

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 28 JUNE 2007

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	Parish/Ward Officer Recommendation Ward Councillors
1	S/2007/0594	SHREWTON
4 - 9	Miss L Flindell	REFUSAL
	FOX GRANT FOX BARN LOWER WOODFORD SALISBURY SP4 6NQ	TILL VALLEY WARD Councillor Mills Councillor West
2	S/2007/1138	ALLINGTON
10 - 12	Mrs S Appleton	REFUSAL
SV	KAREN & KARIS LANE WESSEX LODGE WYNDHAM LANE ALLINGTON SALISBURY	UPPER BOURNE WARD Councillor Hewitt Councillor Wren
3	S/2007/0448	WINTERBOURNE
13 - 15	Mrs E Milton	REFUSAL
	MR RICHARD BRUCE-WHITE BARN TO NORTH OF THE MANOR HOUSE THE PORTWAY WINTERBOURNE GUNNER SALISBURY SP4 6JL	WINTERBOURNE WARD Councillor Hewitt Councillor Wren
4	S/2007/0886	DURRINGTON
16 - 20	Mrs B Jones	REFUSAL
SV	GLEBE DEVELOPMENTS WESSEX LTD FORMER PACKWAY SERVICE STATION THE PACKWAY LARKHILL SALISBURY	DURRINGTON WARD Councillor Ms Broom Councillor Lee Councillor Wright
5	S/2007/0827	FIGHELDEAN
21 - 25	Miss L Flindell	REFUSAL
	MR & MRS J B BALLS ACORN COTTAGE 279 ABLINGTON FIGHELDEAN SALISBURY SP4 8JX	BULFORD WARD Councillor Smale Councillor Spencer

6	S/2007/0828	FIGHELDEAN
26 - 30	Miss L Flindell	REFUSAL
	MR & MRS J B BALLS ACORN COTTAGE 279 ABLINGTON FIGHELDEAN SALISBURY SP4 8JX	BULFORD WARD Councillor Smale Councillor Spencer
7	S/2007/0518	AMESBURY EAST
31 - 52	Mr A Madge	APPROVE SUBJECT TO S106
	NICK HOLMES LEISURE LTD 48 LANGHAM STREET LONDON	AMESBURY EAST WARD Councillor Brown Councillor Noeken

Agenda Item: Highways Act 1980– Section 116 Application Proposed Diversion of Byway 1 and Bridleway 29, Amesbury

Part 1

Applications recommended for Refusal

1

Application Number:	S/2007/0594		
Applicant/ Agent:	DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED		
Location:	CHURCH HOUSE SHREWTON SALISBURY SP3 4JT		
Proposal:	ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING ANCILLARY BUILDING, CONSTRUCTION OF GARAGE, CREATION OF NEW VEHICLE ACCESS		
Parish/ Ward	SHREWTON		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	II
Date Valid:	20 March 2007	Expiry Date	15 May 2007
Case Officer:	Miss L Flindell	Contact Number:	01722 434377

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Mills has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to: the interest shown in the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Church House is a Grade II listed building located within the Housing Policy Boundary of Shrewton. The river Till runs to the west boundary of the site, a part of the River Avon System Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and SSSI. The site is also located within Flood Zone 3. The site is contained by brick, render and flint walling to the roadside, with vehicular access from the north east corner of the site.

THE PROPOSAL

To alter and extend an existing outbuilding to create ancillary living accommodation, the construction of adjoining garages and the creation of a new vehicular access in the south west corner of the site.

PLANNING HISTORY

1985/162	Conversion of outbuilding to granny annex	Withdrawn 05.11/1986
1986/1917	Erection of garden shed	Approved 30/01/1987
2006/2045	Additions and alterations to existing ancillary building and construction of adjoining garages. Creation of new vehicle access	Refused 01/12/2006

REASON FOR REFUSAL:-

(1) The proposed new vehicular access and associated driveway will result in the removal of a Yew Tree and, by reason of its close proximity to another Yew Tree (shown to be retained), could endanger its long-term retention. Both these trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order and the loss of these trees would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and the setting of the listed building. The application would therefore be contrary to policy G1, G2, CN3, CN5, and CN17 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.

]

CONSULTATIONS

Arboricultural Officer - Object. The Yew trees are TPO'd. The applicants state that I was not available to discuss mitigation for the loss of the 2 Yew Trees, this is because the trees are considerable in age and importance, and therefore I believe they should be retained.

WCC Highways –

I confirm the position of this Authority remains as stated in the recommendation for S/2006/2045, that the proposed access is considered to provide an acceptable and safe means of entering and leaving the site, with all vehicles able to enter and leave in a forward gear at a point where visibility is excellent to on-coming traffic, but remains poor for traffic travelling in the non on-coming direction. Because traffic travelling from the north (non on-coming direction) along High Street is travelling relatively slowly through the tight bend, the access is considered, on balance, to be reasonably located.

I further confirm that the existing access is considered significantly less safe due to the TOTAL lack of visibility for emerging vehicles. The applicant may well not be able to improve visibility at the existing access due to planning/conservation and other constraints.

No highway objection is therefore raised.

Recommendation to S/2006/2045:

I met the agent some weeks ago and confirm that I am satisfied that the new access will provide a much improved arrangement than currently exists. Visibility to oncoming traffic is excellent and although visibility to the left (non oncoming direction) is restricted by the sharp bend, traffic is travelling on the opposite side of the carriageway and at slow speed. Therefore, provided all vehicles can enter and leave the site in a forward gear, I feel that the access will be safe and satisfactory. The details show a large area outside the garages, which allow all vehicles to turn. I also note that the existing boundary wall is shown to be slightly set back from its current position, which will also provide some (minor) additional improvement to visibility. I therefore recommend that no highway objection be raised.

SDC Conservation – I would refer you to my previous consultation response:

No objections to this application (the driveway or the extension to the existing 'studio' building). It is a shame that the new opening will break through a lowish stone/flint/brick wall but it does seem to be in a better position. In terms of the details – I am not sure from the drawing what is proposed. I think the second 'layer' is actually the trellis work – but I don't know. I would that we need to know what the new gate piers will be constructed from and clarification about the wall. I would also just confirm that the gates should be wooden vertical plank painted. In terms of the extension (and this is not a curtilage listed structure) I have no objections but would ask that the windows match the existing windows and that the garage doors are side hung wooden. Roof tiles to match existing.

They are of course proposing to block up the existing vehicular access. The drawing shows brick. The brick needs to match the adjacent section of brick and so does the mortar (colour and application).

I am somewhat concerned that there are no elevational drawings of the wall as per the previous application (plan entitled Boundary Wall Details) and even these were short on clear information. I would not be happy with this application being approved without some greater level of detail concerning new sections of wall and the drive entrance.

Natural England – Natural England has not comments further to our previous letter of 31.10.2006:

The application site is in vicinity of the River Avon SAC which means the application must be determined in accordance with the requirements of the Habitat Regulations in particular Regulations 48 and 49. Based on the information provided, Natural England has no objection to the proposed development provided, that is permission is granted, a condition is applied that a method statement be supplied outlining how pollution to the river will be prevented. It is our view that with this condition in place, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, it would not be likely to have a significant effect on the important interest features or the River Avon SAC, or any of the features of special scientific interest of the River Avon System Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Environmental Health – The application site is within the predicted 1 in 100 year flood plain of a statutory main river and the environment agency should be consulted in respect of the flood risk assessment provided by the applicant.

Environment Agency - We have no objection to the proposed development subject to the following conditions and informative being included in any planning permission granted.

Flood Risk

We acknowledge the application has a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) reference 0623/01A dated 28.03.06

The second paragraph within the FRA incorrectly states that 'The site, outlined in red on this E/A plan on the High Street in Shrewton is adjacent to an existing watercourse and is identified as having less than a 0.1% chance of flooding because it is outside the extreme flood risk area.'

The site is within zone 3, an area which has a greater than a 1% chance of flooding.

However, we can confirm that your FRA is considered to meet the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 25 – Development and Flood Risk and that the proposed development is in accordance with the guidance contained therein.

Condition: Floor levels of any habitable accommodation should be set no more than 30mm below the principal ground level within the main house.

Reason: To protect the development from flooding.

Condition: No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until detailed drawings showing the construction as indicated within the FRA has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the approved programme and details

Reason: To ensure the mitigation proposals contained within the FRA are included within the final scheme.

Condition: Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), the annex will be used for use by the occupants of the main house and will not be sub let or used as holiday accommodation

Reason: To prevent intensification of use within the flood plain which would put additional people at risk.

Informative: Under the terms of the Water Resources Act 1991 and the Land Drainage Byelaws, the prior written consent of the Environment Agency is required for any proposed works or structure in, under, over or within 8 metres of the top of the bank of the river Till, designated a 'main river'.

We do not accept liability for the detailed calculations contained in the FRA. This letter does not constitute approval of those calculations nor does it constitute our consent or approval that may be required under any other statutory provision, byelaw, order or regulation. Flood risk cannot be eliminated and is expected to increase over time as a result of climate change and this letter does not absolve the developer of their responsibility to ensure a safe development.

Recommendations

Conservation Designation

The site is located next to national and international conservation designations. Therefore you should consult with Natural England with regard to protection of the designations at this site.

Pollution Prevention

Safeguards should be implemented during the construction phase to minimise the risks of pollution and detrimental effects to the water interests in and around the site. Such safeguards should cover the use of plant and machinery, oils/chemicals and materials; the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles; the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds and the control and removal of spoil and wastes.

Water Efficiency

Water efficiency measures should be incorporated into this scheme. These could include, for example, water butts, rainwater recycling and the use of water efficient internal appliances and systems. It would assist in conserving natural water resources and offer some contingency during times of water shortage. A copy of our publication 'Conserving Water in Buildings' is available upon request.

Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service –Have submitted a letter of recommendations with regard to fire safety measures. This information could be added as an informative to any consent.

Wessex Water – The development is located within a foul sewered 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. This can be agreed at the detailed design stage.

The developer has proposed to dispose of surface water to 'existing'. As there are no existing public/separate surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site, it is advised that the developer

investigate alternative methods for the satisfactory disposal of surface water from the site (eg soakaways). Surface water should not be discharged to the foul sewer. Your Council should be satisfied with any suitable arrangement for the disposal of surface water.

With respect to water supply, there are water mains within the vicinity of the proposal. Again, connection can be agreed at the design stage.

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.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement: Yes, expiry date 19th April 2007
Site Notice displayed: Yes, expiry date 19th April 2007
Departure: No
Neighbour notification: Yes, expiry date 11th April 2007
Third Party responses: None received
Parish Council response: No objections

MAIN ISSUES

Loss of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order and Highway safety
Principle, scale and design, impact to residential amenity, setting of listed building
Flood risk, protected species

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Local Plan policies G1 (sustainable development) G2 (General criteria for development), G4 (Flooding), H16 (Housing Policy Boundary), D3 (development of ancillary outbuildings), H33 (Accommodation for dependent persons), CN3 and CN5 (Listed building), C6 (Development within special landscape area), CN17 (trees covered by Tree Preservation Orders)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Loss of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order and Highway safety

The two yew trees on the south boundary of the site have had a Tree Preservation Order served upon them. These trees occupy a prominent position within the street scene, terminating the view of the site travelling north along the High Street.

The previous 2006 application would have resulted in the loss of one these Yews (because it is situated in the line of the new driveway) and the difference in ground level on each side of the existing retaining wall is significant and the necessary alterations and proximity of the proposed driveway would likely to have caused root damage to the other tree.

The application was refused on the following grounds:

(1) The proposed new vehicular access and associated driveway will result in the removal of a Yew Tree and, by reason of its close proximity to another Yew Tree (shown to be retained), could endanger its long-term retention. Both these trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order and the loss of these trees would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the street scene and the setting of the listed building. The application would therefore be contrary to policy G1, G2, CN3, CN5, and CN17 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.

This application proposes to remove both the trees, since although the applicants have revised the position of the driveway in an attempt to retain the second tree, they cannot demonstrate that the second tree can be retained.

The supporting text to policy CN17 of the local plan states that 'trees are a major contributor to the character and appearance of many parts of the Local Plan area' and that 'The Local Planning Authority is concerned about the loss of amenity trees throughout the District'. Policy G2 of the local plan requires new development to respect existing beneficial landscape features

and avoid the loss of natural features such as trees, which are desirable to retain (criteria iv and v of policy G2).

The Yew Trees are close to the road and make a significant contribution to the visual amenity of the area and street scene (set at the end of the High Street). The loss of the trees would detract from the visual amenity of the area and as such the proposed works should not be permitted unless there are clear and convincing reasons to do so.

The property has an existing gated vehicular access from the northern end of the eastern boundary directly off the High Street.

This application has been submitted in response to the previous refusal, providing additional information that the existing vehicular access is hazardous, with 2m high walls either side of the existing gated access forming the edge of the highway with no footpath and no visibility splay. This results in emerging vehicles projecting well onto the carriageway and obstructing traffic long before any visibility is available.

There is no formal record of any road traffic accidents at this point, although the applicant has included anecdotal evidence with the application confirming concerns from local residents over highway safety.

Wiltshire County Council Highways department has confirmed that they consider that the proposed access is considered to provide an acceptable and safe means of entering and leaving the site, with all vehicles able to enter and leave in a forward gear at a point where visibility is excellent to on-coming traffic, but remains poor for traffic travelling in the non on-coming direction. However, as traffic travelling from the north (non on-coming direction) along High Street is travelling relatively slowly through the tight bend, they have confirmed that the access is considered, on balance, to be reasonably located.

They have also advised that they consider that the existing access is considered significantly less safe due to the total lack of visibility for emerging vehicles.

However, there is a 30mph speed limit along this stretch of road, and combined with the natural speed deterrent of the sharp bend, and the built up nature of the village in this location with houses and walls set to the edge or close to the carriageway, it is unlikely that cars will be travelling at high speeds at this point.

The trees are an important feature and provide significant public amenity value and it is not considered that the improvements to the vehicle access arrangements outweigh the loss of the Trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

The applicants have included details that they intend to plant replacement trees, although it would take many years for replacement trees to make an equivalent contribution to the locality.

Principle, scale and design, impact to residential amenity, setting of listed building

The existing studio building to be converted and extended is situated in the northwest corner of the site. The proposed extension will be at right angles to the existing building with a slightly raised ridge. The existing building will form the annex with living room, bathroom and kitchen at ground floor and stairs to a first floor bedroom with dormer window looking into the site on the east roof slope. The extension at right angles will provide an open carport, double garage with storage area above.

