, DP6 this is not illustrated, DP7 do not see this, DP8 if this is to be done, why has not access been shared. DP9 perhaps met. r) 5.00 - the verbiage of this entire section is contrived and self-serving.	n) The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. It is not driven by the wants of the developer. O) the proposed access is acceptable to Wiltshire County Highways. p – r) points noted.	No Action
30	Dr & Mrs Thomas	Objection	a) The brief goes against many of the constraints and opportunities laid out in the leaflet. B) Impact on safety of additional traffic and the lack of proposals to address the problem. C) The layout and style of the proposed development which is neither in keeping with the existing housing nor the countryside. The limited screening of trees will mean the new development will stand out, especially given the height of the proposed buildings	a) The information contained in the leaflet is lifted directly from the development brief, so there is no conflict between the leaflet and the brief. b) Traffic issues were considered by the local plan inspector who allocated this site. Rowbarrow was designed as a link road. There is no objection from the County Highways on safety or additional traffic grounds. The road was specifically designed to allow access to the hospital as well as access to the existing residential development. c) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The 3-storey country house is an approach that ensures that the density of the development conforms to Government guidance. The detailed landscape strategy will form part of the planning application.	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
31	Details withheld	Objection	<p>Safety a) vehicles using Rowbarrow as a rat run travelling at excessive speedb) traffic calming is required along with a 20mph speed limit, but we acknowledge that access by emergency vehicles will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>AccessC) the building of a link road, as outlined in the local plan must be a pre requisite.d) it is not acceptable to have 2 accesses off Rowbarrow. Access should be from the community hall, or a new access of Odstock road.</p> <p>Proposed structures e) They are not in keeping with the local character or the local countryside. Object to the 3 storey element - they should wither be reduced in height or the site excavated to lower the overall elevation.f) The density to too great and needs to be reassessed.</p> <p>Aspect g) more planting and vegetation is needed including evergreen trees to screen the development. Account must be taken of the interests of existing residents in maintaining their aspect.</p> <p>Proposed developer h) it is questionable whether Westbury should be allowed to develop this site. If they are no the owners (if not who does own the site) we oppose their involvement in any way. Specific points on the brief</p> <p>i) 3.2 new plan does not take adequate account of the slope of the land. -i.e. 3 storey development</p> <p>j) 3.6 - new planting on the north west boundary needs to be enhanced - parts need replacement. 3.9 - view of existing residents must also be taken into account, not just the views across the</p>	<p>a & b) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital</p> <p>c& d) The link road has been built as part of the previous development – Rowbarrow. The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road, and discussions are ongoing with the community association about possible use of their junction for access.</p> <p>e& f) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. Parts of the site will have to be excavated in order for the houses to be built – issues of visual impact will be covered in the environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application.</p> <p>g) There will be landscaping for this development, but this detailed issue will be covered as part of the planning application - DP 5 covers planting and states that native species should be used. The right to a view is not a planning consideration.</p> <p>h) This is not a planning matter, but the comments will be passed to Westbury.</p> <p>i) the slope of the land has been taken onto account: this is why the development has been limited to around the 72m contour.</p> <p>J) The developers have indicated a willingness to strengthen the planting although it is outside the site boundary.</p> <p>k & l) there is no right to a view – the development will be assessed to ensure that the landscape impact will be minimal.</p> <p>m) Comments are noted</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
31	Details withheld	Objection	city.l) 3.10 - old Sarum and the cathedral SHOULD NOT be factors in determining the aspect of this development m) 3.13 - existing residents find the inference here insulting.n) 3.15 - this development does not achieve harmony with villa, estates and the open countryside this is a high density money grab by the developer o) 3.20 & 3.21 - the proposed access solution is not viable nor in the interests of the residents of Rowbarrow p) DP1 -not met by the proposed development, DP2, not even close, DP3, in whose view?, DP4, what about safety, DP5 not met, DP6 this is not illustrated, DP7 do not see this, DP8 if this is to be done, why has not access been shared. DP9 perhaps met.r) 5.00 - the verbiage of this entire section is contrived and self-serving.	m) Point noted n) The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. It is not driven by the wants of the developer. O) the proposed access is acceptable to Wiltshire County Highways. p – r) points noted.	No Action
32	J lillingstone-Price	Objection	a) Increase in traffic will increase the problems already encountered b) Vegetation on existing area is poor - bird life is non-existent. C) Proposed development is not in keeping with current housing d) Problems with poor workmanship with Westbury's	A) Traffic issues were considered by the local plan inspector who allocated this site. Rowbarrow was designed as a link road. There is no objection from the County Highways on safety or additional traffic grounds. The road was specifically designed to allow access to the hospital as well as access to the existing residential development. B) There is an opportunity to improve this problem with the planning that will be proposed as part of this development. DP5 states that biodiversity will be promoted. c) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The 3-storey country house is an approach that ensures that the density of the development conforms to Government guidance. The detailed landscape strategy will form part of the planning application.	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
				D) this is not a planning matter but the comments will be passed to Westbury.	
