

Schedule Of Planning Applications For Consideration

In The following Order:

Part 1) Applications Recommended For Refusal

Part 2) Applications Recommended for Approval

Part 3) Applications For The Observations of the Area Committee

With respect to the undermentioned planning applications responses from bodies consulted thereon and representations received from the public thereon constitute background papers with the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985.

ABBREVIATIONS USED THROUGHOUT THE TEXT

| | |
|--------------|---|
| AHEV | - Area of High Ecological Value |
| AONB | - Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty |
| CA | - Conservation Area |
| CLA | - County Land Agent |
| EHO | - Environmental Health Officer |
| HDS | - Head of Development Services |
| HPB | - Housing Policy Boundary |
| HRA | - Housing Restraint Area |
| LPA | - Local Planning Authority |
| LB | - Listed Building |
| NFHA | - New Forest Heritage Area |
| NPLP | - Northern Parishes Local Plan |
| PC | - Parish Council |
| PPG | - Planning Policy Guidance |
| SDLP | - Salisbury District Local Plan |
| SEPLP | - South Eastern Parishes Local Plan |
| SLA | - Special Landscape Area |
| SRA | - Special Restraint Area |
| SWSP | - South Wiltshire Structure Plan |
| TPO | - Tree Preservation Order |

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE
 FOLLOWING COMMITTEE:
NORTHERN AREA 20 APRIL 2006

Note: This is a précis of the Committee report for use mainly prior to the Committee meeting and does not represent a notice of the decision

| Item Page | Application No Officer | Parish/Ward Recommendation Ward Councillors |
|------------------|--|--|
| 1 | S/2006/0319 Miss L Flindell | NEWTON TONY REFUSAL |
| | MR & MRS DEWFALL 2 PARK COTTAGES BEECHFIELD NEWTON TONEY SALISBURY New 4-bedroom dwelling. | Cllr Hewitt Cllr Wren |
| 2 | S/2006/0626 Miss L Flindell | DURRINGTON REFUSAL |
| | MR CROOK NURSERY HOUSE 24 ANDREW CLOSE DURRINGTON SALISBURY 8 No. Semi-detached dwellings. | Cllr Baker Cllr Mrs Greville Cllr Rodell |
| 3 | S/2006/0545 Miss L Flindell | AMESBURY EAST APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS |
| | 3 FLOWER COURT FLOWER LANE AMESBURY SALISBURY Change of use from existing retail to A2. | Cllr Brown Cllr Noeken Cllr Peach |
| 4 | S/2006/0520 Miss S Harvey | AMESBURY EAST APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS |
| | MR ARNOT 32 BEAMONT WAY AMESBURY SALISBURY Erection of conservatory to rear. Change of use of garage to bedroom. | Cllr Brown Cllr Noeken Cllr Peach |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 5 | S/2006/0556 | AMESBURY EAST |
| | Miss S Harvey | APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS |
| | MR ARNOTT 32 BEAMONT WAY AMESBURY SALISBURY Change of use of private residence to residential care home for four adults with a learning disability & garage to bedroom & erect conservatory. | Cllr Brown Cllr Noeken Cllr Peach |
| 6 | S/2006/0107 | IDMISTON |
| SV | Mr A Madge | |
| | DSTL PORTON DOWN SALISBURY Demolition of existing buildings and construction of new offices, data centre, fire station, extension to existing restaurant and associated parking and landscaping. | Cllr Hewitt Cllr Wren |

Part 1

Applications recommended for Refusal

1

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|---------------|
| Application Number: | S/2006/0319 | | |
| Applicant/ Agent: | R B GOGGIN PARTNERSHIP | | |
| Location: | LAND ADJACENT TO 2 PARK COTTAGES BEECHFIELD NEWTON TONEY SALISBURY SP4 0HH | | |
| Proposal: | NEW 4 BEDROOM DWELLING | | |
| Parish/ Ward | NEWTON TONY | | |
| Conservation Area: | LB Grade: | | |
| Date Valid: | 15 February 2006 | Expiry Date | 12 April 2006 |
| Case Officer: | Miss L Flindell | Contact Number: | 01722 434377 |

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

A similar application on the site (S/2005/1517) was considered at the Northern Area Committee meeting on the 20th October 2005

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site currently forms the side garden of No 2 Beechfield, an end of terraced dwelling built of red brick with dominant roof. The terrace and associated gardens extend into the parkland, at an angle to the main road through Newton Tony. The boundary of the site with the parkland is open with low shrubs to the east and south and chainlink fencing to the site boundaries. There are trees to the north boundary of the site.

There is an existing detached double garage within the side garden, to the rear of the main dwelling.

THE PROPOSAL

This application is for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling within the side garden retaining the existing double garage. Parking is proposed in the front garden of No 2 to replace the parking lost with the proposed development.

