

Minutes

Meeting of : Northern Area Committee
Meeting held in : Antrobus House, Amesbury
Date : Thursday 23 March 2006
Commencing at : 4.30pm

Present:

Councillor M A Hewitt – Chairman
Councillor C G Mills – Vice-Chairman

Councillors J A Brady, D W Brown, Mrs J M Greville, J C Noeken, A G Peach, J Rodell, J R G Spencer, I C West, F Westmoreland, T Woodbridge and K C Wren.

Apologies: Councillor M Baker

Parish Councillors: Mr Stubbs (Newton Tony), Mr Burt (Bulford), Mr Healing and Mrs M Towle (Durrington), Mr I Holiday (Wylye), Mr N Bayne (Tilshead) and Mrs Woodford (Berwick St James)

Officers

Mr A Madge (Development Services), Mr J Crawford (Legal and Property Services), Mr S Hawkins (Development Services – Enforcement), Mr G Hobbs (Transportation) and Ms S Draper (Democratic Services).

514. Exempt Business

Resolved - That the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of agenda item 3 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined within Part 1 of Schedule 12A inserted into the Local Government Act, 1972, by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, and more particularly specified below:-

- Paragraph 13** - Information which, if disclosed to the public would reveal that the authority proposes –
- (a) to give under any enactment a notice under or by virtue of which requirements are imposed on a person; or
 - (a) to make an order or direction under any enactment



Awarded in:
Housing Services
Waste and Recycling Services



- (b) the determination of any matter affecting the authority (whether, in either case, proceedings have been commenced or are in contemplation);

*Summary of 'exempt' matter
Land at Winterbourne Gunner*

516. Public Questions/Statement Time:

Mr Burt asked the following question: "I heard on South West TV that the South West Regional Assembly based in Exeter, were to review planning policies and the transport plan for the whole region.

Could the Committee be informed who represents Salisbury at the South West Regional Assembly and are decisions being made in Exeter which are contrary to those made in Salisbury?

Also could we be informed who the un-elected members of the South West Regional Assembly are and when the region will be formally accepted if at all?"

The Chairman read out the following response for Mr Burt:

"Councillor John Collier represents Salisbury District Council at the South West Regional Assembly.

The Assembly, as Regional Planning Body, is required to review the existing Regional Planning Guidance, which is now called the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) and to develop a new Regional Spatial Strategy for 2006-2026. The new RSS will provide a broad strategy for future development in the region over a 15-20 year period and it will inform the preparation of future statutory development plans, prepared by local authorities. The RSS will be developed in accordance with National guidance and the Assembly will work in close partnership with local authorities and other local organisations to develop strategies for the sub-regions, which will ensure an integrated and coordinated approach to the future growth and development of the region.

Councillor John Collier has added that although the Assembly has a regional brief the members try to reflect the needs and aspirations of local communities. The Council has taken the view that as the Assembly is in existence and decisions will be taken which will affect the District, it is better to have representation on the Assembly to make a case for the people of Salisbury District. Therefore the Council remains engaged with the Assembly and the priority is to ensure a good outcome for the RSS.

He also added that should Mr Burt have any more specific questions then he is happy to correspond with him on this issue. Councillor Collier's contact address is available from Democratic Services.

For information on the membership of the Assembly and its future, you can visit the Assembly website at www.southwest-ra.gov.uk or telephone the Assembly on 01823 270101."

517. Councillor Questions/Statement Time:

Councillor West, in his capacity as Chairman of the Durrington Swimming Pool and Fitness Centre Managing Body, gave all members of the Committee an advert for the Centre that the Managing Body had created. He asked that the Committee help to support the Centre by arranging for this to be placed in local village/parish magazines and local shops and community halls.

Councillor Mrs Greville added that as a member of the Managing Body and a local councillor, she had written an article for the Durrington News promoting the Centre and she would be happy to do a similar article for any other member's local parish magazine should they wish.

518. Minutes:

Resolved – that the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 23rd February 2006 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

519. Declarations of Interest:

Councillor West declared a personal interest in Mr Burt's question in relation to the South West Regional Assembly as he was a member of the Assembly.

Councillor West and Councillor Mills both informed members that as they had submitted an alternative proposal for the A303, which was due to be considered under agenda item 9, they felt it was inappropriate to

participate and vote on the issue and therefore they withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of agenda item 9.