33	C Ennew	Objection	<p>a) The increase in traffic has not been considered</p> <p>b) There will only be 1 point of access to both developments given that very few use the Odstock road junction. Downton road is already congested.</p> <p>C) Unhappy with Westbury being the developer</p> <p>d) cheap 3 storey flats are not a community and are a blot on the countryside. The aspect from Rowbarrow also needs to be considered.</p>	<p>A & b) The local plan inspector who allocated this site considered traffic issues. It will also be considered as part of the ES and the Transport Assessment that will accompany the planning application.</p> <p>C) This is not a planning matter.</p> <p>D) Having flats on the development gives a choice of types of dwellings. There are not enough smaller dwellings in the area, the provision of flats helps to address this imbalance. The right to a view is not a planning consideration</p>	No Action
34	Mrs C Complin	Neutral	<p>a) Can the car park for the community centre be relocated to the right of the hall away from the existing Rowbarrow development</p> <p>b) is there really a need for 3 access points? Could the community hall entrance be used?</p>	<p>A) the community hall already has the benefit of planning permission.</p> <p>B) The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan.</p>	b) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points
35	Details withheld	Neutral	<p>a) 3 storey blocks will be too high and out of keeping - although the concept is quite innovative</p> <p>b) proposed landscaping is not good enough. Westbury need to be held to firm plans</p>	<p>a) The 3-storey country house is an approach that ensures that the density of the development conforms to Government guidance.</p> <p>B) The detailed landscape strategy will form part of the planning application. It is normal practice for the maintenance of the landscaping to be eventually taken over by the councils parks department once a commuted sum is received from the developer.</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
36	C Clarke	Objection	<p>a) More consideration needs to be given to the issues of traffic conditions, safety and also the positioning of the access roads</p> <p>b) the description of the locality is inaccurate and the comparison to other large local country estates is ludicrous</p> <p>c) the overall design is inappropriate and not in keeping with its surroundings</p>	<p>a) The local plan inspector who allocated this site considered traffic issues. It will also be considered as part of the ES and the Transport Assessment that will accompany the planning application. The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan.</p> <p>b) The development is not intended to be a large country estate but is the approach that the developer has taken.</p> <p>C) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission. The 3-storey country house is an approach that ensures that the density of the development conforms to Government guidance</p>	a) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points
37	T Wells	Objection	<p>a) 3 storey development out of keeping with present buildings - was told that new development will be in keeping with Rowbarrow.</p> <p>b) An existing rat run will only get worse</p> <p>c) too many entrances</p> <p>d) too high density</p>	<p>a) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines.</p> <p>B) Rowbarrow is not used as a short cut, it is a link road specifically designed to allow access to the hospital as well as access to existing residential development.</p> <p>C) The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan.</p> <p>d) the minimum density as set out in Government guidance (PPG3) is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve</p>	c) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points
38	Details withheld	Objection	Proposals for a shop and doctors surgery will not be viable in this location. The money and space should be devoted to the community centre.	a) An independent consultant has found that a shop is financially viable in this location. The Primary Care Trust has said that surgery is not required in this location. As set out in DP12, if other community facilities are required, they will be negotiated.	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
39	CPRE	Support	a) We support 25% affordable housing b) support the focus on the view of the cathedral as providing a unique identity for the development c) support the inclusion of a sizable tract of open countryside d) support the integrated approach to transport and emphasis on pedestrian and cycle provision e) welcome the individual approach to layout and design, although have some reservations about the country villa approach with estate buildings.	a) We have now negotiated 33% affordable housing. B) Support is welcomed c) the open countryside indicated on the master plan, will not be in the ownership of Westbury, but will remain private land. The master plan will be annotated to reflect this d) Support is welcomed e) support is welcomed	c) The masterplan has been annotated to show the open countryside