PLANNING HISTORY

2004/2388 Two storey extension to terrace end and single storey extension to rear and associated works AC 29.12.2004
 2005/1517 New 4 bedroom dwelling Refused 26/10/2005

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1) The site is within a prominent and sensitive location in a conservation area, a special landscape area and adjacent to grade II listed parkland. It is considered that the proposed detached dwelling by reason of its design and materials is unsympathetic and inappropriate to the character and appearance of the existing terrace, with subsequent adverse impact to the character and appearance of the conservation area, grade II listed parkland, special landscape area and setting of nearby grade II listed Newton Tony Lodge, contrary to policies H16, D2, C6, CN5, CN8, CN11 and CN18 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

2) The proposed residential development is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to Policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan because appropriate provision towards public recreational open space has not been made.

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - Recommend that no highway objection be raised subject to conditions:-
The access is widened to a minimum of 4.5 metres for a distance of 7 metres from the edge of the carriageway. This widened area shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel).

The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until a properly consolidated and surfaced turning space for vehicles has been constructed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority within the site in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such turning space shall be kept clear of obstruction at all times.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety.

Wessex Water Authority - The development is located within a foul sewer area. It will be necessary for the developer to agree a point of connection onto the system for the satisfactory disposal of foul flows generated by the proposal.

The developer has proposed to dispose of surface water to soakaway. It is advised that your Council should be satisfied with any arrangement for the satisfactory disposal of surface water from the proposal.

Please note that the proposed development is located within a Source Protection Zone and any surface water discharge will need to be in line with the Environment Agency guidelines.

According to our records there is a public foul crossing the site. Wessex Water normally requires a minimum, 3 metres easement width on either side of its apparatus, for the purpose of maintenance and repair. Diversion or protection works may need to be agreed. The developer must agree in writing prior to the commencement of works on site, any arrangements for the protection of our infrastructure crossing the site. With respect to water supply, there are water mains within the vicinity of the proposal. It is recommended that the developer should agree with Wessex Water, prior to the commencement of any works on site, a connection onto Wessex Water infrastructure.

Wiltshire Gardens Trust - No comments to make

REPRESENTATIONS

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Advertisement | Yes, expiry date 16 th March 2006 |
| Site Notice displayed | Yes, expiry date 29 th March 2006 |
| Departure | No |
| Neighbour notification | Yes, expiry date 8 th March 2006 |
| Third Party responses | Yes |

Two letters of support, summarised as follows:

- The proposed house will fit in very well with the existing farm cottages
- No objections to size, scale or siting and consider it to blend into the existing site

One letter of objection, summarised as follows:

- The bulk and location of the property will have an adverse impact on views to and from the Grade II Listed Parkland
- The dwelling will break up the continuation of the adjoining terrace houses
- The size of the 4 bedroom property will overdevelop the plot

Parish Council response None received

MAIN ISSUES

1. Principle
2. Impact on grade II listed parkland/setting of listed building, street scene, landscape and residential amenity
3. Highway safety
4. R2

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP G2 (General), H16 (Housing Policy Boundary), D2 (Design), C6 (Special Landscape Area), CN5 (setting of listed buildings), CN11 (Views into and out of conservation areas), CN18 (historic parks and gardens), R2 (Public open space)
PPG3 – Housing
PPG15 – Planning and the Historic Environment

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Principle

The site lies within the Housing Policy Boundary of Newton Tony, as defined on the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan proposals map, and therefore residential development is acceptable in principle as set out in policy H16, provided that it is in accordance with other plan policies. The site is also within a designated special landscape area, and the open countryside to the north, east and west, forms part of the grade II listed Wilbury Park. The Newton Tony Conservation Area runs to the south of the site.

Policy D2 states that proposals for street and infill development will be permitted where the proposals respect or enhance the character of appearance of an area. The site is also located within a Special Landscape Area where development should have a high standard of design. Whilst PPG 3 makes it clear that new development must make the best use of available land, PPG3 also states that the quality of the environment should not be compromised. PPG 15 (para 2.24) states that the effect of a proposed development on a registered park or garden or its setting is a material consideration in the determination of the planning application and that Local Planning Authorities should protect registered parks and gardens in determining planning applications. Policy CN18 of the local plan specifically refers to development affecting historic parks and gardens where development should safeguard the landscape setting.

2. Impact on grade II listed parkland/setting of listed building, street scene, landscape and residential amenity

The existing house has windows on the east elevation overlooking the proposed development site although this is not the principal elevation. It is proposed to block the first floor window and principal elevations of the proposed dwelling are to the north and south. It is not considered that a dwelling would in principle have an adverse impact to residential amenity through overlooking or overshadowing.

With regards to the impact to the parkland, the proposed detached dwelling is not considered to respect the existing character of the terrace and a detached dwelling is not considered an appropriate form of development with perceived encroachment on the park, and subsequent adverse impact to the grade II listed Wilbury Park and surrounding landscape.

Planning permission has been granted under S/2004/2488 to extend the property to the side with a substantial two-storey extension. The extension was designed to create the appearance of another dwelling/continuation of the terrace, with pitched roof to the same ridge height as the existing dwelling and window detailing to match the existing house and French doors at ground floor creating the appearance of a false front door entrance. Continuation of the terrace as previously approved is a much less dominant method of development.