520. Chairman's Announcements:

The Chairman informed members that Councillor Baker had recently been taken ill. The Committee members agreed that the officer forward their best wishes for a speedy recovery to Councillor Baker.

521. A303 Stonehenge Improvement Scheme Review & Consultation

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Transport Planner and the proposals of Councillor Mills and Councillor West (both previously circulated).

Mrs Woodford on behalf of Berwick St James, Mr Burt on behalf of Bulford Parish Council, Mr Holiday on behalf of Wylve Parish Council, Mr Bayne on behalf of Tilshead Parish Council and Councillor Brady on behalf of Woodford Parish Council, Durnford Parish Council and South Newton Parish Council, informed the Committee that they supported Councillor Mills' and West's proposals with the inclusion of a flyover at Countess East. Mr Healing on behalf of Durrington Parish Council informed the Committee that Durrington Parish Council supported the Councillor Mills and West proposal without a flyover at Countess East.

Councillor Brown-Hovelt had submitted a statement to members in advance of the meeting and further added that he did not wish to give support to any scheme in particular but alerted members to his concerns regarding the accuracy of data provided by the Highways Agency. He called upon members to defer a decision on a preferred scheme and to lobby government for an independent review of all options. He also emphasised that the views of UNESCO needed more careful consideration as it had the power of veto over any proposals.

The following points were made by members:

- That the officer be thanked for a comprehensive and clear presentation on the issues.
- There was an overwhelming feeling amongst members that something must be done for the A303 at Stonehenge.
- They did not wish to make any comment on the location of the Visitor Centre at Stonehenge.
- Members expressed concern that decisions may be taken by the Government which may not reflect the views expressed during the consultation process.

Resolved – That it be recommended to Cabinet that it submits the following response on behalf of the District Council:

1. The Council welcomes the public consultation as part of the Stonehenge Improvement review and reiterates its desire to see the A303 through the WHS upgraded to dual carriageway standard in a form which results in a significant improvement to the setting of the stones.
2. SDC remains supportive of the Published Scheme involving 2.1km bored tunnel as the best option to deliver both the critical infrastructure and environmental improvements to Stonehenge, the surrounding area and the WHS.
3. SDC supports the cut and cover tunnel option as second best alternative should the deep-bore tunnel option not be progressed, subject to the following caveats:
 - (i) That the route and alignment must be chosen which minimises archaeological damage to the WHS.
 - (ii) The roof of the tunnel is sensitively landscaped and contoured so as to blend inconspicuously with the landscape within Stonehenge Bottom.
4. That should the government decide not to progress either of the above options then it be recommended that the government gives serious consideration to the alternative road scheme as proposed by Councillors Mills and West subject to the inclusion of the flyover at Countess East. (Note: the Committee's recommendation relates to the road scheme elements of the proposal only and not the siting of the Visitor Centre at Stonehenge).

Note: Councillor Spencer asked that his dissent to the above decision be recorded.

522. Enforcement Policy and Procedures

The Committee considered the report of the Principal Planning Officer – Enforcement (previously circulated). The officer made the following key points:

- Since 1998 the number of complaints which needed investigation had doubled.

- There was no requirement upon the Council to take enforcement action. However, the Council did have a duty to investigate complaints and reach a decision.
- Any action should always be in the public interest and commensurate with the scale of the breach.
- An individual could appeal against a breach of condition notice and the Planning Inspectorate was currently taking some time to determine cases.
- Negotiation was the key tool for enforcement but where necessary court action would be taken and officers would try to ensure it was as expedient as possible.

The Councillors commended the officers for the excellent job that the enforcement team was doing.

Resolved – That the report be noted.

523. SWAG Grant to Wylve Village Hall

Councillor Mills, Noeken and Woodbridge presented this item to members. They felt that the application was of very high quality and were particularly impressed with the level of local fundraising towards the project. Therefore the Northern Area SWAG Review Panel had recommended that £2,286 be granted to Wyvern Village Hall.

Resolved – That £2, 286 from the remaining 2005/6 SWAG budget be granted to Wyvern Village Hall Wylve.

Following this decision Mrs Carpenter, Chairman of the Wyvern Village Hall Management Committee, and Mr Holiday on behalf of Wylve Parish Council, spoke to thank the Committee for the grant.