40	Britford Primary School	Neutral	a) The pavement along Downton Road should be widened, and a safe cycle lane as part of the pavement would also be beneficial. B) Can the developers assist the school in extending the parking facilities, or an arrangement with the park and ride for dropping off the children. If this were to happen then a crossing point would need to be provided.	a) The developer will be making a contribution towards off site cycle ways. It is the responsibility of the Salisbury Joint Transportation team to identify appropriate schemes. However, these comments will be passed to them for consideration. b) Extending the parking facilities would result in more use of the car, which would be contrary to policy. The use of the park and ride are issues that need to be put to our Joint transportation scheme who are responsible for the park and ride scheme.	No Action
41	Mrs Tooke & Mr Notley	Objection	a) Disagree with 2 new accesses. Suggest that an access onto Odstock road is explored b) we strongly disagree with the position of the community hall car park. If it is unavoidable, then screening would be appreciated c) the height of the 3 storey buildings is not in keeping with the area. d) Westbury's workmanship is unsatisfactory - could other builders be considered.	a) Site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road. The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan. B) The community hall already has the benefit of planning permission. It was only included in the brief to provide the complete picture. C) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. D) this is outside the scope of the brief, but the comments will be passed on.	a) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
42	Mr & Mrs B Shrimpton	Objection	a) an additional line of trees behind the existing ones should be provided for extra screening b) We do not want the grass verge in front of our house to be removed for the bus lane	a) a detailed landscape strategy will form part of the planning application, and these comments will be passed onto the developer b) this is a matter for the Salisbury Joint transportation team who will be responsible for implementing the bus lane.	No Action
43	S Wakefield	Objection	Link road traffic will be very heavy, the dangers are obvious. Can traffic calming be included?	a) Traffic calming has been discussed with the highway authority. Of the several schemes considered, narrowing the road and the introduction of the cycle lanes was considered to be the most appropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a route to the hospital	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
44	L Corbett	Objection	<p>Safety a) vehicles using Rowbarrow as a rat run travelling at excessive speedb) traffic calming is required along with a 20mph speed limit, but we acknowledge that access by emergency vehicles will need to be taken into account.</p> <p>Access C) the building of a link road, as outlined in the local plan must be a pre requisite.d) it is not acceptable to have 2 accesses off Rowbarrow. Access should be from the community hall, or a new access of Odstock road.</p> <p>Proposed structures e) They are not in keeping with the local character or the local countryside. Object to the 3 storey element - they should either be reduced in height or the site excavated to lower the overall elevation.f) the density is too great and needs to be reassessed.</p> <p>Aspect g) more planting and vegetation is needed including evergreen trees to screen the development. Account must be taken of the interests of existing residents in maintaining their aspect.</p> <p>Proposed developer h) it is questionable whether Westbury should be allowed to develop this site. If they are not the owners (if not who does own the site) we oppose their involvement in any way. Specific points on the briefi) 3.2 new plan does not take adequate account of the slope of the land. -i.e. 3 storey developmentj)3.6 - new planting on the north west boundary needs to be enhanced - parts need replacement / renewalk) 3.9 - view of existing residents must also be taken into account, not just the views across the city.l) 3.10 - old</p>	<p>a & b) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital</p> <p>c& d) The link road has been built as part of the previous development – Rowbarrow. The site does not extend to enable access on to Odstock Road, and discussions are ongoing with the community association about possible use of their junction for access.</p> <p>e& f) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. Parts of the site will have to be excavated in order for the houses to be built – issues of visual impact will be covered in the environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application.</p> <p>g) There will be landscaping for this development, but this detailed issue will be covered as part of the planning application - DP 5 covers planting and states that native species should be used. The right to a view is not a planning consideration.</p> <p>h) this is not a planning matter, but the comments will be passed to Westbury.</p> <p>i) the slope of the land has been taken onto account: this is why the development has been limited to around the 72m contour.</p> <p>J) the developers have indicated a willingness to strengthen the planting although it is outside the site boundary.</p> <p>k & l) there is no right to a view – the development will be assessed to ensure that the landscape impact will be minimal</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