Policy H33 of the local plan is relevant to proposals for accommodation for dependent persons. Criteria iv) refers specifically to conversions of existing buildings within the curtilage of the main dwelling. The proposed ancillary living accommodation will be formed principally from the conversion of the existing structure, although the kitchen will be new build, forming the corner of the building with carport and garage section attached to the east. Subject to a restrictive occupancy condition, it is considered that the principle of conversion and small extension of the existing building to form ancillary living accommodation is acceptable.

The accommodation will be adjacent to a Public House to the north of the site although will be separated and contained by the proposed extension at right angles. As such it is not considered that the use of this accommodation as ancillary to the main house will suffer significant disturbance from the adjacent commercial premises.

No windows are proposed at first floor on the west roofslope, and it is proposed to add a 1.8m high fence to the west boundary screening the ground floor kitchen and bathroom windows. It is not considered that the use of the proposed driveway running to the west boundary of the site will adversely affect the privacy and enjoyment of the garden of Brookside to the west of the site. Subject to a condition requiring details/landscaping plan for the west boundary of the site (there is existing planting) and restricting additional windows being added to the west roofslope of the building, it is not considered that residential amenity of Brookside will be significantly adversely affected.

The Conservation Officer has raised no objections to the proposed extensions/alterations and it is considered that subject to conditioning materials and restricting use and additional windows, that residential amenity to surrounding dwellings and the setting of the listed building will be preserved.

Flood risk, protected species

The site is located within a Floodplain. The applicant has provided a Flood Risk Assessment to which the Environment Agency has raised no objections subject to conditions.

Concern has also been raised with regard to the impact that the proposed driveway will have upon the stability of the bank to the adjacent watercourse. The agent has suggested that these concerns could be overcome via a condition requiring more details on the method of construction of the driveway.

The site is adjacent to the river Till a part of the River Avon System Special Area of Conservation and SSSI. Concerns have been raised to the potential pollution to the river. Natural England has raised no objections to the application subject to a condition requiring a method statement to be provided.

CONCLUSION

The proposed alterations and extensions are considered appropriate to the overall appearance of the site without harm to the setting or character or appearance of the Listed building. On balance WCC Highways have recommended that the proposed vehicular access is an improvement on the existing. However, the proposal involves the creation of a new vehicular access/driveway, which will result in the removal of Yew Trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order, which form a considerable visual amenity within the street scene.

It is not considered that the improvements to the vehicle access arrangements outweigh the loss of the Trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed new vehicular access and associated driveway will result in the removal of two Yew Trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order. The trees are in a prominent position and make a significant contribution to the visual amenity of the area and street scene. The loss of these trees would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area, street scene and the setting of the listed building. The application would therefore be contrary to policies G1, G2, CN3, CN5, and CN17 of the Salisbury District Local Plan.

Application Number:	S/2007/1138		
Applicant/ Agent:	KAREN & KARIS LANE		
Location:	WESSEX LODGE WYNDHAM LANE ALLINGTON SALISBURY SP4 0BY		
Proposal:	WESSEX LODGE WYNDHAM LANE ALLINGTON SALISBURY SP4 0BY PROPOSED SINGLE GARAGE WITH INTERNAL STORAGE AREA FOR DISABLED EQUIPMENT		
Parish/ Ward	ALLINGTON		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	4 June 2007	Expiry Date	30 July 2007
Case Officer:	Mrs S Appleton	Contact Number:	01722 434541

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Hewitt has requested that this application be considered by the Northern Area Committee for reason of local interest

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Wessex Lodge is a detached bungalow located within a Housing Policy Boundary in the village of Allington, to the north of Salisbury.

THE PROPOSAL

The proposal involves the erection of a detached garage to the front (south west) of the existing dwelling.

PLANNING HISTORY

S/2007/1137 – Retrospective application for: erection of 1.3 metre high fence to the front of the property – current application awaiting decision.

S/2007/0835 – Single storey extension – current application awaiting decision

S/2007/0668 – Proposed new garage to house motability vehicle and disabled equipment – W/D 23/05/2007

CONSULTATIONS

Please note that at the time of writing this report, the application was still within the public consultation period, which expires on 05 July 2007. All consultation responses received before the date of the committee will be included in late correspondence.

WCC Highways

No response at the time of writing this report

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement:	No
Site Notice displayed:	Yes – Expiry 05/07/2007
Departure:	No
Neighbour notification:	Yes – Expiry 27/06/2007
Third Party responses:	None at the time of writing this report
Parish Council response:	None at the time of writing this report

MAIN ISSUES

Principle

Northern Area Committee 28/06/2007

Scale, design and impact on the visual amenities of the street scene
Impact on neighbour amenities
Other Issues

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, G2 (General), H16 (Housing Policy Boundary), D3 (Design) and C6 (Special Landscape Area).

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

This detached bungalow is located within a Housing Policy Boundary in the village of Allington. As a result, small-scale developments will be acceptable provided they conform to the relevant design policy. In this case, the design policy relevant is D3, which states that developments should be of a scale and design that is appropriate to the overall appearance of the existing dwelling, using complementary materials. This policy also states that developments should be carefully integrated in relation to other properties and the overall landscape framework. Policy G2 is a general policy that ensures developments do not have any significant adverse impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties.

The dwelling is also located within a Special Landscape Area and as such, policy C6 applies. This policy states that the siting and scale of development should be sympathetic with the landscape.

Scale, design and impact on the visual amenities of the street scene

The proposed garage will be located approximately 8.9 metres to the south west (front) of the existing bungalow. The garage will be approximately 4.7 metres wide, approximately 5.6 metres long and will have a pitched roof with a maximum height of approximately 3.3 metres (all measurements taken from the submitted drawings). The garage will be constructed from brick for the walls and concrete tiles for the roof, both of which will match the materials used in the existing dwelling. The garage will also include an up and over garage door along with a personal side door (both white in colour) on its north eastern elevation.

The proposed scale and design of the garage, along with the materials used is considered appropriate to the overall appearance of the existing dwelling. However there are concerns over the potential impact the garage may have on the visual amenities of the street scene.

The area to the north east of Wyndham Lane is characterised by modern detached dwellings, both bungalows and houses built to similar designs in a linear form of development. The new residential development of Bishops Reach is located to the south west of Wyndham Lane. The proposed garage will occupy a prominent position on the grassed area to the front of the property, set back approximately 2 metres from the front boundary. In this part of Wyndham Lane, there are no other structures sited forward of the properties themselves and as a result, it is considered that the garage will look out of place in its proposed location and would therefore be unduly prominent in the street scene to the detriment of the overall appearance of the surrounding area.

The proposed garage would, to some extent be partially screened by the existing boundary fence on the site and the applicant has also included some landscaping which will further screen the garage. However, there is no guarantee that the existing fence will remain in place, as it has been erected without planning consent (it is over 1 metre in height next to a highway used by vehicles). An application for retrospective planning consent was submitted on 4 June 2007 and although the application is in the early stages of the planning process, there are concerns on the overall appearance of the fence its potential visual impact on the surrounding area. Notwithstanding this, even if the fence were to be approved, it is only 1.3 metres in height, the proposed garage would exceed this by approximately 2 metres and it is considered that although the proposed planting would reduce the impact the garage would have on the street scene, the garage would still represent an undesirable development forward of the dwelling,

which would ultimately be unduly dominant within the street scene. The approval of this application would also set an undesirable precedent for similar developments in the immediate surrounding area.

It is considered that the proposal would introduce a new structure to the sites frontage, which is of a scene out of keeping with the local character and pattern of development, contrary to policies D3, H16 and C6 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

Impact on neighbour amenities

The proposed garage will not include any fenestration that has the potential to overlook the neighbouring dwellings and as a result, the proposal will not cause any overlooking. The proposed garage will also only affect the front garden of the neighbouring property, and due to its scale, it is considered that it will not cause any significant overbearing/overshadowing.

Other issues

The planning officer is aware that the reason for this development is to store a motability vehicle and disabled equipment used by a disabled occupant of the dwelling. This equipment is currently stored in an existing garage to the side of the dwelling. However, application number S/2007/0835 for the erection of a single storey extension replaces this existing garage. This proposed extension is likely to be acceptable to the Local Planning Authority and a meeting has been arranged with the agent currently dealing with the extension application to explore an alternative design that meets the needs of the occupant but allows for a garage which is not forward of the house.

CONCLUSION

The proposed garage due to its siting forward of the dwelling, would be unduly prominent in the street scene to the detriment of the overall appearance and character of the existing dwelling, the street scene and the area as a whole, contrary to policies H16 (iv), D3 (ii) and C6 (i) of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed garage due to its siting forward of the dwelling, would be unduly prominent in the street scene to the detriment of the overall appearance and character of the existing dwelling, the street scene and the area as a whole, contrary to policies H16 (iv), D3 (ii) and C6 (I) of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.
2. Contrary to the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:
H16 (iv) - Housing Policy Boundary
D3 (ii) - Design
C6 - Special Landscapae Area

Application Number:	S/2007/0448		
Applicant/ Agent:	MR RICHARD BRUCE-WHITE		
Location:	BARN TO NORTH OF THE MANOR HOUSE THE PORTWAY WINTERBOURNE GUNNER SALISBURY SP4 6JL		
Proposal:	DEMOLISH PARTIALLY COLLAPSED GRADE II LISTED BARN AND ATTACHED STORES		
Parish/ Ward	WINTERBOURNE		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	27 February 2007	Expiry Date	24 April 2007
Case Officer:	Mrs E Milton	Contact Number:	01722 434313

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

HDS does not consider it prudent to exercise delegated powers.

This application for listed building consent is being brought to committee due to the interest shown in the application and the controversial nature of the application.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Manor Farm is situated on the southern side of the Portway in Winterbourne Gunner. The farm complex consists of the farmhouse, the barn (and attached stores) to the north of the farmhouse, a small granary, and a large granary (mostly collapsed).

The barn, which is the subject of this application, was added to the Statutory List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest as a Grade II listed building on 29 May 1987, together with the farmhouse, large granary and small granary. The buildings are noted in the listing for their group value.

The large granary partly collapsed several years' ago, and the owner was successful in having the building delisted in May 2002.

The barn in question, which dates from the early to mid-seventeenth century, is timber framed and weatherboarded, and has a thatched roof (although this has mostly collapsed). According to the owner, the last real use for the barn was as a milking shed in the 1930s, and since then it has only ever been used for low-level storage.

THE PROPOSAL

Approximately three-fifths of the barn collapsed in November 2005. This application is for the demolition of the remaining two-fifths.

PLANNING HISTORY

A chronology of events relating to the barn, and the past resolutions of the Northern Area Committee is given in the table in Appendix 1.

An application was made for the demolition of the barn in 2004, and this was subsequently refused as being contrary to the guidance in PPG15 and the local plan policy.

The most recent decision relates to the resolution by the Northern Area Committee in March 2006 not to pursue urgent works or enforcement action following the collapse of part of the barn in November 2005. However, the owner was later found guilty of the wilful destruction of the barn in the Magistrates' Court in October 2006, and was fined £12,000 plus £2,500 in costs.

CONSULTATIONS

English Heritage - "The justification for the proposals in the submission is solely based on photographs and brief description however there is no information on the significance and condition of the timbers or alternative schemes for the building. We do not consider that the application contains sufficient justification for demolition of this listed building".

The Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings - "The Society feels extremely strongly that this application should not be approved. Supporting documents mention the barn's poor condition, but not the regrettable circumstances that led to this. It states that the building would be impractical to repair, but there is no detailed assessment of surviving fabric. Two bays stand, and it is often the case with timber framed buildings that historic timbers are more durable than first appears and can be reassembled (with repairs and supplementary timbers where necessary)...The Society would be willing to assist your authority with an assessment of the condition of surviving timbers".

Ancient Monuments Society - "(a structural survey) would nevertheless be useful in highlighting what if any of the fallen timbers might be capable of reconstruction and which of those still standing can be retained...We would welcome the comfort of a day's assessment by a conservation architect or surveyor before there was acquiescence in complete destruction".

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement:	Yes - Expired 29.3.07
Site Notice displayed:	Yes - Expired 29.3.07
Departure:	No
Neighbour notification:	Yes - Expired 22.3.07
Third Party responses:	None received
Parish Council response:	None received

Salisbury Civic Society - "While it may be difficult to see how the barn can ever be returned to its original form, the details of the story leading to its current state are such that it is very hard to accept the applicant's contention that permission should be given for it to be swept away completely. We must therefore register an objection in principle to the loss of a listed building".

MAIN ISSUES

The loss of a listed building, and the effect on the conservation area.

POLICY CONTEXT

Policy CN1 (demolition of listed buildings) and CN9 (demolition of buildings in conservation areas) of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The government advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 15: Planning and the Historic Environment is that an application for the demolition of a listed building needs to be considered in the context of the criteria set out in paragraph 3.19. These are: i) the condition of the building, and the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance and to the value derived from its continued use; ii) the adequacy of efforts made to retain the building in use; iii) the merits of alternative proposals for the site.

The criteria are considered in relation to the barn in question as follows:

i) The condition of the building, and the cost of repairing and maintaining it in relation to its importance and to the value derived from its continued use:

The applicant does not supply any form of structural assessment which identifies whether the barn is capable of reconstruction, nor has he provided any information regarding the potential cost implications of this. Nor has the applicant explained whether he has made any recent

enquiries as to whether grant aid may be available to assist with the reconstruction of the building. The applicant has not suggested that a viable use could be found for the barn if it were restored. The proposals, therefore, fail to be justified by assessment against this criterion.

ii) The adequacy of efforts made to retain the building in use:

The applicant does not provide any information regarding attempts to find alternative uses for the building.

iii) The merits of alternative proposals for the site:

There are no alternative proposals being made for the site at the present time.

On the basis of the above criteria, it would appear that the applicant has not adequately justified the demolition of the listed building.

The application refers to the adverse impact that the building currently has on the conservation area, however, this is as a result of the applicant's neglect and unauthorised work to the listed building.

As mentioned previously, the building is Grade II listed and contributes to the group value of the historic farmstead. The large granary has already collapsed and was subsequently delisted, and this has undermined the group. Clearly, the removal of the barn in question would diminish the group value of the site yet further.

