

**CITY AREA COMMITTEE - 16/12/04
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Planslist
Item No.

**1. S/2004/2431 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING ERECTION OF 1 HOUSE AND 2 FLATS
AND ACCESS AT 51 HULSE ROAD, SALISBURY**

Design Forum – “Although the revised scheme is acceptable in design terms, and turns the corner well, the Forum is of the opinion that the first scheme is a better and more imaginative design. Unlike the first scheme which clearly comprised two separate buildings, the revised scheme appears as a single building, and consequently appears more dominant. The revised scheme is more likely to create overshadowing of the neighbouring property than the first scheme. The flat roof at the rear is not sympathetic”

Third Party Reps: 11 letters making the following points:

- a) Scheme does not have enough on site parking and will exacerbate parking problems in area
- b) Proposal is too large and of a greater density than existing development in the locality
- c) Design is out of keeping with area where dwellings are set back and a transition between public and private space exists
- d) The riverside wall and bank are an eyesore and should be removed to improve views
- e) Proposal will be an eyesore from the adjacent footpath walk
- f) Proposal will adversely affected no.49, due to rear parking noise, size of building, and attachment of fixtures to the boundary walling
- g) Impact on amenities

HDS note:

The comments of the Design Forum are interesting. The Forum clear feels that the overall design is acceptable, but considers the scheme less successful than the scheme previously refused by members of CAC. Therefore, it appears that there are difference between the views of the Forum, your officers, and members on this design issue, and members will have to consider these differences carefully when deciding the application.

Whilst the comments of third parties are mostly covered in the report, and do not affect the recommendations within the officer report, members should consider the above points carefully before coming to a decision on the matter.

The previous reasons for refusal have been attached for members convenience:

“The proposal, due to a combination of its overall size, massing, bulk, and siting, and its prominent corner location, would have an adverse impact on the character of the area which is generally typified by more domestic scale buildings positioned on relatively spacious corner plots, and would also have an adverse impact on adjacent properties due to the increase in overshadowing and dominance caused by the proposed buildings. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy G2 and D2(i) of the Salisbury District Local Plan.”

**CITY AREA COMMITTEE - 16/12/04
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

2. S/2004/2445 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF 10 No. DWELLINGS WITH ACCESS AND PARKING AT 8 COLDHARBOUR LANE, SALISBURY

Agent – Amended site plan incorporating 15 parking spaces, including 5 visitor spaces. Bicycle storage sheds have been incorporated into rear gardens of dwellings. Landscaping strips have been added along the north and south boundaries of the car park.

WCC Highways – No objections

HDS notes

Whilst the parking layout and parking space numbers included in the original scheme is still considered acceptable, this amended layout is considered to offer a way of addressing local concerns regarding the impact of more housing on the already congested highway system, without affecting the quality of the scheme.

Members should note that the scheme involves a small additional section of footway along Coldharbour Lane. The following condition is suggested to secure such provision:

“Before any of the dwellings are first occupied, the proposed footway adjacent to Coldharbour Lane shall be completed and made available for use, in accordance with a scheme to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The footway shall be constructed in full accordance with the agreed scheme.

REASON: “In the interests of highway safety.”