44	L Corbett	Objection	. Sarum and the cathedral SHOULD NOT be factors in determining the aspect of this development m) 3.13 - existing residents find the inference here insulting.n) 3.15 - this development does not achieve harmony with villa, estates and the open countryside this is a high density money grab by the developer o) 3.20 & 3.21 - the proposed access solution is not viable nor in the interests of the residents of Rowbarrow p) DP1 -not met by the proposed development, DP2, not even close, DP3, in whose view?, DP4, what about safety, DP5 not met, DP6 this is not illustrated, DP7 do not see this, DP8 if this is to be done, why has not access been shared. DP9 perhaps met.r) 5.00 - the verbiage of this entire section is contrived and self serving.	m) Comments are noted n) The minimum density as set out in PPG3 is 30 dwelling per hectare, which this site will achieve. It is not driven by the wants of the developer. O) the proposed access is acceptable to Wiltshire County Highways. p – r) points noted.	No Action
45	Dr Thorne	Objection	a) Density of proposed buildings may lead to the area becoming a slum, and lead to vandalism. B) Insufficient parking and the risk of accidents with cars parked on pavements c) 2 exits onto Rowbarrow is a good idea d) no need for a shop. Government policy is to close down single handed doctors and encourage large medical centres	a) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. B) The dwellings will have a maximum of 1.5 spaces per unit, which is in line with Government guidance. In recent years it had become an option to have "car barns" instead of garages. Research has shown that the majority of households do not park cars in garages, but it is counted as one of the parking spaces. This can then lead to cars having to park on the road, causing problems. If open car barns or other open parking spaces are used, residents are more likely to use them for parking, thus alleviating some of the car-parking problem. C) The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan.	c) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
				d) An independent consultant has found that a shop is financially viable in this location. The Primary Care Trust has said that a surgery is not required in this location	
46	Wessex Water	Neutral	a) New sites are expected to provide drainage to adoptable standards. B) The wording of DP7 should be supplemented with the following " storm water drainage systems shall be built to an adoptable standard in consultation with Wessex water. C) There is sufficient capacity at the sewage treatment works, and water resources in the area to accommodate the anticipated peak demand from the development.	A & b) point noted. The text of DP7 will be amended to include this wording. C) Confirmation of capacity is welcomed	A & b). The text of DP7 has been amended to include this wording.
47	Details withheld	Neutral	a) The country villa and estate style may be an excuse for building excessively high buildings. B) DP2 should specify that the development will not exceed 2 storeys. C) DP1 should include more guidance on what is meant by a high quality environment	a) Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines. B) The design of the buildings and their visual impact will dictate the maximum height, the text in DP2 has been amended to ensure that no buildings will be higher than a 2 storey building at the 72m contour line. C) DP1 spells out what will be expected of this development. Design is a subjective matter.	a) The text of DP2 to be amended .See section 3b in the attached report
48	A Aertssen	Objection	a) No further development in the area off Downton Road b) Number of access roads needs to be reviewed and reduced to 2 c) Height of proposed buildings is too high d) community hall: we fear an increase of noise nuisance and vandalism. The car park orientation should be reviewed	a) This site is allocated in the local plan for development. B) The scheme has now been redesigned with only 2 access points as shown on the masterplan. c) issues of visual impact will be covered in the environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application. D) the community hall already has the benefit of planning permission, however with the land swap to facilitate the provision of the shop, the community hall	b) The masterplan has been amended to show only 2 access points

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
				is being redesigned and these comments will be passed on to the community association to take into account when redesigning the new hall.	