CONCLUSION

The building, being timber framed could possibly be reassembled. Since no evidence of any assessment with regards to the feasibility of reconstruction has been provided, it is not possible to come to any conclusion about this.

The case for complete demolition, and subsequent loss of this historic asset and resultant diminution of group value, has not been made. Demolition of the listed building would only be justified if it were proven that the barn was incapable of reconstruction, or that the cost would be so high as to be disproportionate to the significance or value of it after reconstruction. The total removal of the listed building, therefore, would be contrary to the advice in PPG15 and Policy CN1 of the local plan.

An insufficient case has been made regarding the demolition of the building in the context of the conservation area.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Reasons for Refusal

1. The case for the demolition of the listed building and building in the conservation area has not been made, and therefore the loss of a historic asset, and a significant building within the traditional farm complex and the conservation area has not been adequately justified. This would be contrary to the advice contained in PPG15, and Policies CN1 and CN9 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

(N.B. It should be noted that if Members are minded to approve this application, that, under the terms of the legislation, it must be referred to the Government Office for the South West for determination because it involves the total demolition of a listed building.)

Application Number:	S/2007/0886		
Applicant/ Agent:	JOHN A GOLDFINCH		
Location:	FORMER PACKWAY SERVICE STATION THE PACKWAY LARKHILL SALISBURY		
Proposal:	ERECTION OF 4 TWO-BEDROOM & 10 ONE-BEDROOM FLATS WITH OFF ROAD PARKING FOLLOWING REMOVAL OF EXISTING GARAGE WORKSHOP/OFFICE BUILDING & FORECOURT CANOPY		
Parish/ Ward	DURRINGTON		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	26 April 2007	Expiry Date	21 June 2007
Case Officer:	Mrs B Jones	Contact Number:	01722 434388

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Wright and Cllr Broom have requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:
the local interest shown in the application.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site is the former Packway Service Station at Larkhill. To the north is an existing belt of mature trees and wide grass verge, and to the south is the remainder of the forecourt area, canopy and station buildings. To the south is Howard Vyse Road and to the east is Lightfoot Road, both of which comprise linear arrangements of terraced and semi detached dwellings. Existing residential development in the vicinity is characteristically two storey, set back from the road edge behind wide grass verges in perpendicular arrangements, with rear gardens centred around parking "courtyards".

The site lies within the Larkhill Military Garrison and Stonehenge World Heritage Site.

THE PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking to demolish the remains of the station, and erect ten one bed flats and four two bed flats, in two separate two and two and a half storey buildings erected in the south and east quadrants of the site.

The building line of the development would be kept broadly level with the existing building line fronting The Packway, with a wall provided to the north to separate a car parking area from the remainder of the site, which would be kept open. Further parking would be provided to the south along Howard Vyse Road and a new footpath is proposed along the south and east boundaries. Flats 1-4, 9 and 10 would be provided with amenity space in the centre of the site, along with two communal bin stores to the west next to the link path.

PLANNING HISTORY:

1984/589 Workshop and stores with ancillary living accommodation over AC

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways: **No objection** subject to condition requiring a footpath along Lightfoot Road. see below.
Environment Agency: **No objection** subject to conditions relating to groundwater and contamination, and water efficiency
Forward Planning: **No Objection** on grounds of loss of employment site; full comments awaited.
Housing & Health Officer: **No observations**

Wessex Water Authority: Not in a Wessex Water sewered area. Assume barracks is served by a private system. Points of connection and any easements would need to be agreed.

Design Officer: **Objection** see Appendix 1

Defence Estates: **No safeguarding objections**

Tree Officer: Arboricultural Method Statement required as a condition, including protective fencing.

Archaeology: See below – condition to secure programme of archaeological work required.

Waste and Recycling: Awaited

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement: Yes Expiry 7/6/07

Site Notice displayed: Yes Expiry 7/6/07

Departure: No

Neighbour notification: Yes Expiry 23/5/07

Third Party responses: Yes **Two letters of objection** on the following grounds:

Too many flats and too close to Howard Vyse Road (HVR) properties, loss of daylight, gable end of 3 storey building would be just 20m away, overlooking, No 4 HVR already has gable end of No 8 HVR, proximity of bin stores, question need for low cost accommodation, impact of dense development on area, overlooking into bedrooms, disruption during construction, increase in litter, social issues will arise, local population have not been consulted by Defence Estates.

Parish Council No objections

MAIN ISSUES

Principle and new Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing)

Loss of Employment

Scale and Design, Impact on Amenities

Contamination and Environmental Health issues

Highway Safety

Archaeology and Trees

Public Open Space

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan G2, E16, D2, R2, TR11, TR14, CN24, G12, G13

The guidance in Creating Places, PPS1 and PPS3.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle and New Planning Policy Statement 3 (Housing)

The site lies within an existing military garrison, in an Area of Special Archaeological Significance, and within the Stonehenge World Heritage Site. The development is therefore acceptable in principle under Policy G12 and G13, subject to the other policy provisions of the local plan.

PPS3 was published in November 2006, and sets out the Government's current policy stance on housing development. It gives a new national indicative minimum site threshold of 15 units for affordable housing provision and the proposal is therefore just under this threshold.

PPS3 seeks to ensure a wide choice of high quality homes, improve affordability and increase supply, through sustainable mixed communities. It sets out the criteria to consider when assessing design quality as the extent to which the development:

- Is easily accessible and well connected to public transport and community facilities and services and is well laid out
- Provides or enable good access to amenity space

- Is well integrated with and compliments neighbouring buildings and the local area in terms of density, scale, layout and access
- Facilitates efficient use of resources during construction and in use
- Takes a design led approach to the provision of car parking space, with a high quality public realm
- Creates a distinctive character and supports a sense of local pride and civic identity
- Provides for biodiversity.

PPS1 and PPS3 state that good design should contribute positively to making places better for people. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions should not be accepted. High quality and inclusive design should create well mixed and integrated developments, and have well planned public spaces that bring people together and provide opportunities for physical activity and recreation. It means ensuring a place will function well and add to the overall character and quality of the area.

PPS3 also places a much greater emphasis on the need for development to be well integrated with and complementing neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access, and to provide or enable good access to private outdoor space such as residential gardens patios and balconies. Para 17 goes on to say, "Particularly where family housing is proposed, it will be important to ensure that the needs of children are taken into account and that there is good provision of recreational areas including private gardens." Members may feel that this would at least apply to the two bedroom flats.

Loss of Employment

Policy E16 states that on existing employment land, the redevelopment of premises for other purposes will only be permitted where, "The proposed development is an acceptable alternative use that provides a similar number and range of job opportunities." The only exceptions are where the land or premises are a non employment use that would bring improvements to the local environment. The applicant has submitted evidence to demonstrate that the site would no longer be viable for an employment generating use, following a 6 month marketing exercise in May 2006. A full report has been submitted by the commercial agents, stating that in their view, the property is obsolete in economic terms for a modern commercial business, and that the marketing demonstrated that planning uses outside the scope of the existing use have not yielded positive interest in the property. In this particular case, due to contamination issues, it is also considered that the proposed residential development would bring benefits to the local environment. The proposal is therefore considered to comply with Policy E16.

Scale and Design and Impact on Amenities.

Policy D2 sets out the criteria for infill development, which will be permitted where proposals respect or enhance the character or appearance of an area in terms of the building line, scale, heights and massing of adjoining buildings and characteristic plot widths the architectural characteristics and type and colour of materials of adjoining buildings the complexity and richness of materials, form and detailing of existing buildings.

The design policies of the adopted Local Plan have been reinforced by the recent adoption of Creating Places as supplementary design guidance. The comments of the Design Officer and response from the applicant are attached in **Appendix 1**.

The proposed design of the two buildings is considered to be acceptable in terms of the physical appearance and detailing of the individual structures. However, the scale, interrelationship, massing and siting of the development has raised a number of issues of concern.

The 8m high west flank wall of Flat 1&5 would be about 10 metres away from the front / east facing elevations of 4 and 6 Howard Vyse Road. The distance between front elevations of dwellings in the vicinity of the site (Alanbrooke Road, Lightfoot Road and HVR) ranges between 25m and 40m. The development is therefore considered to create an undesirably close relationship, which is uncharacteristic of the area, could affect light levels reaching the main elevations of Nos 4 and 6, and may result in the development appearing unduly dominant from their main windows.

The 8.5m flank wall of Flat 9, 11 and 13 would be just under 4m away from the ground (living and kitchen) and first floor windows (beds) of Flats 1,2,7 and 8. This is likely to result in an undesirable environment for occupiers, given that these windows are already north facing. Limited amenity space is provided for Flats 1-4, measuring some 4m by 5m, but being north facing, with two of the gardens flanked by an 8.5m wall and the remaining two being overlooked at close range by the first floor living/kitchen windows of Flats 9 and 10. Therefore, these gardens are likely to be of an unsatisfactory standard (see PPS3 above).

The Design officer has raised concerns about conflict between the 8 parking spaces accessed from Howard Vyse Road, and the proposed new footpath. (Please refer to Appendix 1). The provision of parking along the north wall would also be uncharacteristic of other nearby residential development facing onto the Packway, which is separated by wide grass verges and boundary walls. However, this is not considered to be a sufficient ground for refusal on its own, as the path could be deleted from the scheme (see Highway Safety below).

The proposal is therefore considered to result in overdevelopment of the site, which would create a cramped form of development, out of keeping with the character of area, and likely to result in undue harm to the amenities of the existing occupiers of 4 and 6 Howard Vyse Road, and future occupiers of the Flats, contrary to Policy G2, D2 and the guidance in PPS3.

Refuse, Recycling, Contamination and Environmental Health Issues

Two bin stores are proposed close to the western boundary of the site. Comments from the recycling officer are awaited. However, the EHO has no observations regarding the proposal. The Environment Agency have no objections to the development, subject to a condition requiring the applicant to submit a scheme to deal with the risks associated with the contamination of the site. A water efficiency scheme should also be provided.

Highway Safety

The Highway Authority has no objection in principle regarding the proposal, but has requested a condition to ensure that a footway of 1.35m is constructed along the Lightfoot Road frontage. Given the Design Officer's concerns regarding the footway along Howard Vyse Road, it is recommended that this part of the scheme is deleted, if Members are minded to grant consent for the development.

Public Open Space

The applicant has signed but not yet completed a Section 106 Agreement in respect of Policy R2. The relevant commuted payment would normally be due within the 13 week period for the major application, and this should form part of any subsequent recommendation for approval by the committee.

Trees, Archaeology and Impact on World Heritage Site.

The site, which lies south of The Packway, is designated as part of the Stonehenge World Heritage Site. Policy CN24 states that development that would adversely affect the archaeological landscape of the SWHS or the fabric or setting of its monuments, will not be permitted. The County Archaeologist suggests that a group of Bronze Age barrows were identified in the area and the most northerly of the group is about 100m south of the proposal, although its exact location is unknown. On this basis, there is potential that the barrow could be located on the site, but that the site has been disturbed. Therefore, the archaeologist recommends that a watching brief takes place during the initial stages of construction in accordance with a written scheme of investigation.

The tree officer has raised no objection, subject to conditions requiring submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement, including protective tree fencing.

CONCLUSION

Whilst the proposal to provide new residential development on the former service station site in Larkhill is acceptable in principle, the development, by virtue of its density, layout and massing would be uncharacteristic of the existing spacious layout of the area and is likely to create a living environment which would have an adverse impact on the amenities of existing and future occupiers.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Reasons for Refusal

1. The development would comprise fourteen flats, with six amenity spaces and parking areas to the north and south. By virtue of its siting, density, layout and massing, the development would be uncharacteristic of the spacious layout of existing residential development in the locality and is likely to create a living environment which would adversely affect the amenities of the existing occupiers of 4 and 6 Howard Vyse Road and the future occupiers of the flats. The development would therefore be contrary to Policy G2 and D2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, and the guidance in PPS1 and PPS3.
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.

And contrary to the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

Policy G2	General Principles for Development
Policy D2	Design
Policy R2	Public Open Space

And the guidance in Creating Places, PPS3 and PPS1.

1. 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.

Application Number:	S/2007/0827		
Applicant/ Agent:	DAMEN ASSOCIATES		
Location:	ACORN COTTAGE 279 ABLINGTON FIGHELDEAN SALISBURY WILTSHIRE SP4 8JX		
Proposal:	SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO NW & NE ELEVATIONS GARDEN WALL LINK TO ANNEXE		
Parish/ Ward	FIGHELDEAN		
Conservation Area:	FIGHELDEAN	LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	23 April 2007	Expiry Date	18 June 2007
Case Officer:	Miss L Flindell	Contact Number:	01722 434377

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Smale has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to: the controversial nature of the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

No 279 Ablington is a semi detached two storey-thatched grade II listed property within the Special Restraint Area and Conservation Area of Ablington.

The property was extended in 1998 with a two storey side extension. An existing garage was converted and extended into ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling under S/2004/623. There is currently gravelled parking in front of and between the converted garage and extension. The garden extends at the rear to a lane accessing other dwellings in Ablington.

THE PROPOSAL

To extend the property at the rear of the two storey extension (to form a ground floor lounge), porch extension to the side and a garden wall linking the detached annexe and the main building)

PLANNING HISTORY

92/0713	Erection of detached garage & construction of access	R	30.07.92
92/0714LB	Erection of detached garage & construction of access	R	30.07.92
93/0756	Erection of detached garage & construction of drive & vehicular access	AC	16.07.93
93/0757LB	Erection of detached garage & construction of drive & vehicular access	AC	16.07.93
98/0793	Two storey extension	AC	06.07.98
98/794LB	Two storey extension	AC	06.07.98
00/1611	Re-paint existing to match new extension in Farrow & Ball colour lime white.	R	17.10.00
04/0617	LBW Conversion of garage to domestic accommodation. Extension at rear of garage LBC not required	WD	27.04.2004
2004/623 annexe"	Conversion and extension of garage to provide "granny annexe"	AC	13.05.2004

New windows should match those on the original cottage (single pane window design is not in keeping with the existing multipaned windows).
Proposed glazing exceeds building regulations
Access to kitchen is only impeded as the owners have moved the original access from the rear of the kitchen to its present position
The original cottage has a rear entrance/hall providing access to the house without stepping directly into the lounge or dining room.
Rendering the lobby will compete with the existing brick and flint gable wall
The original cottage was extended in 1998.
The depth of the extension should not exceed 1/3rd of the frontage of the building.
Overdevelopment of a listed building which has previously been extended
The character of the listed building is adversely affected by the proposals
References to other development in vicinity of site are incorrect/difference between these sites and the application site

Two letters from applicant in response to representations/objecting to inconsistent and misleading advice, summarised as follows:
Sufficient space will be retained for 3-4 cars
Plans have been adjusted in light of advice from the conservation officer and planning office following meetings and pre-application drawings
A separate application has been submitted for additional parking to the rear of the site (S/2007/950)

Parish Council response None received

MAIN ISSUES

Principle, impact upon setting of/listed building, conservation area, Special Restraint Area, residential amenity and highway safety/parking

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP G2 (General), C6 (SLA), H21 (extensions to dwellings in Special Restraint Area), CN8 (Development in Conservation Areas), CN3 & CN5 (Listed Buildings), D3 (extensions) PPG 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The Grade II listed building is located within a sensitive area designated as a Special Restraint Area and Conservation Area.