524. Update on the Development of the CO-OP in Amesbury

The Head of Legal and Property Services informed the Committee that he had been in correspondence with the person in charge of the construction of the new store at the CO-OP. He had been informed that the projected start date for construction was the first week after Easter. Further to this he had been advised that the only issues remaining were some matters of detail regarding the highways agreement which should be concluded shortly.

The Head of Legal and Property Services had also contacted the Highways Department at Wiltshire County Council and officers had confirmed that subject to one or two matters of detail the agreement was ready to be signed.

Councillor Noeken informed the Committee that he had also contacted the CO-OP to ascertain the latest position and he had been informed that a safety audit had recently been completed which had recommended one or two design changes which were being actioned. He also stated that he had again urged the CO-OP to erect boards to inform the public about the new store and they had endeavoured to do this shortly.

Resolved – That a further update be brought to the next meeting.

525. Update on the Expansion of Porton Down

Councillor Wren informed the Committee that Idmiston Parish Council had raised many objections to the proposals as contained within the 18/84 application submitted by DSTL. He had written to local objectors and advised them to contact the right honourable Robert Key MP and the District Council Planning Office to formally lodge their objections.

He informed the Committee that the County Council had also submitted a comprehensive highway objection to the proposals.

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that he had held a meeting with DSTL and the Highway's Agency to discuss some of the objections in detail and DSTL had been given the opportunity to overcome some of the concerns. Once the Planning Department had received DSTL's revised proposals then a report would be brought to the Northern Area Committee.

Councillor Noeken raised the concern that in light of the strong concerns of the parish councils, Wiltshire County Council and the concerns over the procedure raised by the District Council, the government could be seen to be acting inappropriately by deciding the application itself. Therefore he requested that legal officers investigate the possibility of a legal challenge should the government pursue with determining this application via the 18/84 procedure.

Resolved – That the possibility of raising a legal challenge to the use of the 18/84 procedure be investigated.

526. Chinese Takeaway, Porton.

The Committee considered the report of the Principal Environmental Health Officer (previously circulated).

Resolved – That the report be noted.

527. S/2006/0241 – Conservatory and Extension To Patio at Paddock View, 17 Beechfield, Newton Tony, Salisbury, SP4 0HQ For Mrs I E Witney

Mr Edwards, a neighbour, spoke in objection to the above application.

Mrs I E Witney, the applicant, spoke in support of the above application.

Mr Stubbs, on behalf of Newton Tony Parish Council, informed the Committee that the Parish Council objected to the above application.

Further to the receipt of these statements, the Committee considered the previously circulated report of the Head of Development Services together with the schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting.

Resolved –

1. That the above application be refused for the following reasons:

1) The proposed conservatory by reason of its design, size, appearance and materials is considered to be an unsympathetic and large addition to the rear of this new dwelling, out of character with the Newton Tony Conservation area and surrounding dwellings and contrary to policy D3 and CN8 of the adopted local plan.

2) The proposed conservatory by reason of its positioning outside of the housing policy boundary is considered to be an intrusive development which in turn is having an adverse effect on the open countryside and is contrary to policy H16 and H31 of the adopted plan.

2. That the applicant be informed that this decision has been taken in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

1) Adopted local plan policy CN3 development affecting listed buildings, CN5 development within the curtilage of listed buildings, CN8 development, which affects the conservation area, CN10 open spaces, and gaps in conservation area

528. S/2006/0071 – New Studio and Glazed Lobby at Paddock View, Beechfield, Newton Tony, Salisbury, SP4 0HQ For Mr Stocken

Mr Edwards, a neighbour, spoke in objection to the above application.

Mrs I E Witney, the applicant, spoke in support of the above application.

Mr Stubbs, on behalf of Newton Tony Parish Council, informed the Committee that the Parish Council objected to the above application.

Further to the receipt of these statements, the Committee considered the previously circulated report of the Head of Development Services together with the schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting.

Resolved –

1. That the above application be refused for the following reason:

(1) The proposed studio by reason of its size, design and appearance is considered to be overdevelopment of this small site, out of keeping with the conservation area and adjacent grade 2 listed building, as such the proposal is contrary to policy D3 and CN8 of the adopted local plan.

*The meeting concluded at 1920
Members of the public present: 15*