The conservation officer considers that any house in this setting should be designed to blend into the landscape and that the design proposals are inappropriate for the prominent location, which does not reflect the scale, design, materials, roof pitch and openings of the existing terrace. The application is a resubmission of the 2005 application, which proposed flint and brick banding and uPVC windows and was refused on the grounds of the design and materials of the dwelling. The materials have been altered to include the use of Blockley Red Stockbridge Blend facing bricks, Redland plain brown roof tiles, and double glazed timber windows. The design has been altered with the addition of flat roof dormer windows instead of hipped.

The applicant has submitted a design statement outlining that the proposed material finishes are considered to be generally sympathetic to the existing terrace which was constructed in 1947 after the Second World War when building materials were of poor quality and in short supply which restricted design.

The District Council's Design Forum considers that the site is very attractive and that revised scheme is of poor quality. They have recommended that an analysis of the character of the area should form the basis for a new design with consideration given to the effect of the new house on the setting of the listed building.

Newton Tony Lodge to the south of the development site is a grade II listed building with a clear view of the development site, and it is considered that the proposed development will compromise the setting of this listed building by reason of the impact to the parkland.

3. Highway safety

The applicant proposes to make good the private access track, and whilst this is under shared ownership, the applicant has certified that they have served notice on the landowners. Wiltshire County Council Highways Department has recommended no objections to the proposal subject to conditions and it is not considered that highway safety will be adversely affected subject to conditions. As concerns re land ownership is a civil matter and the applicant has complied with planning procedures with regards to land ownership, it is considered that highway requirements could be dealt with as a Grampian condition, and is not a reason of refusal of the application.

4. R2

The scheme relates to the creation of new residential development and in order to comply with the requirements of policy R2 of the local plan, applicants are required to enter into a unilateral undertaking and provide a commuted financial payment. Applicants are now required to sign agreements during the course of the application. The applicant has signed and returned the agreement and although payment is only requested if the council is minded to approve the scheme. It will be necessary to include a reason for refusal relating to policy R2 in the event of an appeal against a decision to refuse the scheme.

CONCLUSION

The site is located within the Housing Policy Boundary where the principle of residential development is accepted subject to being considered against other relevant policies within the local plan. However, the site is also within a special landscape area and adjacent to grade II listed parkland. It is considered that a detached dwelling as proposed is inappropriate to the character of the area, with subsequent adverse impact to the listed parkland, special landscape area and setting of nearby grade II listed Newton Tony Lodge and views into and out of Newton Tony Conservation Area, contrary to policies of the Adopted SDLP.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

(1) The site is within a prominent and sensitive location in a special landscape area and adjacent to grade II listed parkland. It is considered that the proposed detached dwelling by reason of its bulk, and design is unsympathetic and inappropriate to the character and appearance of the existing terrace, with subsequent adverse impact to the character and appearance of the grade II listed parkland, special landscape area and setting of nearby grade II listed Newton Tony Lodge, and nearby conservation area contrary to policies H16, D2, C6, CN5, CN11 and CN18 of the Adopted of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and guidance contained within Planning Policy Guidance Notes 3 and 15.

(2) The proposed residential development is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to Policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan because appropriate provision towards public recreational open space has not been made.

INFORMATIVE: R2 FOR REFUSAL

The applicant has signed and returned a standard unilateral undertaking but has not submitted the required financial payment. It should be noted that the reason given above relating to Policy R2 of the adopted Local Plan could be overcome if the required financial payment is submitted.

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Application Number: | S/2006/0626 | | |
| Applicant/ Agent: | MR S P MANKIN | | |
| Location: | NURSERY HOUSE 24 ANDREW CLOSE DURREINGTON SALISBURY SP4 8EJ | | |
| Proposal: | DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING & BUILD 8NO SEMI DETACHED DWELLINGS | | |
| Parish/ Ward | DURREINGTON | | |
| Conservation Area: | | LB Grade: | |
| Date Valid: | 21 March 2006 | Expiry Date | 16 May 2006 |
| Case Officer: | Miss L Flindell | Contact Number: | 01722 434377 |

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Peach has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:

- the interest shown in the application
- the controversial nature of the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site is located within the Housing Policy Boundary of Durrington and contains an existing detached two-storey dwelling with vehicular access from Andrew Close. There are a number of mature trees within the site and hedging to the site boundaries. A public footpath runs to the north of the site separating the site from the rear gardens of the dwellings in Windsor Road.

THE PROPOSAL

Outline planning permission with all matters reserved for eight residential dwellings

PLANNING HISTORY

None

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - The comments had not been received at the time the report was written. These will be included in the late correspondence.

Wessex Water Authority - The comments had not been received at the time the report was written. These will be included in the late correspondence.

Arboricultural Officer - Beech Tree is not worthy of a TPO – poor branch union, would require surgery and or bracing, this would have a detrimental effect on the amenity value. Boundary hedges would be good to keep along with some small conifers in SE corner for future screening.