The listed building policies CN3 and CN5 require that development within or outside of the curtilage of a listed building will only be permitted where it does not harm the character or setting of the building. Policy D3 of the local plan requires extensions to existing properties to be compatible in terms of the scale, design and character of the existing property and use of complementary materials.

Policy H21 of the Local plan applies to extensions to dwelling within SRA's. Although there is no set limit (as a % of total floor area) on how much a dwelling may be increased in size, policy H21 refers to extensions to be of small scale and subservient to the dwelling to which they relate. The policy states proposals will not be permitted that would result in the character of the dwelling being lost through successive extensions.

PPG 15 states that many Grade II buildings are of humble and once common building types and have been listed precisely because they are relatively unaltered examples of a particular building type; that Local Planning Authorities should attempt to retain the characteristics of distinct types of building and modern extensions should not dominate the existing building in either scale, material or situation. Thatched cottages of linear form typify Ablington.

Planning permission and listed building consent applications for extensions to the dwelling have previously been refused for extensions to the dwelling (the reasons are given above).

The existing cottage has a small scale and simple linear character, which is important to retain in accordance with the listed building, conservation and housing restraint policies of the local plan.

The application is a result of pre-application discussions following the previous refusals. During these discussions it was suggested (without prejudice to any formal decision taken in respect of development of the above site) that an extension should be more transparent so as not to create such a solid extension on the building. A scheme was drawn up which proposed more glazing than now proposed, but this was amended as building regulations were changed in 2006 reducing permissible glazing.

The proposed lounge extension has been reduced in size from the previously refused scheme, but it is still very solid, which taken in combination with its projection from the rear of the cottage will project out disproportionately from the rear of the cottage and is considered to be out of scale and character with the original linear form of the cottage.

The applicant has made reference to extensions and outbuildings, which have been permitted on other sites in Ablington. Planning applications are judged on their own merits against the relevant policies of the Salisbury District Local Plan. This property has already been considerably extended in the past and this degree of further extension is considered to result in a detrimental cumulative effect.

There is close boarded fencing to the boundary with the adjoining dwelling and as such it is not considered that residential amenity through overlooking from an extension projecting into the rear garden will have an adverse impact upon residential amenity.

A simple lean to lobby extension is also proposed on the side elevation of the 1998 extension with solid wall to the rear joining onto the sidewall of the annex.

Objections have been raised that the proposed wall linking the lobby/main house to the annex will have the same visual impact as the previously refused linkway extension, which was refused on the grounds that the gap between the 1998 extension and annex should be retained in order to preserve the form of the original cottage.

The previous linkway extension formed a usable hallway space and was glazed to the front elevation under a pitched roof and dominated the front elevation of the house and was out of character with the simplicity of the existing house. The proposed 1.9m high wall (as scaled from the submitted plan) is of a simple design (rendered above brick plinth with tile creasing and rendered brick coping), does not compete with the main house and is considered to be acceptable to the overall appearance of the dwelling and site.

Condition 6 of the 2004 annex approval states that the parking area between the annex and the existing dwelling shall be retained for parking of vehicles in perpetuity for the reason to ensure that the site is provided with adequate facilities for the parking of vehicles. The proposed lobby extension will be built across some of this gravelled parking area, and concerns/objections have been raised on the grounds of loss of parking.

However, sufficient space remains on the site for two cars to park clear of the highway on the premises (two 2.4m x 5m spaces in accordance with appendix V of the Adopted Local Plan). Any obstruction to the public highway is dealt with under separate legislation.

It is considered that the scale and design of the proposed lobby will not compete with the existing building.

CONCLUSION

The proposed rear extension by reason of its overall scale and built form will have an adverse impact upon the historic form and small scale, simple linear character of the Grade II listed building and as such will have an adverse impact to the Conservation Area and Special Restraint Area of Ablington, contrary to policies CN3, CN5, CN8 H21 and D3 of the Adopted Local Plan and guidance contained within PPG 15.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL

Reasons for Refusal

(1) The proposed rear extension by reason of its overall scale and built form will have an adverse impact upon the historic form and small scale, simple linear character of the Grade II listed building and as such will have an adverse impact to the Conservation Area and Special Restraint Area of Ablington, contrary to policies CN3, CN5, CN8 H21 and D3 of the Adopted Local Plan and guidance contained within PPG 15.

Application Number:	S/2007/0828		
Applicant/ Agent:	DAMEN ASSOCIATES		
Location:	ACORN COTTAGE 279 ABLINGTON FIGHELDEAN SALISBURY WILTSHIRE SP4 8JX		
Proposal:	SINGLE STOREY EXTENSIONS TO NW & NE ELEVATIONS GARDEN WALL LINK TO ANNEXE		
Parish/ Ward	FIGHELDEAN		
Conservation Area:	FIGHELDEAN	LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	23 April 2007	Expiry Date	18 June 2007
Case Officer:	Miss L Flindell	Contact Number:	01722 434377

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Smale has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to: the controversial nature of the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

No 279 Ablington is a semi detached two storey-thatched grade II listed property within the Special Restraint Area and Conservation Area of Ablington.

The property was extended in 1998 with a two storey side extension. An existing garage was converted and extended into ancillary accommodation to the main dwelling under S/2004/623. There is currently gravelled parking in front of and between the converted garage and extension. The garden extends at the rear to a lane accessing other dwellings in Ablington.

THE PROPOSAL

To extend the property at the rear of the two storey extension (to form a ground floor lounge), porch extension to the side and a garden wall linking the detached annex and the main building)

PLANNING HISTORY

92/0713	Erection of detached garage & construction of access	R	30.07.92
92/0714LB	Erection of detached garage & construction of access	R	30.07.92
93/0756	Erection of detached garage & construction of drive & vehicular access	AC	16.07.93
93/0757LB	Erection of detached garage & construction of drive & vehicular access	AC	16.07.93
98/0793	Two storey extension	AC	06.07.98
98/794LB	Two storey extension	AC	06.07.98
00/1611	Re-paint existing to match new extension in Farrow & Ball colour lime white.	R	17.10.00
04/0617	LBW Conversion of garage to domestic accommodation. Extension at rear of garage LBC not required	WD	27.04.2004

2004/623	Conversion and extension of garage to provide "granny annex"	AC	13.05.2004
2006 753	Single storey extension to NW elevation linkway extension to annex on NE elevation	Refused	26/05/2006

Reason for refusal:-

(1) The proposed extensions by reason of their overall bulk, scale, built form and loss of gap between the house and annexe will have an adverse impact upon the historic form and small scale, simple character of the Grade II listed building and as such will have an adverse impact to the Conservation Area and Special Restraint Area of Ablington, contrary to policies CN3, CN5, CN8 H21 and D3 of the Adopted Local Plan and guidance contained within PPG 15.

2006 754	Listed Building application - Single storey extension to NW elevation linkway extension to annexe on NE elevation	Refused	26/05/2006
----------	---	---------	------------

Reason for refusal:-

(1) The proposed extensions by reason of their overall bulk, scale, built form and loss of gap between the house and annexe will have an adverse impact upon the historic form and small scale, simple character of the Grade II listed building, contrary to policies CN3 and CN5 of the Adopted Local Plan and guidance contained within PPG 15.

2006 766	Construction of detached garage NW of dwelling including formation of access from highway	Refused	31/03/2006
----------	---	---------	------------

2006 767	Formation of access from highway and works to wall	Refused	31/03/2006
----------	--	---------	------------

07/0354	Single storey extensions to NW & NE elevations garden wall link to annex	Refused	16/04/2007
---------	--	---------	------------

Reason for refusal:-

(1) The proposed rear extension by reason of its overall scale and built form will have an adverse impact upon the historic form and small scale, simple linear character of the Grade II listed building and as such will have an adverse impact to the Conservation Area and Special Restraint Area of Ablington, contrary to policies CN3, CN5, CN8 H21 and D3 of the Adopted Local Plan and guidance contained within PPG 15.

07/0355	Listed building application – Single storey extensions to NW & NE elevations garden wall link to annex	Refused	16/04/2007
---------	--	---------	------------

Reason for refusal:-

(1) The proposed rear extension by reason of its overall scale and built form will have an adverse impact upon the historic form and small scale, simple character of the Grade II listed building, contrary to policies CN3 and CN5 of the Adopted Local Plan and guidance contained within PPG 15.

CONSULTATIONS

SDC Conservation - I still feel that the proposed extension on the rear of the building is out of scale with the existing cottage, this is particularly evident looking at its projection from the rear of the building as seen on the north east elevation. The property has been extended in the past, and this degree of further extension would result in a detrimental cumulative effect. As well as being reduced in size, I would prefer the extension to be much more transparent so as not to create such a solid extension on the building. I also feel that the solid (tiled) hipped and flat roof would not be in keeping with the existing character of the listed building.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes, expiry date 24 th May 2007
Site Notice displayed	Yes, expiry date 24 th May 2007
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes, expiry date 24 th May 2007

Third Party responses Yes, four letters of representation, summarised as follows:
The extension to No 280 was built in 2002 and limited in size to 3.7 metres to keep the linear shape of the Grade II listed building
Previous applications have been refused. Resubmitted application only reduces internal area of lounge extension.
Condition on 2004 application stated parking area between annex and existing dwelling should be retained for parking in perpetuity.
The lobby extension and garden wall link infringes on the parking area, reducing on site manoeuvring space and resulting in on-road parking on a blind bend on busy road used by all form of vehicles. This will restrict access to driveways opposite the site/cause hazard and greater probability that vehicles will crash into opposite fence, cause erosion of banks and damage to drains
Errors in design and access statement
Proposed garden wall will block the area completely from the south and its visual impact will be identical as the previous linkway proposal, which was refused.
The garden wall between the main house and annex is out of character with the hamlet.
It is important to maintain a gap between the extension and the annex in order to preserve the form of the original cottage
Any proposed extensions should be thatched
New windows should match those on the original cottage (single pane window design is not in keeping with the existing multipaned windows).
Proposed glazing exceeds building regulations
Access to kitchen is only impeded as the owners have moved the original access from the rear of the kitchen to its present position
The original cottage has a rear entrance/hall providing access to the house without stepping directly into the lounge or dining room.
Rendering the lobby will compete with the existing brick and flint gable wall
The original cottage was extended in 1998.
The depth of the extension should not exceed 1/3rd of the frontage of the building.
Overdevelopment of a listed building which has previously been extended
The character of the listed building is adversely affected by the proposals
References to other developments in the vicinity of site are incorrect/there are differences between these sites and the application site

Two letters from applicant in response to representations/objecting to inconsistent and misleading advice, summarised as follows:
Sufficient space will be retained for 3-4 cars
Plans have been adjusted in light of advice from the conservation officer and planning office following meetings and pre-application drawings
A separate application has been submitted for additional parking to the rear of the site (S/2007/950)

Parish Council response None received

MAIN ISSUES

Impact upon setting of/listed building

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP CN3 & CN5 (Listed Buildings)
PPG 15 – Planning and the Historic Environment

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The Grade II listed building is located within a sensitive area designated as a Special Restraint Area and Conservation Area.

The listed building policies CN3 and CN5 require that development within or outside of the curtilage of a listed building will only be permitted where it does not harm the character or setting of the building. Policy D3 of the local plan requires extensions to existing properties to be

compatible in terms of the scale, design and character of the existing property and use of complementary materials.

Policy H21 of the Local plan applies to extensions to dwelling within SRA's. Although there is no set limit (as a % of total floor area) on how much a dwelling may be increased in size, policy H21 refers to extensions to be of small scale and subservient to the dwelling to which they relate. The policy states proposals will not be permitted that would result in the character of the dwelling being lost through successive extensions.

PPG 15 states that many Grade II buildings are of humble and once common building types and have been listed precisely because they are relatively unaltered examples of a particular building type; that Local Planning Authorities should attempt to retain the characteristics of distinct types of building and modern extensions should not dominate the existing building in either scale, material or situation. Thatched cottages of linear form typify Abington.

Planning permission and listed building consent applications for extensions to the dwelling have previously been refused for extensions to the dwelling (the reasons are given above).

The existing cottage has a small scale and simple linear character, which is important to retain in accordance with the listed building, conservation and housing restraint policies of the local plan.

The application is a result of pre-application discussions following the previous refusals. During these discussions it was suggested (without prejudice to any formal decision taken in respect of development of the above site) that an extension should be more transparent so as not to create such a solid extension on the building. A scheme was drawn up which proposed more glazing than now proposed, but this was amended as building regulations were changed in 2006 reducing permissible glazing.

The proposed lounge extension has been reduced in size from the previously refused scheme, but it is still very solid, which taken in combination with its projection from the rear of the cottage will project out disproportionately from the rear of the cottage and is considered to be out of scale and character with the original linear form of the cottage.

The applicant has made reference to extensions and outbuildings, which have been permitted on other sites in Abington. Planning applications are judged on their own merits against the relevant policies of the Salisbury District Local Plan. This property has already been considerably extended in the past and this degree of further extension is considered to result in a detrimental cumulative effect.

A simple lean to lobby extension is also proposed on the side elevation of the 1998 extension with solid wall to the rear joining onto the sidewall of the annexe.

Objections have been raised that the proposed wall linking the lobby/main house to the annexe will have the same visual impact as the previously refused linkway extension, which was refused on the grounds that the gap between the 1998 extension and annexe should be retained in order to preserve the form of the original cottage.