49	C Binns	Neutral	This representation was not about the site, but about the park and ride site up the road.	No comments required	No Action
50	Dr G M Anlezark	Neutral	<p>a) Cycle parking needs to be provided at the Park and Ride and consideration needs to be given to allowing schoolchildren to use the P&R in the mornings to alleviate congestion</p> <p>b) safe and direct routes to the city / schools and other facilities should be looked at.</p> <p>c) An information pack including up to date walking and cycling maps should be given to new residents.</p> <p>d) 3.23 why should pedestrian links be at the main vehicular access</p> <p>e) 3.24 details of the cyclist route to the city centre would be welcomed.</p> <p>f) Figure 6 shows a 1.2 m cycleway in the road on one side, but a 3 m footway / cycleway. There seems to be no logical reason for this.</p> <p>g) DP4 The development seems suitable for consideration of a home zone. Details of cycle parking needs to be given as much thought as car parking. Low traffic speeds should be compulsory not just encouraged</p> <p>h) DP4 strategic routes for pedestrians and cyclists need to be provided before links can be made to them.</p> <p>i) DP7 More detail of how sustainable use of resources is to be achieved should be listed in the full application</p>	<p>a) This issue is being investigated by the Joint transportation team who are responsible for the park and ride</p> <p>b) Routes to local facilities will be considered in ES and Transport Assessment</p> <p>c) an information pack will be given to new residents</p> <p>d) Pedestrian links do not have to be only at the vehicular accesses. Additional links could be provided if these fit with the design. Pedestrians are likely to use these routes in any event and if pedestrians are not accommodated at the vehicular accesses potential conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles could arise.</p> <p>e) Details of cyclist routes would be addressed in the ES and Transport Assessment</p> <p>f) where possible cyclist and pedestrians should be segregated. This is achieved by providing cycle paths on carriageway and a separate footway. This is achieved on the north side of the road. On the south side pedestrian and cyclist routes are combined to allow for slower cyclist travelling up hill.</p> <p>g) Some elements of the development could be designed to home zone with 10mph. Cycle parking will be considered in detail as part of the planning application</p> <p>h) The Salisbury Joint Transportation Team is developing strategic cycle network. The development will contribute towards the routes.</p> <p>i) the planning application will have to demonstrate how the development will meet sustainability objectives.</p>	DP 10 has been amended to include reference to cycle parking

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
			<p>j) The proposed community hall seems to have an excessive number of spaces. Where are the cycle parking spaces to be located</p> <p>k) the children play area should have cycle parking</p> <p>l) the shop surgery and other community facilities need to have cycle parking.</p>	<p>J) The community hall already has the benefit of planning permission, however the parking will be able to be looked at with a revised design for the community hall.</p> <p>K) Point noted – the text of DP10 will be amended to include reference to cycle parking.</p> <p>L) This will need to be addressed by the developer to be in accordance with the Local Plan cycle standards. DP4 does state that cycle parking will be accommodated on plot – this is not just for the houses.</p>	
51	J Thorne	Objection	<p>a) The site is not suitable for housing as it is on a hill and part of a prominent landscape. Especially 3 storey dwellings. B) Nothing is being done to improve the infrastructure in the area, e.g. schools, doctors dentists etc.</p>	<p>a) The landscape issues concerning this site were considered at the local plan inquiry, which led to the Inspector allocating the site for development. Guidance on design and housing density has changed since Rowbarrow was given planning permission, and the approach put forward by Westbury is their response to the current guidelines.</p> <p>B) the primary and secondary schools will receive financial contributions as part of this development. A doctors surgery was put forward, but the Primary care trust have stated that a surgery is not required in this location. A shop is also to be provided as part of this development.</p>	DP12 amended to include reference to a shop