REPRESENTATIONS

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Advertisement | Yes, expiry date 20 th April 2006 |
| Site Notice displayed | Yes, expiry date 20 th April 2006 |
| Departure | No |
| Neighbour notification | Yes, expiry date 13 th April 2006 |
| Third Party responses | Yes, one letter of no objections |

Three letters of objection/concern, summarised as follows:-

- Highway safety hazard and impact to residential amenity through Increase in traffic and road parking in Andrew Close and use of turning circle in front of residential dwellings
- Traffic already a problem through HGVs, vans and cars using road for access/parking for Sainsbury's shop and village hall
- Sewerage problems in road will be increased
- Impact to birds and wildlife through loss of grounds of house

Parish Council response None received at time of writing report

MAIN ISSUES

Principle

Impact on character of area, neighbours, street scene

Highway safety/parking

Trees

R2

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan policies G2 (General), H16 (Housing Policy Boundary), D2 (infill development), R2 (open space)

Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 - Housing

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

The site is located within the Durrington Housing Policy Boundary where the principle of infilling, small scale development and redevelopment is acceptable, provided it does not conflict with the design and other policies of the Local Plan and there is no loss of any open area which would make a positive contribution towards the character of the settlement.

Current government policy as set out in PPG3 is to make a more efficient use of previously developed land in order to halt the trend towards outward expansion by concentrating development within existing settlements. PPG 3 (para 54) makes it clear that new development must make the best use of available land without compromising the quality of the environment.

The Local Plan states that redevelopment of a site would be permitted if the proposal respects or enhances the character of appearance of an area in terms of Policy D2 (i) the building line, scale of the area, heights and massing of adjoining buildings and the characteristic building plot widths.

Impact on character of area, street scene

The site is approximately 57m wide. The applicant has submitted an illustrative site plan indicating how the eight dwellings could be accommodated on the site. This shows four pairs of semi-detached dwellings with an average building plot width of 7m. The building plot widths to the semi-detached dwellings to the south of Andrew Close are approximately 10m wide and those to the north in Windsor Road are approximately 13m wide.

It is considered that the proposal by reason of the number of units proposed would result in undesirable cramped form development, out of character with the locality, contrary to policies G2, D2 and H16 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

Highway safety/parking

The comments from WCC Highways Department had not been received at the time the report was written; however it is considered that insufficient space will be available for car parking on the site.

Trees

The agent has stated that all the trees on the site will probably be felled. In light of this the District Council's Arboricultural Officer has assessed whether the mature tree within the site is worthy of retention. He has no objections to the loss of the tree, but has recommended that the mature hedging and small conifers to the southeast corner be retained.

Open Space

The application does not make provision for off-site open space and is therefore contrary to policy R2 of the Adopted SDLP

CONCLUSION

This application has been considered against the relevant policies from the Adopted Local Plan. The site is located within the HPB where the principle of residential development is accepted subject to being considered against other relevant policies within the local plan.

However the proposed development would constitute an undesirable intensification of use of the site, which would be out of sympathy, appearance and character with the pattern of existing development within the local environment.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

(1) The site is within a Housing Policy Boundary Area as defined in the Adopted Salisbury District Local. However the number of dwellings proposed would constitute an undesirable intensification of use of the site, which would be out of sympathy, appearance and character with the more spacious pattern of existing development within the local environment and seriously eroding the current sense of openness in the street scene, thereby being seriously detrimental to the character of the area. This would be contrary to policies H16, G2 and D2 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.

(2) The proposed residential development is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan, as appropriate provision towards public recreational open space has not been made.

Informative

It should be noted that the reason given above relating to Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan could be overcome if all the relevant parties agree to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement, or if appropriate by condition, in accordance with the standard requirement for recreational public open space.

Part 2

Applications recommended for Approval

3

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Application Number: | S/2006/0545 | | |
| Applicant/ Agent: | GERAL BOWERING ASSOCIATES LIMITED | | |
| Location: | FLOWER COURT 3 FLOWER LANE AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7JE | | |
| Proposal: | CHANGE OF USE FROM EXISTING RETAIL TO A2 | | |
| Parish/ Ward | AMESBURY EAST | | |
| Conservation Area: | LB Grade: | | |
| Date Valid: | 14 March 2006 | Expiry Date | 9 May 2006 |
| Case Officer: | Miss L Flindell | Contact Number: | 01722 434377 |

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Peach has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:

- the controversial nature of the application (retail facilities in Amesbury)

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

No 3 Flower Court is a mid-terraced unit located within the identified primary shopping area of Amesbury, as defined on the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan proposals map.

THE PROPOSAL

To change the use of unit 3 Flower Court from A1 (retail) use to A2 (betting shop) use

PLANNING HISTORY

1983/1083 Construction of 5 small shop units with storage over and associated forecourts and accesses AC 04.10.1983

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - no highway objection is raised as the location is based in town centre where there are a number of public parking areas.

Housing & Health Officer - No observations

SDC Forward Planning - The proposal is acceptable in Policy terms and the Forward Planning Team have no objection to the proposal. It is suggested that the issue of parking be discussed with the applicant before a decision is made.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement No

Site Notice displayed Yes, expiry date 17th April 2006

Departure No

Neighbour notification Yes, expiry date 5th April 2006

Third Party responses Yes, one letter of objection containing 8 signatures summarised as follows:

- Amesbury needs shops to encourage visitors, and doesn't need another betting shop.

Town Council response Object - Prior to our own local planning document being published, ATC objects to any further erosion in the town centre of retail shopping facilities. The town has already lost a considerable number of retail shopping facilities in the town centre and with an Northern Area Committee 20/04/2006

expanding population there should be more, not less, shopping facilities available in the town centre.