The previous linkway extension formed a usable hallway space and was glazed to the front elevation under a pitched roof and dominated the front elevation of the house and was out of character with the simplicity of the existing house. The proposed 1.9m high wall (as scaled from the submitted plan) is of a simple design (rendered above brick plinth with tile creasing and rendered brick coping), does not compete with the main house and is considered to be acceptable to the overall appearance of the dwelling and site.

It is considered that the scale and design of the proposed lobby will not compete with the existing building.

CONCLUSION

The proposed rear extension by reason of its overall scale and built form will have an adverse impact upon the historic form and small scale, simple character of the Grade II listed building,

contrary to policies CN3 and CN5 of the Adopted Local Plan and guidance contained within PPG 15.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL

Reason for refusal:

(1) The proposed rear extension by reason of its overall scale and built form will have an adverse impact upon the historic form and small scale, simple character of the Grade II listed building, contrary to policies CN3 and CN5 of the Adopted Local Plan and guidance contained within PPG 15.

Part 2

Applications recommended for Approval

7

Application Number:	S/2007/0518		
Applicant/ Agent:	HAMILTONS ARCHITECTS		
Location:	PLOT BW 2/3 MID SUMMER PLACE AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7SQ		
Proposal:	NEW LEISURE CENTRE DEVELOPMENT TO INCLUDE AMENDED LEISURE IMPACT ASSESSMENT, ADDITIONAL PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND RELOCATION OF CYCLE PARKING		
Parish/ Ward	AMESBURY EAST		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	9 March 2007	Expiry Date	8 June 2007
Case Officer:	Mr A Madge	Contact Number:	01722 434541

Members will recall that the previous application on this site was deferred at the last meeting of Northern area committee on the 26th April 2007 in order that consideration of this application be deferred to enable an independent analysis of the quantitative need for this proposal.

An independent firm of advisors was appointed in May of this year (PMP Consulting) and their report is attached to this one.

The scope of the consultants work

The consultants were employed to and have carried out an independent assessment of the existing leisure facilities in the area. Taking in a catchment area which covers a 15 minute drive time from the application site. (A 15 minute drive time was selected in order to concur with similar distances that had been adopted by other interested parties in this application). Crucially this 15 minute drive time covers the larger settlement of Salisbury to the south of the existing site. The consultants have through the methodology outlined in the report come to conclusions on the qualitative and quantitative need for the sports facilities that are being offered at the proposed new facility. They have factored in to their calculations and conclusions the existing fitness stations at the various military establishments located within the catchment area.

Their conclusions are as follows –

Quantitative need

Fitness stations (Gym)

They have concluded that the number of fitness facilities per 1000 people is 7.9. This includes both public and private sector facilities. This compares with the overall national average of 4.84 stations per 1000 population and 4.09 stations per 1000 population in the south west region. The consultants have pointed out that the latter figures are not a threshold or target level of provision. On this point therefore the consultants conclude that there is an oversupply of fitness stations that oversupply being 97 stations. Many of these stations are located in the town of Salisbury. However overall within the catchment area it is concluded there is no quantitative case for additional health and fitness stations in the district.

Swimming Pool provision

The consultants have concluded from their analysis of supply and demand of swimming pools that there is a marginal shortfall of water space. This is noted as 14m² at present. The addition of a swimming pool at Solstice Park would not however affect this statistical shortfall as private water space is not included in the supply figures. Based on the supply/demand analysis there is no additional water requirement at present.

Squash provision

There is a shortfall of 3.2 squash courts in the catchment area and the consultants therefore conclude that there is a quantitative case for the proposed squash development.

These are the consultants conclusions on the quantitative need for the facilities being provided.

Qualitative need

Having assessed the quantitative need for this development the consultants have gone on to assess the qualitative need as follows –

The consultants have stated that the level of provision in qualitative terms is deemed to be average. Good quality facilities are (they state) generally acknowledged as an important way to help maintain the currently high participation rates whether provided by the private or public sector.

The average standard of provision has been indicated by

The results from the active people satisfaction which implies that there is a dearth of quality sports facilities in Salisbury and the fact that there are no Quest accredited centres. The low score of Salisbury (4% of population) on the sport England index of access to Quality Assured facilities. Site assessments of facilities by the consultants.

There is presently little in the way of studio space other than new space which is now becoming available at Durrington- this prohibits the offering of activities proving increasingly popular such as pilates, yoga, stepping, and spinning

The consultants come to the conclusion that at present there is no quantitative demand for health and fitness facilities at the present time in the catchment area.

These then are the conclusions of the consultants report which clearly indicate that whilst the picture is not straightforward and black and white in terms of both quantitative and qualitative need the consultant has concluded there is presently no quantitative need for the development. Members will recall that this was the initial reason for refusal for the first planning application.

Planning Policy Statement six

In addition to assessing the qualitative and quantitative need for this development members also need to consider the impact that this development will have on town centre facilities and government guidance contained within PPS6 sets out how to assess this impact and various tests that need to be applied. It is important to note that given that the consultants have included Salisbury within a 15 minute drive time of the proposed new facility these tests need to be applied to Salisbury City centre as well as to Amesbury. PPS6 states that where development plans have been adopted prior to the publication of PPS6 local authorities should have regard to the policies

The primary impact of any new facility will be to sports/leisure facilities located within the two town centres and to this end there are essentially three facilities to be considered

Bodyworks Health and fitness (Amesbury)
LA Fitness (Salisbury)
Eclipse leisure (formerly the Guilder centre)

NB other facilities such as Amesbury Sports centre, Five Rivers Leisure Centre or Parkwood Health and Fitness are located outside the town centre and therefore not covered by the provisions of PPS6.

PPS6 makes the following requirements.

- An assessment of the quantitative need
- An assessment of the qualitative need
- Securing the appropriate scale of development
- Impact assessment
- Ensuring Locations are accessible and by a choice of means of transport

Quantitative need

Clearly the consultants employed by the council have fully assessed both the quantitative and qualitative need for the sports/leisure aspect of this development at the present time and therefore it is not considered necessary for officers to reassess these issues at this stage. The consultants report does however rely on population figures from 2001 (which are the most up to date census figures available) and both future demand over the next five years and the increase in population from 2001 need to be considered. As the census figures are the most up to date accurate figures at the present time we can only assume that there has been an increase in the population however whether the increase in population to date and that predicted in the next five years would be substantial enough to meet the current perceived oversupply against the national average in facilities is not clear.

Since 1999 and up until 2006, 1267 new houses have been built in the catchment area and up until 2011 (four years hence) a further 1606 are scheduled to be built. Whilst this is a high figure assuming a reasonable take up of sport and leisure facilities from all these new homes it would seem unlikely that the number of people required to ensure a quantitative demand exists would ensue given the high number of facilities as existing that the consultants have identified. Also to be considered as well as the leisure facilities is the smaller part of this development which includes conferencing facilities as can be seen from the response from the councils own economic development department there is a lack of conferencing facilities of the size being proposed within the area as identified by this councils economic development department 2006 report. Whilst other conferencing facilities exist they are not of this scale and there is a clear need identified within that report for conferencing facilities of the scale proposed.

In quantitative supply terms therefore officers conclude that the quantitative demand for the leisure and sport element of this development as a whole does not exist. There is however a quantitative need for the conferencing facilities.

Qualitative need

Other than the development under consideration officers are unaware of any other new developments that would help meet the qualitative need identified by the consultants. Whilst individual clubs/sports centres may improve their facilities over the course of the next five years this is unknown and equally they may deteriorate. Therefore for the purposes of this report officers have taken the consultants views that there is scope for improvement to the qualitative provision as read and there does therefore exist a qualitative need for the sports leisure facilities offered by this application.

The exact internal specifications of exactly what the conferencing facilities would provide does not form part of this application and is beyond the control of the local authority. However as these would be purpose built facilities specifically for the users of Solstice Park and the surrounding area it is assumed for the purposes of this report that the standard of the conference facilities would be high given this and given the identified need for high quality conferencing facilities in this area it is considered that there is a qualitative need for the conference facilities

The appropriate scale of development

Amesbury is the second largest settlement within the district after Salisbury and at present is essentially served by two sports/leisure providers. One is Bodyworks in the town centre and the other is Amesbury sports centre. Obviously one of these is council owned whilst the other is private. Neither of these facilities provide a swimming pool which in a town the size of Amesbury is something which many would expect to be provided and neither provide squash courts or tennis courts (although the Sports centre does have a large sports hall). Both are limited in the service they provide according to the consultants report. Given the size of the settlement of Amesbury and the projected amount that it is to grow over the next five years it is very clear in officers opinion that the scale of development is suited to the size of Amesbury as a settlement and appropriate to be located within Amesbury.

Impact assessment

PPS6 states that a full impact assessment of proposals where they are in accordance with an up to date development plan strategy does not need to be undertaken. Given that this is an allocated site within the local plan and is allocated for leisure uses, the view could well be taken that there is not a need to undertake an impact assessment of the proposal. None the less the text to policy E8A requires the impact in terms of viability and vitality to be assessed in accordance with the local plan. Therefore the impact of this proposal is assessed below

A leisure impact assessment has been provided to accompany the planning application. The impact assessment identifies the proposed clients as those people working on the business park, living in and around Amesbury and visitors to the hotel located on the business park. The assessment concludes that the existing population levels and current average member levels could sustain more health and fitness facilities than currently exist at present and that there is a quantitative need for a new facility. This is at odds with the consultants report. The impact assessment also identifies that continued growth in population and in the health and fitness sector will increase that need over time which is accepted. In this case part of the need also arises from the employees of the business park and hotel visitors. The assessment furthermore states that there is currently no leisure operation offering the range and type of facilities which is available in many town centres and cities. Although need has been shown, concern should be had to the viability to other leisure businesses that the development may cause. There are two leisure facilities in Amesbury, the first is the council run sports centre and the second is the Bodyworks fitness studio. This development could have an impact on the viability of these facilities. With regard to Bodyworks it is felt that the range of facilities provided is less than that provided by this proposal and therefore could attract a slightly different clientele with a different price bracket. As far as impact on the council run facilities is concerned although again the proposal could have an impact as it does have members. It also provides a pay as you go services which provides for a different need, council facilities furthermore tend to provide for the lower end of the market and therefore this proposal will probably be aiming at a different level of clientele. Given that there could well be an impact on the viability of these facilities the impact that this would have in terms of vitality particularly for the town centre also needs to be considered.

Bodyworks fitness studios currently operates from a number of units located at one end of the town centre, if this operation became unviable and thus ceased trading this would leave a number of vacant units at one end of the town centre, It would also mean that there may be knock-on effects for other traders as clients of Bodyworks may well link their trips to other shops whilst in the town centre. Whether linked trips are made and in what quantity is unknown and is very difficult to quantify given that individuals will make decisions on this on an ad hoc basis. It is however reasonably safe to assume that there will be some linked trips and these would be lost if the facility closed.

Given the quantitative values that the consultants have provided on fitness stations there is the possibility that the bodyworks facility may become less viable if the new facility were to open. However Bodyworks is a small facility within the town centre and even taking into account linked trips which may effect other shops it is not considered that the loss of this facility by itself would have such an adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the town centre as to by itself warrant refusal of the application.

In giving consideration to other town centre sites that might also suffer viability wise consideration has to be given to the two sites in Salisbury, (Eclipse Leisure and LA fitness) LA fitness offer in terms of sport and leisure is more in line with that which will be offered by the new facility and therefore may well suffer more than the other facility. Given that these two leisure facilities are located further away than those in Amesbury it is considered that the likely impact will be less. None the less again their viability could be effected by this development however this is more debateable given their locations and the large population in Salisbury. The loss of either of these facilities is unlikely to significantly effect the viability of the town centre of Salisbury given its large size and the very diverse range of facilities that are on offer which will continue to support it.

It is also felt with increasing populations through an increase in housing and employment land in Amesbury this facility can provide for an increasing need. There should therefore be a possibility for clawback for all facilities if this proposal goes ahead.

Conclusion

Members will see from the above assessments provided by the consultants which assess the need for this facility and the latter assessment by officers in relation to PPS6 issues that the issues surrounding this application are not clear cut and there are a number of issues in terms of need and effect on other facilities that conflict with each other

There is a significant quantitative provision of fitness stations in the catchment area well in excess of the national average

There is a shortfall in supply of water space and squash court provision (there is limited information on the supply of tennis courts).

There is an identified need within the district for conferencing facilities of the type being provided.

The proposed facility may well have an effect on the viability of existing facilities within Amesbury town centre and potentially further afield in Salisbury.

Officers do not consider the effect on the viability of the town centre facilities to significantly effect the town centre of Amesbury or Salisbury as a whole even taking into account linked trips that may well be lost as the result of any town centre closures.

Members need to take account of these conflicting issues and assess the application as a whole. advice is given in PPS6 which states that weight should be given particularly to quantitative need for this development and this needs to be borne in mind.

It is officer's opinion that this is a difficult issue but given that this application proposes a package of facilities only one of which (the fitness stations) has been shown to be in significant supply and a significant proportion of the facilities proposed are not found in the Amesbury area. Given that Amesbury is expanding significantly in terms of both employment and housing and taking account of all the other issues above it is recommended that this application be approved.

The previous report to committee is reproduced below with changes/updates in bold

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

The previous application on this site was decided by Northern Area and it is therefore considered that this application should also be determined by committee.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site is a vacant plot of land on the existing Solstice Park site (Plot BW2) This parcel of land is part of a larger plot situated at the northern end of Solstice Park designated within the original application 99/0721 for a comprehensive redevelopment of the surrounding area for business uses. This part of that site was designated for recreational and leisure uses. At present further east of this site a new Pizza Hut restaurant has been built as well as a KFC and Brewers Fayre public house. A new hotel is now well advanced in construction terms and a Somerfield store with associated petrol station has also been built. Immediately to the east of the site is a further and final plot on the leisure section of this site, which as yet does not have an end user.

To the north of the site runs the main A303 road, which provides good vehicular access to the Solstice Park development. In a wider context the town of Amesbury itself is situated to the west and south and the smaller settlement of Durrington to the North.

The site is surrounded on three of four sides by access roads to Solstice Park whilst on the final side the site is bounded by the A303.

THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the erection of a three-storey building comprising gym and leisure facilities. In detail the proposal includes on the lower ground floor a new 150 square metre pool, 2 squash courts, changing facilities and seating area, on the Upper ground floor proposed are a restaurant and kitchen, Dance Studio, Staff Area, Coffee Bar and entrance Foyer, Whilst on the first floor there is proposed a Gym area, function space and separate Studio Gym. Externally there are four tennis courts, which can double as five a side football pitches, 158 Parking spaces and landscaping.

Amendments have been made to the application by the applicants since the previous application which include an amended leisure impact assessment, an additional pedestrian access and the relocation of the cycle parking

PLANNING HISTORY

S/2003/028 Full planning application for the erection of 120 bed hotel and roadside service area and associated parking, landscaping and access ways together with detailed drainage Approved 17/11/03

S/2004/0777 Proposed 149 Bed hotel (C1) petrol filling station, family pub and restaurant (A3) associated parking landscaping and access ways with detailed drainage proposals. 18/10/04

S/2006/2326 New leisure development to include new leisure building outdoor courts, parking and landscaping. Refused 2/2/06 - *Refused on grounds that the applicant had not shown that there would be a quantitative need for this type of development and therefore the development would have an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of Amesbury town centre contrary to policy R1B of the adopted Salisbury local plan.*

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways –

Pre-application discussions have taken place and I note that size of the proposal is now smaller than originally considered by applicant -this is welcomed as the parking level did initially present some concern. The parking level is now considered appropriate for the level of activity proposed based on the PPG13 and LP parking guideline advice of 1 space per 22m². The applicant states that parking level is low but I am not clear why this statement is made. Applicant also states that a green travel plan will be instigated, which is welcomed.

Access is made via an existing internal access road within the mixed use area of Solstice Park and I confirm that there are no in principle highway objections to the development from a highway safety viewpoint subject to confirmation on the matters below: -

Access for pedestrians and cyclists should be improved by providing an additional link at the west end of the development near to the London Road roundabout. Cycle access to the front of the building should be improved by providing covered cycle stand near to the main access, not as shown in a remote location. Finally, I am also concerned about level differences between the site and the section of Porton Road north of the London Road roundabout - although a section/elevation is shown, this is not to scale and is confusing because it appears to indicate that some parking areas close to Porton Road may be within the sloping/graded banking area. Therefore improved detailing of this area is required before I am prepared to make a formal recommendation.

I confirm that I will recommend that a travel plan shall be approved prior to the start of the development.

I look forward to the further details.

WCC Planning - The principle of developing this site for leisure development is established within the approved Master plan for the Solstice Park site. Therefore, Wiltshire County Council, as strategic planning authority, has no objections regarding this application and welcomes the use of sustainable building design in this development.

WCC Library/ Museum - The site was the subject of an archaeological evaluation as part of an outline application for the whole business park (S/1992/721). There were no significant archaeological features identified in the area, while a watching brief was carried out during the subsequent landscaping. On this basis I have no comments to make on the application.

Housing & Health Officer - I have no objection to the application in principle however if you were minded to grant consent I would recommend that the following conditions be attached to it.

1. Before commencement of the development hereby permitted there shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA a scheme for the insulation against noise emissions from any extractor fans, compressor motors and all similar equipment. Such a scheme as approved in writing by the LPA shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the LPA before any part of the development is brought into use.

2. A similar scheme is recommended for the control of odour.

3. Before the commencement of the development hereby permitted there shall be a scheme submitted to and approved by the LPA in writing for the control of dust emissions on and from the site during the construction phase. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the LPA through the period of construction

Wessex Water Authority:

Foul Drainage

- There is a section 104 Agreement in place for the sewers to serve this site
- The S104 foul sewerage system has adequate capacity to serve the proposals
- Flow calculations to be submitted for approval in due course
- *Surface Water Drainage*
- There are no public surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site.
- A new discharge to watercourse or ditch may be required
- The use of Soak ways may be possible
- *Sewage Treatment*
- There is sewage treatment capacity available
- There is adequate capacity at the terminal pumping station
- *Water Supply*
- There are new S41 water mains constructed adjacent to the site.
- There will be adequate capacity in the distribution system unless the development requires abnormally high volumes of potable water. Details of demands should be provided for approval in due course.

Environment Agency - We have no objection to the proposed development subject to the following conditions and informatives being included in any permission granted.

Surface Water Drainage

Condition:

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water run-off limitation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved programme and details.

REASON

To prevent the increased risk of flooding.

Pollution Prevention

CONDITION

All foul drainage, including swimming pool filter backwash water, from the site must be discharged to the public sewerage system.

REASON

To protect the local water environment from pollution.

INFORMATIVE

The applicant must liaise with the local sewerage undertaker regarding the availability, location and adequacy of the existing public sewerage and sewage treatment facilities.

CONDITION:

Prior to being discharged into any soak away system, all surface water drainage from parking areas and hardstandings should be passed through deep sealed trapped gullies or oil interceptors designed and constructed to have a capacity and details compatible with the site being drained. Roof water should not pass through the interceptor.

REASON:

To protect the local environment from pollution.

INFORMATIVE

Surface water from car parking areas less than 0.5 hectares and roads should discharge via deep sealed trapped gullies. For car parks greater than 0.5 hectares in area, oil interceptor facilities are required such that at least 6 minutes retention is provided for a storm of 12.5mm rainfall per hour. With approved "by-pass" type of interceptors, flows generated by rainfall rates in excess of 5mm/hour may be allowed to by-pass the interceptor provided the overflow device is designed so that oily matter is retained. Segregation of roof water should be carried out where possible to minimise the flow of contaminated water to be treated. Detergents, emulsifiers and solvents must not be allowed to drain to the interceptor, as these would render it ineffective.

Water Efficiency

CONDITION:

No development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for water efficiency has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

REASON

In the interests of sustainable development. Salisbury District Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on "Achieving Sustainable Development" promotes the prudent use of natural resources. It is necessary to minimise the local demand for water to protect future supplies.

INFORMATIVE

The development should include water efficient appliances, fittings and systems in order to contribute to reduced water demand in the area. These should include, as a minimum, dual-flush toilets, water butts, spray taps, low flow showers (no power showers) and white goods (where installed) with the maximum water efficiency rating. Greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered. The submitted scheme should consist of a detailed list and description (including capacities, water consumption rates etc. where applicable) of water saving measures to be employed within the development.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Flood Risk

Section 4 of the Environmental Report submitted forms a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). This FRA is considered to meet our requirements of Planning Policy Guidance Note PPG25-Development and Flood Risk, and that the proposed development is therefore in accordance with the guidance contained therein. We do not accept any liability for the detailed calculations contained in the FRA. This letter does not constitute approval of those calculations nor does it constitute our consent or approval that may be required under any other statutory provision byelaw, order or regulation.

Flood risk cannot be eliminated and is expected to increase over time as a result of climate change and this letter does not absolve the developer of their responsibility to ensure a safe development.

Sustainable Drainage Systems

Surface water run-off should be controlled as near to its source as possible with sustainable drainage systems (SUDS). This reduces flood risk through the use of soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds etc. SUDS can also increase groundwater recharge, improve water quality and provide amenity opportunities. A SUDS approach is encouraged by Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000. Further information on SUDS can be found in :

PPG25 paragraphs 40 – 42 and appendix E.

CIRIA C522 document Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems-design manual for England and Wales.

Interim Code of Practice for sustainable Drainage Systems (advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues, available at www.environment-agency.gov.uk and www.ciria.org/suds)

Pollution Prevention

Safeguards should be implemented during the construction phase to minimise the risks of pollution and detrimental effects to the water interests in and around the site.

Such safeguards should cover the use of plant and machinery, oils/chemicals and materials; the use and routing of heavy plant and vehicles; the location and form of work and storage areas and compounds and the control and removal of spoil and wastes.

Defence Estates – We confirm that the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

Natural England – No response to this application but previous application stated -Thank-you for sending me the Environment Agency's response, which places the onus on Wessex Water in this instance. As long as the abstraction and discharge requirements for this planning application fall within current Wessex Water licences, and as long as there is a definite commitment to water efficiency measures such as rainwater harvesting, clearly identified through planning conditions, Natural England has no further objections in these respects.

In addition, I am satisfied that protected species survey is not required, based on photographs and aerial photography which show the site to be bare ground.

Highways Agency – No Objections

Sport England – Sport Englands current position is that we have submitted a letter of support to Salisbury District Council on 12th December 2006 and our position has not changed since then.

For information we provided some further comments to Keith Flint (Bodyworks) on 1st Feb 2007, which I understand was reported to the Planning Committee. This did not change our overall position and stated the following:

As I explained on the phone, our analysis uses information contained in the Active Places database (www.activeplaces.com). It only includes facilities available for community use (ie local authority, membership clubs, etc). This does not include facilities provided by the MOD solely for use by their own personnel. I acknowledge that there are a number of MOD facilities in the area which provide for the large MOD population in the locality and this factor should also be taken into account in reaching a conclusion on the overall level of provision in the area.

Sport England's response of the 12th December stated - We note from the information accompanying the current application proposes the following facilities:

Swimming pool (150m²)
2 x squash courts
4 x outdoor tennis courts
Gym area (397m²), plus studio gym
Changing rooms
Function / conference rooms

The Leisure Impact Assessment includes an analysis of need for health and fitness facilities in the Amesbury area, and concludes (para 4.18) that 'there is a clear quantitative and qualitative need for the proposed development'.

Sport England's Active Places Power database of sports facilities in England (available free to registered local authorities at www.activeplacespower.com) shows that, in terms of health and fitness facilities:

Salisbury District has an overall provision of 409 fitness stations (public and private) – this equates to 3.57 per 1,000 population. Whilst Salisbury is currently the best provided local authority in Wiltshire, it is still below the regional and national average for health and fitness stations per 1,000 population (England being 4.94 and the South West 4.09).

An analysis of Amesbury and surrounding six wards shows that the level of provision per 1,000 population is also below both the national and regional average, and stands at about 2.6 stations per 1,000 population.

In the light of this, Sport England's view is that, based on information contained in our Active Places database, it is unlikely that the proposed development would lead to any significant adverse impact on existing health and fitness provision in the area. We therefore wish to lend our support to this application.

Economic Development – Following rejection of the last planning application at Northern Area Committee I would like to reiterate our support for the above proposal concerning development of new leisure and conference facilities at Solstice Park.

The proposal includes the provision of large scale multi purpose conference and banqueting facilities, which it is estimated could seat approximately 300 people. At present Salisbury and south Wiltshire has a severe lack of medium to large scale conference facilities as identified in the 2006 report 'A review of hotel and conference facilities in Salisbury District' carried out by this team for the Planning and Economic Development Overview and Scrutiny Panel. This affects, among other things, our ability to cater for the higher end of the business tourism market, the tourism strategy for south Wiltshire published last year, highlights the need to develop the conference market in Salisbury and this proposal would help to fulfil this objective. Specifically the strategy's Action Plan contains the following objective: 'By 2010 to have professional high quality, flexible conference facilities capable of attracting medium to large conferences (250-800)'. The centre would be a welcome boost to the south Wiltshire economy and Solstice Park's location and close proximity to London and the South West from the A303 would make it an attractive venue to many companies and event organisers.

This development, together with the Holiday Inn, would provide valuable and currently unavailable facilities for businesses at Solstice Park and also for major employers within the Salisbury Research Triangle. It is also likely to be attractive for businesses further afield due to its proximity to Stonehenge and Salisbury City

Considering the strategic importance of Amesbury, Solstice Park and the SRT to the future of Salisbury district it is essential that facilities such as this are provided to meet growing and changing needs of businesses and the wider population.

Salisbury District Council Tourism – From a tourism prospective, we would support this application as we believe that it compliments nearby hotel development. We commend high quality hotel facilities, and I understand that these proposals would serve the needs of guests to the nearby holiday Inn. Proposals for leisure and conference facilities at the Holiday Inn were not developed in favour of this leisure facility and as such this development compliments the hotel. The provision of conference facility is fully supported. Indeed the tourism strategy for south Wiltshire has an action to develop the conference market in Salisbury by having a target to have

professional high quality, flexible conference facilities capable of attracting medium to large conferences'.

Tourism is a vital part of the local economy, currently accounting for 8% of all jobs locally. For Salisbury and South Wiltshire to maintain a viable tourism industry, we need to encourage the development of leisure facilities associated with hotels so that visitors to the region will be encouraged to stay longer and spend more.

Although I understand that this facility would be primarily local residents on a membership basis and hotel guests. We would, however view that it would be beneficial if access to this leisure centre could be offered to visitors to the area, possibly by means of reasonably priced 'day passes', or to encourage the management to cooperate with other local accommodation providers in the area, in order to widen the tourism benefit of the development.

MOD – No objections

Design Forum

- The Design Forum's overall view is that the scheme for a glazed box with more solid 'book ends' represents a clear simple design concept, which fits well into the context of Solstice Park.
- The Forum recognizes that the scheme is still developing and that it contains a number of issues yet to be resolved, but that it demonstrates promise of being a well designed building.
- The critical issue of sustainability still needs to be addressed. The activities within the building are likely to generate surplus heat and energy, which will require sophisticated means of ventilation. It is important to investigate how the building can be designed sustainability to achieve an excellent BREEAM rating. A Services Engineers Sustainability Statement will be needed.
- Information will be needed on how the mechanics of the building are expressed on the external elevations and roof, and in the surrounding landscaped areas.
- The Forum expresses concern that the proposed landscaping scheme does not appear to follow the overall landscaping approach agreed for Solstice Park.
- The amount of green areas shown on the landscape drawings is over optimistic. Much of the area shown colored green is likely to be paved or semi-paved.
- The impact of the loading area and the boundary landscaping between the Sports Centre and the Kentucky Fried Chicken outlet to the east, is not shown.
- When the application is formally submitted, the forum hope to see the inclusion of some specimen trees, which will become significant landscape features within the development, located where there is sufficient space for them to grow to full maturity.
- The design, function and landscaping of the area between the Sports Centre and the A303 needs to be given much more detailed consideration.
- Provision should be made for coach and bus drop off points and for coach parking.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes Expired 12/4/07
Site Notice displayed	Yes Expired 12/4/07
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes Expired 2/4/07
Third Party responses	Yes 4 letters of objection. – Summarised as follows

9 letters of objection including that from Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners contained as appendix 1.