52	B Thorne	Objection	<p>a) The leaflet was misleading as there was no mention of 3 storey flats.</p> <p>B) Surely no amount of grading will hide the impact that the 3 storey development will have on the landscape.</p>	<p>a) The leaflet was just a small taster of the overall brief. The purpose of the leaflets was to encourage residents to come to the exhibitions or to look at the brief in detail.</p> <p>b) The design of the buildings and their visual impact will dictate the maximum height, detailed issues of visual impact will be covered in the environmental impact assessment that will accompany the planning application</p>	No Action

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
53	Salisbury Civic Society	Objection	<p>a) The brief attempts to put forward logic for a different form of development. The arguments put forward are poor, but the idea is to be applauded.</p> <p>B) There is no mention of how the Downton Road tree shelter belt will be maintained or the planting reinforced</p> <p>c) the site is currently used as a play area, dog walking and dumping rubbish. The brief is silent on the management and control of the remaining field. It should say that it will be fenced off and retained in agricultural use.</p> <p>d) The brief does not cover the importance of Downton Road, Odstock Road and Rowbarrow in the local road network</p> <p>e) the narrowing of Rowbarrow and the addition of cycle lanes is a short sighted illogical proposal.</p> <p>f) The best analogy for the development would be the garden suburb concept</p> <p>g) the brief is weak on how many planted areas and public spaces will be maintained after the development is complete. These should be defined in the brief.</p> <p>h) The proposed development is part of a larger community, which has no community facilities. It is doubtful whether a community hall is needed, but a shop and a doctors would form a tangible heart, especially if they were sited at the top north west of the site</p>	<p>a) Comments are noted</p> <p>b) The tree belt will ultimately be transferred to the Council for maintenance with the other landscaping and open space. Additional planting will be detailed in the landscape plans that will form part of the planning application. DP5 and paragraph 4.3 have been amended to refer to the future maintenance of the open spaces.</p> <p>c) the remaining field is outside the scope of this brief. The development does not want to fence itself in from the countryside, but the landscaping will have to be designed to discourage residents from trespassing on the land.</p> <p>d) Odstock Road, Downton Road and Rowbarrow are important vehicle routes in Salisbury. Whilst not explicit in the brief, this has led to the access arrangement and the treatment of Rowbarrow proposed.</p> <p>e) The road is to be narrowed and cycle lanes provided to help reduce speeds on Rowbarrow. Other measures have been discussed with the highway authority to reduce speeds. These were considered inappropriate because of the importance of Rowbarrow as a through route to gain access to the hospital.</p> <p>f) This analogy could be another approach to development on this site. The country house approach is Westbury's response to the development principles.</p> <p>G) 4.3 of the development brief states that the future maintenance of the open spaces will be subject to the s106. Additional wording will be included to point 6 to add the words district council to clarify any misunderstanding.</p> <p>H) The community hall already has the benefit of planning permission. A shop is to be provided on site and the PCT have said that a doctor surgery is not required in this location</p>	<p>b & g) DP5 and para 4.3 amended to include reference to the open spaces ultimately being maintained by the District Council.</p> <p>h) DP12 amended to include reference to a shop. See paragraph 3c in the attached report.</p>

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
53	Salisbury Civic Society	Objection	<p>i) One of the proposed access points is outside the site.</p> <p>j) Much is made of the view of the cathedral to justify the country house. The spire is only visible over the tree shelter belt</p> <p>k) There is no mention in the brief of the height of the buildings permitted</p> <p>l) The site boundary is not shown on the masterplan</p> <p>m) the walkways / cycleways are restricted by the lack of provision in phase 1</p> <p>n) the brief is too weak to allow SDC to apply the necessary development control over any developer.</p>	<p>i) Point noted – the master plan, and figure 6 have been amended to correct this.</p> <p>J) From the open countryside beyond the cathedral can be clearly seen (see photograph on page 7) It is important that views from outside the site are also taken into account.