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on Primary Shopping Area, Vitality and Viability of Amesbury, highway safety/parking

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP S1 (Primary shopping areas in Salisbury and Amesbury), G1 (Sustainable development), G2 (General)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The site is within the identified Primary Shopping Area of Amesbury; therefore policy S1 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan will be relevant. The principal role of the primary shopping area is to ensure that the vitality of these areas continues and where possible is improved to provide attractive shopping environments. Policy S1 is permissive of change of use applications from A1 to A2/A3 uses provided that the retail function of the area is not undermined. The impact of the loss of a retail unit on the vitality and viability of the settlement of Amesbury must also be assessed as set out in policy G1. Local shops are essential to the economic and social life of settlements and collectively ensure that places remain sustainable by providing a range of services, thus reducing the need to travel by car. The Town Council has objected to the application on the grounds that the proposed change of use will have an adverse effect on the retail function of the area and Town.

In order to ensure that retailing activity remains the dominant land use at ground floor level within these areas, the supporting text of the local plan policy S1 states that at least 60% of the units of a particular street block frontage or frontage of 50 metres either side of the application site, should remain in retail (A1) use. It has been calculated that if change of use is granted for A2 use, then over 60% of the secondary shopping area within this particular street block frontage and frontage of 50metres either side of the application will remain in A1 (retail) use.

Whilst no car parking is proposed as part of the development, the site is accessible by a choice of a means of transport being within walking distance of Amesbury Bus Station, lay by parking to the west and is within 150m walking distance of free car parking.

In light of the accessibility of the site to alternative car parking facilities and bus station, and as WCC highways department have raised no objections to the application, it is not considered that highway safety will be adversely affected.

CONCLUSION

The application has been considered against the relevant policies of the Adopted Local Plan. It is considered that as a 60% of the uses within the street frontage 50m either side of the application site will remain in A1 retail use, that the application will accord with the provisions of the local plan and the proposed change of use will therefore not undermine the retail function of the settlement of Amesbury and therefore will not affect the vitality and viability of the settlement. The proposed use will also provide a service to the local community, accessible by a choice of a means of transport with adequate parking close by to the development site.

The Use Classes Order 1987 also permits the change of use from A2 to A1 without the requirement for planning permission, should the betting shop move in the future.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

Reason for approval:

The proposed change of use which will provide a service for the local community; is not considered to undermine the retail function of Amesbury in accordance with Policy S1, or undermine the vitality and viability of the settlement of Amesbury, in accordance with policy G1, and is accessible by a choice of a means of transport with adequate parking close by to the development site.

And subject to the following conditions:

1 . The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. AS amended by section 51 (1)of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

INFORMATIVES: POLICY

This decision has been in accordance with the following policy/policies of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan: S1 (Primary shopping areas in Salisbury and Amesbury), G1 (Sustainable development), G2 (General).

| | | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|--------------|
| Application Number: | S/2006/0520 | | |
| Applicant/ Agent: | MR ARNOT | | |
| Location: | 32 BEAMONT WAY AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7UA | | |
| Proposal: | ERECTION OF CONSERVATORY TO REAR. CHANGE OF USE OF GARAGE TO BEDROOM | | |
| Parish/ Ward | AMESBURY EAST | | |
| Conservation Area: | | LB Grade: | |
| Date Valid: | 10 March 2006 | Expiry Date | 5 May 2006 |
| Case Officer: | Miss S Harvey | Contact Number: | 01722 434541 |

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Noeken has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:

- The interest shown in the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

32 Beamont Way is a modern detached property located on a modern housing estate to the east of Amesbury town centre. The property is located within a Housing Policy Boundary.

THE PROPOSAL

The proposal involves the erection of a conservatory to the rear of the property and the conversion of the existing integral garage into a bedroom.

Please Note: This application does not involve a change of use, it relates only to the erection of a conservatory and conversion of the garage.

PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history for the site.

CONSULTATIONS

| | |
|----------------------|-----------------|
| WCC Highways | No Objections |
| Environmental Health | No Observations |

REPRESENTATIONS

| | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Advertisement | No |
| Site Notice displayed | Yes – Expiry 13/04/2006 |
| Departure | No |
| Neighbour notification | Yes – Expiry 03/04/2006 |
| Third Party responses stating: | Yes – One letter received from the neighbouring property |

- A construction of a garage/conservatory in this area has the potential to restrict the 'right to light' into my property, overlook our garden and invade our privacy.

| | |
|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Town Council response | Yes – No Objections |
|-----------------------|---------------------|

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle
- Scale and design
- Impact on neighbour amenities

- Impact on the street scene
- Impact on highway safety

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP, G2 (General), D3 (Design) and H16 (Housing Policy Boundary)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

32 Beamont Way is a detached property located within a Housing Policy Boundary in Amesbury. As a result of this, small-scale development will be allowed provided it conforms to the relevant design policy. In this case the design policy relevant is D3, which states that extensions should be of a scale and design that is appropriate to the overall appearance of property, using complimentary materials. This policy also ensures that developments are integrated well into the overall landscape framework. Policy G2 ensures developments do not have any significant adverse impacts on the amenities of adjoining dwellings.