Consider that the local authority has the power not to determine the application and as little has changed in this application the authority should decline to determine it.
If the local authority does decide to determine the application the only possible decision is that of refusal because so little has changed since the previous application and that which has changed is not material to the previous reason for refusal.
Consider the application is still contrary to policy RB1 of the adopted local plan and the requirements of PPS6.
Very little has changed from the first plans
The application will affect the existing fitness facilities in the town.
The facilities the leisure centre will offer are already in place locally in Amesbury, Boscombe Down and Durrington.
The site should be used for new facilities such as a Bowling Alley, Climbing Wall or indoor running track.

There are already too many empty buildings in Amesbury without adding to them.
Gyms already exist at Bodyworks, Durrington Pool, Amesbury Sports centre and the MOD and QinetiQ have their own private gyms.

Other facilities are already available in the local area.

If the facility goes ahead in the form proposed this will undoubtedly kill off the independent businesses and local council run community services already provided in the surrounding area. Considers that the RPS figures have not included the Gym facilities that are available at the MOD facilities at Larkhill, Netheravon Camp and Boscombe Down. Considers that either the fitness facilities at these Gyms should be included in RPS's report or these areas should be excluded from the catchment areas. IF MOD facilities were included the number of existing Gym facilities available would well exceed the need given the population figures. (Figures have been submitted to support this).

There are conference facilities at Salisbury race course, Salisbury golf club, Tidworth college, Grasmere Hotel, The Portway centre, Synapse Interactive. Also wedding reception function rooms available at two local hotels. Dance classes have now been taken away from Amesbury Sports Centre and moved up on to Archers Gate. It is not true to say there are no facilities in the area.

There is a strong need to protect our existing public facilities that have been under threat of closure i.e Durrington Swimming Pool and Amesbury Sports Centre. These facilities provide a valuable and affordable service to the community and any threat to take business away from them would increase the possibility of closure and is this a gamble worth taking just to have a high profile name on a building. Will the facility take on the Youth clubs and Duke of Edinburgh Schemes? What affordable opportunities will it really provide for the youth of this area, what would be left for them?

Solstice Park has suggested that 5000 jobs will be created, however little evidence of this over the last four years, Solstice Park is struggling to achieve its aims. A leisure centre and a new supermarket which will take up a lot of room would reduce the numbers employed at the park. The Leisure facility will be a lifeline for Solstice Park but is this at the expense of existing facilities in the town centre?

Amesbury is not getting a new swimming pool it is a 15m fitness pool This is a gym with a few fancy add ons. There are plenty of gyms in the area and do not forgot Boscombe Downs gym which is open to all of its employees. Where are the businesses to use a conference facility? This will end up as a function room for weddings and parties and we have plenty of places for those facilities.

Disappointed that committee report relies on previous correspondence when no new correspondence has been submitted. Considers it misleading that this representation is applicable to this application. It is considered that Sport England in their late representation to the last committee admitted their quantitative assessment was flawed as it did not take into account the large army populations and gym facilities they had access to. Questions the soundness of the recommendation.

Considers that there is no new evidence of quantitative need that has been offered to members over that which has already been presented and debated at length and therefore does not understand how any decision other than refusal can be reached.

Whilst it is stated that qualitative need was not used as a ground for refusal last time the report does not make it clear to members that PPS6 states that local authorities should place greater weight on quantitative need. The continuing absence of quantitative need should not be overridden by claims of qualitative need.

Concern is expressed that the report concludes that the facility will be in line with policy PPS6 and policies R1A and R1B of the local plan having undertaken no commentary on **the issue of** scale, impact or the sequential approach all of which are requirements of PPS6. Government guidance is clear that LPA's should take account of the following – the extent to which the development would put at risk the spatial planning strategy for the area and the strategy for a particular centre or network of centres, or alter its role in the hierarchy of centres; the likely effect on future public or private sector investment needed to safeguard the vitality and viability of the centre or centres; the likely impact of the proposed development on trade/turnover and on the vitality and viability of existing centres within the catchment area of the proposed development and, where applicable, on the rural economy; changes to the range of services provided by centres that could be affected; likely impact on the number of vacant properties in the primary shopping area; potential changes to the quality, attractiveness, physical condition and character of the centre or centres and to its role in the economic and social life of the community; and the implications of proposed leisure and entertainment uses for the evening and night time economy of the centre (see also paragraph 2.24).

Considers members have not been given sufficient information on the likely impact of the proposal. Consider it is clear that the proposal will impact on the trade of bodyworks and the local authority run sports centres. Consider this is a real concern given that Logan's and the Kebab shop have closed as a result of direct out of town competition.

Letter submitted by Fitness consultants who state that in their opinion – on the basis of our experience in the UK industry of over 20 years, we can state that an average 90% of a clubs membership live within a 3 mile radius of their respective club. Only 10% of a clubs membership live outside this catchments area.

The same fitness consultants consider that it is not in Amesburys or its population to develop the proposed site in Solstice Park. The existing club in Amesbury being Bodyworks fitness studio serves the community and encourages trade in the town centre. Throughout the UK have seen developments for leisure being granted for out of town development at the expense of town centre clubs and other retailers. Surely Solstice Park should be for industrial and office development and we understand that this was its original purpose. We believe that Salisbury District Council should not grant developments at Solstice Park at the expense of the Amesbury's Town Centre.

Letter received from applicants agent raising concern that the consultants employed by the council are only considering the leisure impact of the proposal and not the proposals impact on the town centre in terms of both existing facilities in the town centre and the linked trips that are generated by visits to the existing Gym facilities. The letter quotes PPS6 where it states that PPS6 is a material planning consideration which may override the relevant policies in the local plan where those plans were adopted prior to the publication of the local plan.

The letter sets out the background to their concerns including the policy context of policy E8A of the local plan and PPS6 and PPS17 (open spaces).The objectors agent considers the interface between the two to be important. The same letter raises concern that the consultants specialise in open spaces and not leisure uses and asks that suitably appointed consultants be appointed to look into the issue of the impact on the town centre. It concludes that even if the consultants identify a deficit of facilities in the wider Amesbury area, it can not be concluded that there will be no impact on the town centre, because the proposal is an out- of-centre location and will divert multi-purpose linked trips from the town centre.

Consultants on behalf of Bodyworks have submitted information on the number of fitness facilities operated by the MOD in the area. (*The local authority's consultants have factored this issue into their calculations by excluding the Military population from their calculations*).

15 Letters of Support have been received in relation to this application summarised as follows.

Consider that the proposal supports leisure growth, area regeneration and drives Amesbury as a key leisure and business destination.

The leisure/conference facility will support the council's targets and increase job availability. This will be a large-scale employer for the area.

It will provide state of the art conference and banqueting facilities that are desperately needed in the town and South Wiltshire. This would be an opportunity for the South Wiltshire economy.

Sports and leisure facilities for the new hotel at Solstice Parks clients are not sufficient, as they presently exist in the town. The sports and conferencing facilities are needed for clients of the hotel.

The business plan for the hotel is based on corporate guests staying several nights. The sort of facilities offered at the sports facility are high on guests list of priorities.

Staff of the hotel who live locally have shown a keen interest in using the leisure facility, as similar facilities are not available locally.

The omission of conferencing and fitness facilities at the hotel was deliberate as it was likely that the new leisure facility would provide them

The hotel has been forced to sign up to a green travel plan and as such cannot ask guests to drive to the nearest facilities of an appropriate standard which are in Salisbury.

There is a basic gym in Amesbury but this does not offer the range of facilities that hotel guests now demand, it is merely an exercise room. Durrington has a swimming pool but regretfully this is also rather basic without Jacuzzi's, saunas etc.

The hotel can only cater for small groups and therefore the conferencing facility will draw more business to the hotel and the Amesbury area.

Consider that there are not enough leisure facilities in Amesbury to cater for need, existing facilities are either overpriced or lacking in proper equipment.

New leisure facility will draw many visitors to Amesbury.

Consider that 20% of the new workforce of 750 people at the Crescent office development will require a gym as based on experience with other similar office developments.

A leisure centre within a short walk of the new office development would be ideal

The crescent office development does not include conferencing facilities because they are targeting small and medium businesses. The provision of conferencing facilities elsewhere on the park is therefore an essential requirement.

Modern business parks now feature multifunction buildings similar to that which Nick Holmes is seeking to provide. A conference and leisure centre with catering facilities is essential for the offices on Solstice Park.

The previous assertion that this leisure centre would have a disastrous Knock on effect are not backed by evidence that this would be the case other than for self-preservation.

Amesbury town council states that such a development is unlikely to be of interest to the majority of residents in Amesbury due to cost. Negative statements are being made without any evidence to back them up.

From the point of view of a parent with two young children the new proposal will be unique in that this will have all the facilities under one roof. If a 100-room hotel is built on Solstice Park then where is the logic in not allowing a health facility that will not provide better options for the local residents and will also provide more jobs.

Salisbury and District Chamber of commerce and industry support the project. The business community need new conferencing facilities.

For Salisbury FC to progress into professionalism their training and gym facilities will need to improve. The leisure facility will offer just what they require.

For 18 years a swimming pool has been at the top of many residents priorities for Amesbury and this proposal will provide it.

Amesbury and the surrounding area is becoming more affluent with huge residential and commercial development. The leisure facility will complement this change.

Currently travel to Salisbury every day to use the Parkwood facility which is a 16mile round trip it would make more sense to have a leisure facility locally.

It is continually highlighted the lack of facilities in the area. This facility would help with that problem.

Tintometer Limited requires access to good conferencing facilities that this development would require. There are no other conference facilities in the area.

The proposal is designed for serious fitness enthusiasts and is unlikely to detract from other facilities in the area.

The granting of the facility is very important to Salisbury football club, as it will provide facilities that are missing at the grounds at Old Sarum.

The leisure centre will provide facilities for the football club to organise six a side football tournaments, Soccer schools in half terms and school holidays and cricket schools.

There is currently no market interest in providing a bowling alley, cinema, and Bingo type facility. Business parks around the country have leisure facilities associated with the businesses, as there is a synergy between the two.

At the last meeting of Northern area committee there was a letter from Mr Keith Flint of Bodyworks Amesbury in which he quoted various statements alleged to have been made by the Chairman of the Amesbury Town council meeting on the 3rd April 2007. The meeting was in fact the Amenities committee of which I am the Chairman. In the meeting the chairman is quoted as saying that the nearest conference facilities were in Basingstoke or Bath. This statement was not made but it was pointed out that there were no large hotels with conference facilities close by, in the local area. A member of the committee did say that you would have to travel to Basingstoke or Bath to find similar facilities. Mention was made of a dance studio however this was in a summary of the facilities available at the proposed leisure centre, nothing was said about other classes in the area.

The PMP Report looks at quantitative and qualitative issues. The conclusions in terms of the qualitative deficiencies in existing provision are evident and I do not need to comment further other than to emphasise that qualitative need is an important consideration in PPS 6. The conclusions on quantitative demand identify only one sector of potential 'oversupply' in the study area - health and fitness. However these conclusions do not reflect the position in Amesbury for reasons I set out below.

The conclusions on 'oversupply' in this sector are based on an analysis of a 15 minute drivetime from Amesbury. However if you look at Map 4.1 and the Schedule of health and fitness facilities included you will see that over three-quarters of the health and fitness facilities (calculated in terms of the number of stations) are in Salisbury. Furthermore you will note that while it counts all of these facilities on the supply side only a small proportion of Salisbury's catchment population is included in the population analysis: this seriously skews the results. If the PMP study looked at the Amesbury catchment, as RPS and Sport England have done, then this would produce wholly different results. It is the level of provision in the Amesbury/Durrington/Bulford area which is relevant in this case not that in Salisbury. We know from correspondence in the Journal that people are travelling to Salisbury to the health and fitness facilities there. This is not consistent with policies for sustainability nor in the interests of community provision and greater self-containment in Amesbury.

The PMP analysis utilises existing levels of participation in health and fitness to project future needs. However as pointed out at paragraph 2.5 of their report national policy seeks to increase participation at a rate of 1% per annum. Furthermore as PMP point out at para 5.12 the average level of provision identified is not a threshold or target level. The government seeks to increase provision and there is no fixed measure of 'quantitative need'.

We note that the PMP Report does not refer in any detail to the requirements arising from the business park, the Holiday Inn or to Salisbury FC. These 'needs' are also relevant but do not appear to have been allowed for in the analysis. We would refer you to an article in the latest edition of Property Week (copy attached) which outlines Sport England's strategy of specifically seeking to make provision for such facilities on business parks as part of the overall aim to improve the nations fitness.

Policy E8A of the adopted Local Plan states that leisure provision will be permitted at Solstice Park subject only to 'no adverse impact on the vitality and viability of Amesbury town centre'. The PMP Report acknowledges that it does not seek to address this matter and I believe that the RPS report is the only one which does address it. We would reiterate our conclusions.

Finally I would emphasise that the health and fitness facilities are an integral element of the overall leisure provision proposed in the Nick Holmes scheme both in terms of viability and in terms of the needs of Solstice Park. Without the gym the scheme would not take place. As you know there is widespread support for this proposal, which would represent a step change in the quality of leisure provision in Amesbury.

Town Council response - We welcome this application as one that will enhance the attractiveness of the town.

MAIN ISSUES

- 1 The Policy context
- 2 The previous application, the difference between this application and that one and the council's previous decision.
- 3 The need for a leisure facility/effect on the town centre/ competition.
- 4 Design size and scale of the proposed development
- 5 Other issues

POLICY CONTEXT

Planning Policy

National Planning Policy is contained within PPS1 this states at paragraph 10 that -

Local planning authorities must determine planning applications in accordance with the statutory Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. If the Development Plan contains material policies or proposals and there are no other material considerations, the application should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan. Where there are other material considerations, the Development Plan should be the starting point, and other material considerations should be taken into account in reaching a decision. One such consideration will be whether the plan policies are relevant and up to date.

In addition to this in relation to private interests at paragraph 29 PPS1 states that –

The planning system does not exist to protect the private interests of one person against the activities of another, although private interests may coincide with the public interest in some cases. It can be difficult to distinguish between public and private interests, but this may be necessary on occasion. The basic question is not whether owners and occupiers of neighbouring properties would experience financial or other loss from a particular development, but whether the proposal would unacceptably affect amenities and the existing use of land and buildings which ought to be protected in the public interest.