</p> <p>K) The design of the buildings and their visual impact will dictate the maximum height although the text in DP2 has been amended to ensure that no buildings will be higher than a 2 storey building at the 72m contour line.</p> <p>L) The site boundary is shown in figures 1 and 3</p> <p>m) This may be the case, but this development will still be expected to link in with any existing routes</p> <p>n) The brief does set out the development principles that will be expected on the site. The document is not meant to be overly prescriptive and stifle good design. With the amendments that have come out from this consultation exercise, it is considered that the development principles are robust enough to ensure that the development will meet the requirements. The brief has been in partnership with Westbury who are happy to ensure that the planning application submitted will be in accordance with the brief. Any material departure from the brief could result in the planning application being refused.</p>	<p>i) The master plan, and figure 6 have been amended to correct the access being outside the site.</p> <p>k) The text of DP2 to be amended .See section 3b in the attached report</p>
54	Wilts and Dorset Bus Co	Support	<p>a) The proposed development is well located in relation to the local bus service</p> <p>b) provision of a Cibeles bus shelters with real time bus information would be desirable</p> <p>c) The two bus stops on Rowbarrow could be moved a short distance if required to align with walk routes to the new development.</p> <p>d) Provision of an inbound bus lane along Downton road is very welcome</p>	<p>a) Comments are noted</p> <p>b & c) the Salisbury Joint Transportation Team has identified a need to contribute towards shelters with real time bus information. The specification and location of the bus shelters will be a matter for detailed discussion with the highway authority.</p> <p>D) Support is welcomed</p>	

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
			e) Provision by the developer of two free annual network bus tickets to the initial occupier of each property is being pioneered at Old Sarum, and would be a welcome initiative here.	e) This is being considered further. A detailed package of improvements will be discussed with the bus company.	
55	Salisbury Joint Transportation Team	Neutral	<p>a) Section 2. Tr8(v) is shown on the plan, but there is no mention of the policy on this page.</p> <p>B) 3.25 should state that it "should be provided" rather than "provided"</p> <p>c) 3.27 the bus lane should be provided on the southern side of Downton Road, not the northern side</p> <p>d) Bus lane contribution - it does not say that the contribution will be reasonably related to the development.</p> <p>e) Current bus facilities are poor. Updating the bus stops via a commuted payment should be incorporated</p> <p>f) DP4 - pays no regard to the Downton Road / Rowbarrow junction and the effect that the development will have on the traffic signals, which will need to be addressed.</p>	<p>a) The policy is not referred to as is does not directly affect development on this site. It is shown on the plan as an aid for the public to locate the site.</p> <p>B) the wording actually states "will be provided" which is considered to be robust enough.</p> <p>C) Point noted. The text in 3.27 will be amended to say "Southbound"</p> <p>d) Point noted. Text will be amended accordingly</p> <p>e) Point noted. Text to be included in DP4 stating that contributions towards off site highway improvements will be made.</p> <p>f) The effect of the development on the Downton Road/Rowbarrow junction will be considered as part of the ES and Transport Assessment</p>	<p>c) The text in 3.27 will be amended to say "Southbound" and contribution will be reasonably related to the development.</p> <p>D) Text to be included in DP4 stating that contributions towards off site highway improvements will be made</p>

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
56	City Area Committee	Neutral	<p>a) Request that, as a matter of principle, no building protrude, in height, beyond the '72 degree contour line'</p> <p>b) Confirm the Developer/Forward Planning Team's recognition (as evidenced by the contents of the draft brief) that excellent public transport, cycle and pedestrian access to the development (from the city centre and relevant schools, for example) is a key requirement of the development;</p> <p>c) Endorse the 'key findings' detailed on page 11 of the Draft Development Plan (as circulated with the meeting agenda);</p> <p>d) Ensure that considerably more than the statutory amount (currently 25 per cent) of 'affordable housing' is included as part of the development;</p> <p>e) Ensure that the affordable housing that is provided is distributed throughout the development and is