Scale and design

The proposal involves the conversion of the current integral garage into an additional bedroom. The only noticeable change in the appearance of the front of the property resulting from this conversion will be the presence of a window rather than a garage door. As such it is considered that the garage conversion in this case will be appropriate to the overall appearance of the existing dwelling.

The proposed conservatory will be located to the rear of the property and will be approximately 3.3 metres wide, 4.4 metres long and will have a maximum height of approximately 3 metres. The proposed conservatory will consist of a dwarf wall and glazing on the south and west elevations, and will have an approximately 2 metre high wall and glazing on the east elevation. The conservatory will have a glass roof and the brick used in construction of the walls will match the brick used in the existing property. It is considered that this modest conservatory will be appropriate to the overall appearance of the property, using matching materials, therefore creating a harmonious environment.

Impact on neighbour amenities

It is considered that the window inserted into the front of the existing garage will not cause any significant overlooking, as it will be a significant distance (approximately 20 metres) away from the property opposite.

One letter of objection has been received with regards this application. The occupant of the neighbouring property is concerned that the proposed conservatory will restrict the amount of light entering their property. However, the conservatory will have a glass roof, which will let light pass through to the adjoining property. They are also concerned that the proposed conservatory will overlook their garden and invade their privacy. A relatively high fence divides the two properties, however this fence is constructed in more a picket fence style, rather than being of solid construction, and as such some overlooking is to be expected from both gardens even before the addition of a conservatory. It is considered that the addition of the proposed conservatory will not make the overlooking situation worse than it already is. It is therefore considered that the potential overlooking from the conservatory will not be significant enough to warrant refusal.

The proposed conservatory will be located approximately 4.4 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property, as a result of this and the size of the conservatory it is considered that its bulk will not have any significant adverse impacts on neighbouring amenities.

Impact on the street scene

The only element of this application that could potentially affect the street scene is the conversion of the integral garage. As the only change to the front of the property will be the addition of a window, where the garage door exists, it is considered that there will be no significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the current street scene.

Impact on highway safety

The proposal involves the loss of a garage and therefore one off road parking space. However space will still exist at the property to park two vehicles off road, as such Wiltshire County Council Highways have made no objections to the proposal.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that the proposed garage conversion and the erection of a conservatory will be appropriate to the overall appearance of this modern property. The proposed development will not have any significant adverse impacts on neighbour amenities or the street scene, and although parking will be lost as a result of the garage conversion, the property will still have enough space to park two vehicles off road.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE**REASON FOR APPROVAL**

It is considered that the proposed garage conversion and conservatory will be appropriate to the overall appearance of the property and will not have any significant adverse impacts on neighbour amenities or the street scene.

And subject to the following CONDITION:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. As amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

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

G2 – General Criteria for Development
D3 – Design
H16 – Housing Policy Boundary

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|-----------------|--------------|
| Application Number: | S/2006/0556 | | |
| Applicant/ Agent: | MR ARNOTT | | |
| Location: | 32 BEAUMONT WAY AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7UA | | |
| Proposal: | CHANGE OF USE OF PRIVATE RESIDENCE TO RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME FOR FOUR ADULTS WITH LEARNING DISABILITY AND GARAGE TO BEDROOM AND ERECT CONSERVATORY | | |
| Parish/ Ward | AMESBURY EAST | | |
| Conservation Area: | LB Grade: | | |
| Date Valid: | 15 March 2006 | Expiry Date: | 10 May 2006 |
| Case Officer: | Miss S Harvey | Contact Number: | 01722 434541 |

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Noeken has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:

- The interest shown in the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

32 Beaumont Way is a modern detached property located on a modern housing estate to the east of Amesbury town centre. The property is located within a Housing Policy Boundary.

THE PROPOSAL

The proposal involves the change of use of the existing private residence to a residential care home, which will house four adults with a learning disability. The proposal also involves the erection of a conservatory to the rear of the property and the conversion of the integral garage into a bedroom.

PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history for the site.

CONSULTATIONS

| | |
|----------------------|--|
| WCC Highways | No Objections – No highway objection is raised, as there is sufficient space for two vehicles to park on site. |
| Environmental Health | No Observations |

REPRESENTATIONS

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Advertisement | No |
| Site Notice displayed | Yes – Expiry 20/04/2006 |
| Departure | No |
| Neighbour notification | Yes – Expiry 06/04/2006 |
| Third Party responses | Yes – several letters received raising the following issues: |

- This type of use is not in keeping with the small residential nature of the estate with close proximity to households with children. The change of use could result in an unpleasant confrontational situation in which children should not be placed, there is also potential for noise at all times night and day.
- The property is unsuitable for being a care home and this change of use will have a detrimental impact on the local house prices.
- Were the premises built for residential purposes and not to be converted to business premises and by allowing people to run a business from the estate, you then open up the opportunity for others to run a business of their choosing.