Following on from this PPS6 states that

Need must be demonstrated for any application for a main town centre use which would be in an edge-of-centre or out-of-centre location and which is not in accordance with an up-to-date development plan document strategy. Specific considerations in assessing need for retail and leisure development are set out below. (see PPS6 considerations in the report)

In assessing sites, local planning authorities should consider the impact of the proposal on the vitality and viability of existing centres within the catchment area of the proposed development, including the likely cumulative effect of recent permissions, developments under construction and completed developments. The identification of need does not necessarily indicate that there will be no negative impact.

The site is allocated for leisure uses under policy E8A of the adopted local plan - this states -

Land to the east of Porton Road. Extensive landscaping will be required on the Eastern boundary. The development of the site will be phased with development limited to 18 hectares (net) of employment land during the lifetime of this Local Plan. Provision will be made within the site for a link road to the E8B at Boscombe Down. Proposals for leisure development will also be permitted on the site subject to their being no adverse effect on the vitality and viability of Amesbury Town Centre.

Policies E8A Land allocated for employment at Solstice Park, R1A Sports and recreation facilities, R1B impact of new sports facilities, G2 General policies, G3, Development that would increase the requirement for water, G9 Planning obligations, D1 Extensive development.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The difference between this application and the previous and the councils decision

This new application is essentially for the same facilities as were previously applied for under planning application S/06/2326. There are changes which include an amended pedestrian access at the corner of the site adjacent the car park in order to improve pedestrian access and the cycle parking has been relocated as the local highways authority previous request. The major change is that a modified Leisure Impact assessment has been submitted with this application.

Members previously refused this application on the basis that the applicant had not shown that there would not be a quantitative need for this type of development and therefore members considered that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of Amesbury town centre. This decision now becomes a material planning consideration when assessing this new proposal.

In submitting the new impact assessment the applicants have directly tried to address members' concerns that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the vitality and viability of Amesbury town centre.

The local authority has the power to decline to determine a new application that is materially the same as a previously submitted application. In this instance, officers have registered the application and taken the decision to deal with the application as the main change with this application (the submission of the leisure impact assessment) goes to the heart of the previous reason for refusal in attempting to address the quantitative need for such a proposal.

Leisure impact assessment

Members should note that competition between one sports facility and another is not a material planning consideration in terms of market forces. None the less the effect that this proposal may have on town centre facilities is a material planning consideration in terms of its effect on town centre vitality and viability.

Quantitative need

This report assesses the quantitative need and draws the following conclusions – That based on Sport England's own assessment Amesbury and its hinterland is under represented in terms of the number of fitness stations compared with the national average. With significant population growth, planned in particular at Amesbury and Durrington the shortfall will increase further.

The report concludes that the area could accommodate 2 gyms with over 1250 members each. Bodyworks have 700 members and there is therefore substantial potential for additional gym membership. This is even allowing for some limited gym provision by the military

The report states The Sport England mode indicates that there is room for 2 swimming pools in the area but currently only one is available at Durrington

In assessing this part of the report it is officer's opinion that is clear that from the figures previously provided by Sport England in relation to the last application in combination with the detailed analysis provided by the applicant's impact assessment report that there is a quantitative need for this proposal

Qualitative need

The applicants report concludes that no other facility in the Amesbury area offers the same type of facilities as the proposed development. The only existing club in the area offers only a very

limited range of facilities. The report states that the qualitative need for such facilities is recognised in the Amesbury Community Strategic Plan. The facility will meet a training need for Salisbury Football Club.

The qualitative need for such a proposal was not questioned in the reason for refusal last time and therefore it could be said to be unreasonable to refuse the application on this basis this time. It is not considered that the qualitative need has changed and therefore this is not considered to be a reason for refusal

The site is allocated under Policy E8A of the local plan; this allocates the site for employment development. The policy also allows for leisure development on the site subject to there being no adverse effect on the vitality and viability of Amesbury Town Centre. The policy was carried through from the previously adopted local plan. As a result of the policy a development brief was prepared and adopted on the site as Supplementary Planning Guidance. The masterplan incorporated within this SPG allocates the area that is subject to this application for leisure use. Paragraph 4.25 of the SPG requires all proposed leisure facilities to be tested in terms of impact on Amesbury town centre, giving regard to government planning policy and advice, the paragraph continues by suggesting that potential exists for a range of facilities which are unlikely either to have an impact in planning terms or be able to be suitably accommodated in the town centre e.g. Hotel, pub / restaurant. Therefore the principal for a leisure use including health and fitness and restaurant use has already been established.

Policy R1A allows the provision of new indoor and outdoor sports and recreation facilities within or on the edge of settlements, subject to there being no significant adverse landscape implications and provided they are accessible by means of public transport and other sustainable modes. Policy R1B further requires the impact of out of town proposals to be assessed in terms of their vitality and viability. If no central locations are available, the locations highly accessible by public transport will be considered favourably if deemed suitable in all other respects.

It is therefore felt that a qualitative and quantitative need has been established and that the scale and impact of this facility will be in line with PPS6 and policies R1A and R1B of the local plan.

The following parts of the report are replicated from the original report as they cover the same aspects of the proposal. Members do however need to consider these issues

Design size and scale of the proposed development

The proposal brought before members has been to the Design Forum three times, on the last occasion the Design Forums comments were as at the top of this report. As can be seen the Design Forum largely supported the proposal in design terms. They felt that the building which would essentially 'bookend' the new hotel being constructed would in terms of its size and design be acceptable. The building will be very prominent due to its size and will be highly visible from the A303 and from points around Solstice Park. It is therefore important that the design is of a quality that fits with the rest of the Solstice Park development.

There will be a substantial buffer of trees adjacent the A303, which will in years to come help to soften some of the impact that this building will have. In addition the building is partly set in to the ground so that the lower ground floor will not be seen from the front of the site and this also makes the building appear less tall.

Members will be aware that there is a design code for Solstice Park that all buildings should adhere to in order to gain approval. The Design Code for Solstice Park was written by the same architects who have designed this building and in officers opinion the building adheres to this design code. The design code envisages that Solstice Park will consist of modern buildings of a high architectural design, which use modern materials including amongst others (as this building does) glass and brick. The colour scheme used to this point in Solstice Park, as members will be aware is primarily grey colours with Buff brick supplemented in places by flint and other materials. To this extent the design which consists of primarily grey colours using glass and brick for much of the exterior is considered to comply with the design code in place, although the brickwork is of a different colour to that used elsewhere on the development

Members will note that the design forum raised the point that further work was required on the environmental credentials of the building. The applicants had at the time of writing submitted a full environmental statement. However officers had some concerns about the adequacy of this statement in view of the possible significant environmental demands that such a building could have. At the time of writing officers were awaiting a new environmental statement from the applicants and an update on this matter will be brought to members when it is available.

Other issues

Other issues that have been brought up during the course of this application were that English Nature stated that an appropriate Assessment may be needed for this application and that they would let us know. However despite attempts to obtain advice from them on whether an appropriate assessment was required or not they have not responded. In any case an appropriate assessment has been carried out for Solstice Park and this needs to be updated in view of this application.

Members should be aware if it is not made clear in the report that PPS6 does place great weight on the quantitative need for such developments and this is exactly the issue that the applicants report addresses. Members should also bear in mind that although PPS6 is a material consideration in assessing this application. Officers consider that great weight should be given to the fact that this is an allocated site for leisure use which the local plan makes reference to therefore whilst PPS6 is important what is in officers view of more importance is the fact that the use of the site (in terms of leisure) has already been decided and the issue for consideration is whether the type of leisure use will have an impact on the town centre of Amesbury or not.

As stated above PPS6 is important but in officers opinion not as important as the fact that the site has already been allocated for leisure uses. The applicants have fully addressed the tests applied in PPS6 in their impact statement and officers have assessed the applicants report in line with the tests in PPS6.

Notwithstanding this, it is clear from officer's knowledge of the area that sequentially there are no other Brownfield sites that are available and could support a facility of this scale and size nearer to the town centre than this facility. The only large Brownfield sites located closer to the town centre that are available are those located towards the top of London road and these are not of a size that would accommodate this facility.

The scale and impact of the development is not considered inappropriate by officers to the size of area it is proposed to serve, given that Amesbury is a very substantial sized settlement and the fact that much of the facilities proposed will serve Solstice Park both existing and proposed employment sites as well as the majority of the facilities proposed not currently being available in the area. Amesbury is continuing to grow with further large tracts of hundreds of houses being built currently at Archers gate the demand for this type of development can only therefore be continually growing which further justifies its scale and impact on local facilities.

The impact on town centre facilities is fully considered in the officer's report in terms of both qualitative and quantitative need in the area, which clearly concludes there is a case for such a facility without having a significant impact on other facilities in the area. The closure of Logan's and the Kebab shop are individual cases, which officers do not consider the individual circumstances of which are directly relevant to this case.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion it is considered that the content of the revised leisure impact assessment does in this case provide sufficient grounds in officers opinion for reconsidering the decision on this application and given this revised information on the quantitative need for this development it is recommended that the application be approved

RECOMMENDATION:

Subject to

a) completion of a supplementary s106 agreement to link this development to the provisions of the existing agreements relating to the whole of Solstice Park by 07/06 / 2007

APPROVE

Reasons for Approval:

The application provides for a substantial new sports facility in Amesbury providing a significant number of brand new facilities that are not currently available within the town centre. The site is located in an area already allocated for leisure development. It is considered that this particular development will cater for facilities that are not fully provided elsewhere in the town.

The design of the proposal accords with that in the design code for Solstice Park and will provide a high quality development to serve Solstice Park and the surrounding area

It is considered that the proposal complies with both local policies contained within the adopted plan and national policies contained within PPS6

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. (A07A)
- (2) Before development is commenced, a schedule of external facing materials shall be submitted, and, where so required by the Local Planning Authority, sample panels of the external finishes shall be constructed on the site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D05A)
- (3) Prior to the commencement of development a revised scheme for the siting of the bicycle storage shall be submitted and approved in writing by the local authority
- (4) The bicycle parking areas, as referred to in condition 3 shall be completed and made available for use prior to the first occupation of the Leisure unit.
- (5) Prior to any development commencing, a scheme for the management of the construction of the proposal, including times of operations, and details of how adjacent amenities and the adjacent highway are to be protected, shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the scheme shall be developed as agreed.
- (6) The areas allocated for parking on the submitted plan shall be kept clear of obstruction and shall not be used other than for the parking of vehicles in connection with the development hereby approved.
- (7) No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water run-off limitation has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved programme and details.
- (8) Before development commences a scheme of water efficiency measures for the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme.
- (9) Before development commences, a scheme to minimise the detrimental effects to the water interests of the site and the risks of pollution during the construction phase shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme.
- (10) No development shall take place until details of the treatment to all hard surfaces have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development

shall accord with the details as so approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (G21A)

(11) No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme of landscaping, which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development.

(12) All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation. (G23A)

(13) Prior to the commencement of development a plan shall be submitted and agreed in writing showing an additional pedestrian access at the South Western corner of the site. The pedestrian access shall be constructed prior to the first opening of the leisure centre.

(14) All foul drainage, including swimming pool filter backwash water, from the site must be discharged to the public sewerage system.

(15) Prior to being discharged into any soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking areas and hardstandings should be passed through deep sealed trapped gullies or oil interceptors designed and constructed to have a capacity and details compatible with the site being drained. Roof water should not pass through the interceptor.

(16) No development approved by this permission shall commence until a scheme for water efficiency has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented in accordance with the agreed details.

(17) Before commencement of the development hereby permitted there shall be submitted to and approved by the LPA a scheme for the insulation against noise emissions from any extractor fans, compressor motors and all similar equipment. Such a scheme as approved in writing by the LPA shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the LPA before any part of the development is brought into use.

(18) Before the commencement of the development hereby permitted there shall be a scheme submitted to and approved by the LPA in writing for the control of dust emissions on and from the site during the construction phase. Such a scheme as approved

Reasons for the above conditions:

(1) To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

(2) To secure a harmonious form of development

(3) In order to secure adequate bicycle storage for the development.

(4) In the interests of the amenity of the development

(5) In the interests of amenity

(6) In the interests of highway safety.

(7) To prevent the increased risk of flooding

(8) In order to achieve the sustainable use of water sources

(9) To minimise the detrimental effects to the water interests of the site and the risks of pollution during the construction phase.

- (10) In the interests of amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- (11) In the interests of amenity.
- (12) In order to ensure that adequate landscaping is provided.
- (13) In order to ensure that adequate pedestrian access is provided to the site
- (14) In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.
- (15) To protect the local environment from pollution.
- (16) In the interests of sustainable development. Salisbury District Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on "Achieving Sustainable Development" promotes the prudent use of natural resources. It is necessary to minimise the local demand for water to protect future supplies.
- (17) In the interests of amenity
- (18) In the interests of amenity

INFORMATIVE POLICY

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

Policy E8A Land allocated for employment at Solstice Park, R1A Sports and recreation facilities, R1B impact of new sports facilities, G2 General policies, G3, Development that would increase the requirement for water, G9 Planning obligations, D1 Extensive development.

INFORMATIVE

The applicant must liaise with the local sewerage undertaker regarding the availability, location and adequacy of the existing public sewerage and sewage treatment facilities.

Surface water from car parking areas less than 0.5 hectares and roads should discharge via deep sealed trapped gullies. For car parks greater than 0.5 hectares in area, oil interceptor facilities are required such that at least 6 minutes retention is provided for a storm of 12.5mm rainfall per hour. With approved "by pass" type of interceptors, flows generated by rainfall rates in excess of 5mm/hour may be allowed to by-pass the interceptor provided the overflow device is designed so that oily matter is retained. Segregation of roof water should be carried out where possible to minimise the flow of contaminated water to be treated. Detergents, emulsifiers and solvents must not be allowed to drain to the interceptor, as these would render it ineffective.

The development should include water efficient appliances, fittings and systems in order to contribute to reduced water demand in the area. These should include, as a minimum, dual-flush toilets, water butts, spray taps, low flow showers (no power showers) and white goods (where installed) with the maximum water efficiency rating. Greywater recycling and rainwater harvesting should be considered. The submitted scheme should consist of a detailed list and description (including capacities, water consumption rates etc. where applicable) of water saving measures to be employed within the development.

Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans relating to signage a separate advertisement application will be required for such signage and the approval of this application does not indicate that approval will be forthcoming for such signage. This is without prejudice to any future advertisement application received.

c) Should the s106 not be completed by the date given, it be delegated to the Head of Development Services to refuse for reason of non-compliance with the travel plan and parking restrictions pertinent to the Solstice Park Development.