of mixed tenure;</p> <p>f) Confirm the need for the inclusion of a shop (or shops) and doctor's surgery as part of the development;</p> <p>g) Request that any children's play areas proposed as part of the development be carefully sited;</p> <p>h) Request that specific and carefully-sited areas be allocated for use by young people (as well as those for children);</p> <p>i) Request confirmation that Primary School provision for the area will be sufficient before withdrawing funding or allocating it elsewhere;</p> <p>j) Request that funding allocated for the provision of schools or school-related facilities, if found to be surplus to requirement, be allocated for use in</p>	<p>.a) Point noted. The text in DP2 has been amended to ensure that no buildings will be higher than a 2 storey building at the 72m contour line.</p> <p>b) support is welcomed on this issue</p> <p>c) support is welcomed on this matter</p> <p>d) it has now been agreed that 33% affordable housing will be provided, and the text will be amended to reflect this</p> <p>e) The location of the affordable housing is a detailed matter that will be dealt with at the planning application stage.</p> <p>F) The response from the independent consultant is that a shop is financially viable and therefore this development should provide this facility. Text will be amended accordingly. As for the Doctors surgery, the PCT have confirmed that a surgery is not needed in this location and the brief will be amended accordingly.</p> <p>g & h) This is a detailed matter that will be dealt with as part of the planning application. These comments will be passed onto the developer for consideration.</p> <p>i) The County Council have indicated that contributions for primary and secondary education will be required as part of this development.</p>	<p>a) The text of DP2 to be amended .See section 3b in the attached report.</p> <p>d) It has now been agreed that 33% affordable housing will be provided, and the text of DP9 will be amended to reflect this</p> <p>f) amend text of DP12 to include a shop and remove need for surgery. See section 3c & e of the attached report for the exact wording.</p>

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
			<p>addressing other areas of need (as identified by the District Council in liaison with relevant public);</p> <p>k) Confirm the Developer/Forward Planning Team's recognition (as evidenced by the contents of the draft brief) that 'sustainable development' issues should be an integral component of the development;</p> <p>l) Request that consideration be given to extending the transportation proposals contained within the draft brief to include the designation of certain areas as 'Home Zones';</p> <p>m) that the report be noted and that Officers be charged with obtaining the highest percentage possible of affordable housing, which should be distributed throughout the development, during negotiations with the developers.</p> <p>n) In addition, the Committee extended its thanks to the Forward Planning Team (and also the Developers) for working up the design as proposed, providing a brief that also outlined the 'thinking' behind the proposals and taking the setting of the development into account, as well as for commencing a comprehensive public consultation programme.</p>	<p>K) The support of the committee on this issue is welcomed</p> <p>l) Home zones tend to be done retrospectively on older style housing. The current highways standards and urban design ensure that the principles of home zones are used in road design. The development will be subject to a 20mph speed limit and designed to achieve speeds of this order. Some elements of the development could be designed to home zone with 10mph</p> <p>m) it has now been agreed that 33% affordable housing will be provided, and the text will be amended to reflect this</p> <p>n) support is welcomed</p>	<p>m) It has now been agreed that 33% affordable housing will be provided, and the text of DP9 will be amended to reflect this</p>

Rep No	Name	Support, Object or Neutral	Issues Raised	Response	Change made
57	Wiltshire County Council Highways Department	Neutral	a) Reference should be made to the need to provide a transport assessment b) It should be clarified that the development roads will be the subject of a 20mph traffic zone and will be designed to ensure that the traffic will travel at or below this speed c) The requirements in DP4 and the works shown in the diagram on page 15 have been agreed with the Highway Authority.	A & b) Points noted – DP4 to be amended to reflect this information. C) This confirmation is welcomed.	a) Amend DP4 to make reference to a traffic assessment and that the site will be a 20mph traffic zone.