- The proposed parking for the property will not be sufficient enough for the proposed care home and any increase in traffic would be a safety hazard for children who play in the street. Also after the conversion of the garage, it will be difficult to park two cars off road, at the front of the property.
- There is likely to be an increase in traffic during quiet hours, to address the social and medical needs of people with disabilities.
- The proposal contravenes article 7 of the Schedule of Restrictive Covenants contained within the property's Title Register which states that the purchaser is 'not to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of the property to any Housing Association, Local Authority or other body or organisation providing housing for social, community or charitable purposes'.
- The proposal contravenes article 9 of the Schedule of Restrictive Covenants contained within the property's Title Register which states that the purchaser is 'not at any time to cause, permit or suffer to be done in or on the property, anything which may be cause or become a nuisance or physical damage to the Retained Land or to any owners and occupiers of the Retained Land, other than the normal development of the property.
- Parents currently enjoy the reassurance of knowing that traffic is limited and that the children are unlikely to encounter any 'troubled minds', whilst they play. I know that individuals with this type of disability are capable of saying the most inappropriate things, especially to children, because of their impaired ability to understand and to communicate. As a parent, this is of enormous concern.

Parish Council response Yes – No Objections

MAIN ISSUES

- Principle
- Appropriateness of location
- Impact on road network
- Scale and design
- Impact on residential amenities
- Impact on the street scene
- Other concerns

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP, G2 (General), D3 (Design), PS1 (Community Facilities) and H16 (Housing Policy Boundary).

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

This proposal for a change of use into a residential care home must conform to policy PS1 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan. This policy will allow health and social service development provided such development is located within or adjoining a settlement. This proposal must also conform to policy G2 of the Local Plan, which ensures that developments do not place an undue burden on existing or proposed facilities and services, the existing or proposed local road network or other infrastructure. This policy also ensures that developments do not cause any significant adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

This proposal also involves the erection of a conservatory to the rear and the conversion of the existing integral garage. Small-scale development such as this will be allowed under policy H16 (Housing Policy Boundary) of the Local Plan, provided they conform to the relevant design policy. In this case the design policy relevant is D3, which states that extensions should be of a scale and design that is appropriate to the overall appearance of the property, using complimentary materials. This policy also ensures that developments do not have a significant visual impact on the surrounding area.

Appropriateness of location

There has been increasing emphasis in recent years to integrate people with disabilities into the community by providing accommodation in flats or houses where they can live in a family

atmosphere. This application proposes just this; 32 Beamont Way will be used to house four adults with a learning disability.

The property is located within a modern housing estate to the east of Amesbury Town Centre. The property has easy access to the facilities offered in Amesbury and although the residents will not be able to drive, they will be in walking distance of local shops and there is a local bus service in close proximity. The residents of the proposed care home will have a low dependency and will require only supervision and support from staff, it is considered therefore, that the residents will have some independence and already have access to the community on a daily basis. As a result it is considered that the location of the care home is appropriate, as it will have easy access to all the facilities offered in Amesbury.

There is concern amongst the current residents of Beamont Way that this location is not appropriate for a care home housing adults with a learning disability. Their main reasons for this concern is that the cul-de-sac where the care home will be located is resided by young families with children, they feel that the proposed change of use would place children in an unpleasant confrontational situation. They are also concerned with the potential noise caused by the residents of the care home. However it can be argued that any person who moves into the property could potentially cause excess noise, and could be confrontational towards children playing in the close. The residents of the care home will also be supervised by staff 24 hours a day, this supervision could ensure that residents do not behave inappropriately, something that would not happen if the property were resided by people who are not disabled.

Impact on the local road network

The residents of Beamont Way have raised concern, that the proposed care home will cause a significant increase in the amount of traffic that could have potential safety impacts, with children playing. They also argue that the parking proposed for the care home will not be sufficient and therefore excess vehicles could exacerbate the existing parking problem.

The supporting letter submitted with the application states that none of the residents would be able to drive. The residents will attend day care between the hours of 09:00 and 16:00; it is not clear how the residents will be moved to the day care facility it could be by taxi or they might have to walk to the local bus stop. This means of transport will be finalised by Social Services. Outside of these hours one member of staff will supervise the residents and as a result it is anticipated that only one vehicle will be parked at the property day-to-day. It is true that one off street parking space will be lost due to the conversion of the garage however there will still be sufficient space to park two vehicles off-road. Wiltshire County Council Highways have raised no objections to the proposal, as two spaces will be provided.

It is reasonable for the residents of Beamont Way to be concerned about a possible increase in traffic as a result of the care home. However it is considered that the proposed traffic movements will not increase significantly, with only one vehicle belonging to the member of staff visiting the property daily. There is a possibility of taxis transporting the residents to day care, however it is considered that two taxis daily (one in the morning and one in the evening) will not significantly increase traffic movements. The residents are also concerned about visitors to the proposed care home (e.g. family members and friends) and the increase in traffic this could bring. However it can be argued that visitors to any of the properties in the cul-de-sac could cause an increase in traffic and could exacerbate parking problems.

Scale and design

This proposal also involves the construction of a conservatory to the rear and the conversion of the garage into a bedroom. The proposed garage conversion will only involve a minor change to the appearance of the front of the property, this being the insertion of a window. As a result it is considered that the garage conversion in this case will be appropriate to the overall appearance of the existing dwelling.

The proposed conservatory will be located to the rear of the property and will be approximately 3.3 metres wide, 4.4 metres long and will have a maximum height of approximately 3 metres. The proposed conservatory will consist of a dwarf wall and glazing on the south and west elevations, and will have an approximately 2 metre high wall and glazing on the east elevation. The conservatory will have a glass roof and the brick used in construction of the walls will match the brick used in the existing property. It is considered that this modest conservatory will be

appropriate to the overall appearance of the property, using matching materials, therefore creating a harmonious environment.

Impact on neighbour amenities

It is considered that the window inserted into the front of the existing garage will not cause any significant overlooking, as it will be a significant distance (approximately 20 metres) away from the property opposite.

One letter of objection has been received with regards this application. The occupant of the neighbouring property is concerned that the proposed conservatory will restrict the amount of light entering their property. However, the conservatory will have a glass roof, which will let light pass through to the adjoining property. They are also concerned that the proposed conservatory will overlook their garden and invade their privacy. A relatively high fence divides the two properties, however this fence is constructed in more a picket fence style, rather than being of solid construction, and as such some overlooking is to be expected from both gardens even before the addition of a conservatory. It is considered that the addition of the proposed conservatory will not make the overlooking situation worse than it already is. It is therefore considered that the potential overlooking from the conservatory will not be significant enough to warrant refusal.

The proposed conservatory will be located approximately 4.4 metres from the boundary with the neighbouring property, as a result of this and the size of the conservatory it is considered that its bulk will not have any significant adverse impacts on neighbouring amenities.

Impact on the street scene

The only element of this application that could potentially affect the street scene is the conversion of the integral garage. As the only change to the front of the property will be the addition of a window, where the garage door exists, it is considered that there will be no significant adverse impact on the visual amenities of the current street scene.

Other Concerns

The residents of Beamont Way have raised various other concerns, which are listed below:

1. The proposal contravenes article 7 of the Schedule of Restrictive Covenants contained within the property's Title Register which states that the purchaser is 'not to sell, lease or otherwise dispose of the property to any Housing Association, Local Authority or other body or organisation providing housing for social, community or charitable purposes'.
The proposal contravenes article 9 of the Schedule of Restrictive Covenants contained within the property's Title Register which states that the purchaser is 'not at any time to cause, permit or suffer to be done in or on the property, anything which may be cause or become a nuisance or physical damage to the Retained Land or to any owners and occupiers of the Retained Land, other than the normal development of the property.
Unfortunately concerns about covenants on the property cannot be dealt with under a planning application. This is a civil matter, and if residents feel that covenants have been contravened then they will need to seek advice from a solicitor. There is no condition on the original planning consent for the property restricting the use.
2. Were the premises built for residential purposes and not to be converted to business premises and by allowing people to run a business from the estate, you then open up the opportunity for others to run a business of their choosing.
Each planning application that the Local Authority receives is dealt with on its own merits and allowing this application for a care home will not necessarily mean other businesses will be granted planning consent on the estate.
3. The property is unsuitable for being a care home and this change of use will have a detrimental impact on the local house prices.
Unfortunately impact on local house prices is not a material consideration and as such cannot be considered under a planning application.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that the proposal to change the use of this residential property into a care home for four adults with a learning disability complies with policy PS1 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan. The proposal is located within the settlement of Amesbury, and will house residents with low dependency who will be able to access the community and will be close to local shops and amenities. The proposal will not result in any significant increase in traffic that would exacerbate parking problems or would become a significant hazard to road safety.

It is considered that the proposed garage conversion and conservatory will be appropriate to the overall appearance of the property, and will not have any significant adverse impacts on neighbour amenities or the street scene.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE

REASON FOR APPROVAL

It is considered that the proposal is appropriate to its surrounding area, and will not have any significant impact on highway safety. The proposed garage conversion and conservatory will be appropriate to the overall appearance of the property and will not have any significant adverse impacts on neighbour amenities or the street scene.

And subject to the following CONDITIONS:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. As amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. The premises shall be used as a residential care home only and for no other purposes (including any other purpose within Class C2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification).

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over the use of the premises in the interests of regulating any alternative kinds of residential institutions which could have an adverse effect upon the amenity of neighbouring dwellings.

3. The maximum number of residents in care shall not exceed 4 at any one time.

Reason: In order that the Local Planning Authority may retain planning control over the use of the premises.

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

G2 – General Criteria for Development

D3 – Design

H16 – Housing Policy Boundary

PS1 – Community Facilities

Part 3

Applications recommended for the Observations of the Area Committee

6

| | | | |
|---------------------|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Application Number: | S/2006/0107 | | |
| Applicant/ Agent: | SERCO DEFENCE AND AEROSPACE LTD | | |
| Location: | DSTL PORTON DOWN SALISBURY SP4 0JQ | | |
| Proposal: | DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW OFFICES, DATA CENTRE, FIRE STATION, EXTENSION TO EXISTING RESTAURANT AND ASSOCIATED PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. | | |
| Parish/ Ward | IDMISTON | | |
| Conservation Area: | | LB Grade: | |
| Date Valid: | 16 January 2006 | Expiry Date | 13 March 2006 |
| Case Officer: | Mr A Madge | Contact Number: | 01722 434541 |

Report to follow