

# 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*

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

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE

**NORTHERN AREA 17<sup>TH</sup> JANUARY 2008**

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

<b>Item Page</b>	<b>Application No Officer</b>	<b>Parish/Ward Recommendation Ward Councillors</b>
<b>1.</b>	S/2007/2209	AMESBURY WEST
SV 15:50	Mr A Madge	REFUSAL
	GRAYAN HOUSE & ORCHARD HOUSE COUNTESS ROAD AMESBURY  REDEVELOPMENT TO FORM 28 CATEGORY 2 TYPE SHELTERED APPARTMENTS FOR THE ELDERLY WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING	Amesbury West Ward Cllr Westmoreland
<b>2.</b>	S/2007/2046	WINTERBOURNE STOKE
SV 15:00	Mr A Madge	REFUSAL
	WISMA FARM BERWICK ST. JAMES SALISBURY  DEMOLITION OF EXISTING AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS, EXISTING DWELLING AND OUTBUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING AND REPLACEMENT AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS	Till Valley and Wylve Ward Cllr Mills Cllr West
<b>3.</b>	S/2007/1616	AMESBURY EAST
SV 15:30	Miss L Flindell	APPROVE SUBJECT TO S106
	LAND AT MINTON DISTRIBUTION PARK LONDON ROAD AMESBURY  DEMOLITION OF EXISTING VACANT MECHANICAL WORKSHOP AND ERECTION OF A LIDL NEIGHBOURHOOD FOODSTORE WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING	Amesbury East Ward Cllr Brown Cllr Mitchell Cllr Noeken

# Part 1

## Applications recommended for Refusal

1

Application Number:	S/2007/2209		
Applicant/ Agent:	THE PLANNING BUREAU LTD		
Location:	GRAYAN HOUSE & ORCHARD HOUSE, COUNTESS ROAD, AMESBURY, SALISBURY SP4 7DW		
Proposal:	REDEVELOPMENT TO FORM 28 CATEGORY 2 TYPE SHELTERED APARTMENTS FOR THE ELDERLY WITH ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING		
Parish/ Ward	AMESBURY WEST		
Conservation Area:	AMESBURY	LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	2 November 2007	Expiry Date	1 February 2008
Case Officer:	Mr A Madge	Contact Number:	01722 434541

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

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

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site is currently the site of two large detached dwellings known as Grayan House and Orchard House which are situated on Countess Road to the west of Amesbury close to the town centre. The two dwellings on site date from the late 1980's and are of brick construction with tiled roofs situated in large gardens. To the north of the site lies the grade I listed Amesbury Abbey (currently run as a nursing home) and its parkland setting which is listed at grade II\* on the Register of Historic Parks and Gardens, as well as a grade II\* listed dwelling known as Kent House. To the East of the site across Countess Road which leads to the north to the Countess roundabout are a series of small terraced properties located along the road edge in and around Carleton Place. To the south of the site is a larger building known as the Camelot nursing home which is also listed grade II. To the rear of the site, located off a small cul-de-sac known as Fairfax Close, are a number of semi-detached and terraced residential properties accessed off the High Street. On the North Eastern corner of the Countess Road opposite the Camelot nursing home lies Countess Court a complex of retirement flats.

The area therefore consists of a mixture of different types of residential properties in a historic setting.

### THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the erection of a large block of 28 sheltered apartments for the elderly, which will replace the two existing detached dwellings on the site. It is proposed that the new building will be accessed via a single vehicular and pedestrian access from Countess Road. There are 12 parking spaces proposed to serve the development. The footprint of the development has been designed in the form of a T shape with the head of the T facing towards Countess Road and the rest of the building tailing back into the site. The majority of the flats face either South East or North West.

The ground floor will consist of 11 sheltered apartments of varying sizes a small office, communal lounge area, bin store and mobility scooter store (for seven scooters). On the first floor are a further seven flats, a guest room, store, plant and laundry. On the next floor are a

further eight flats with a further two flats on the top floor. Each floor can be accessed by a lift and stairs.

Externally the building has been designed in a semi-vernacular style with the front elevation consisting of a mixed palette of materials including brick, tile, render and flint with the sides and rear consisting of render, tile and brick. There are windows situated on all elevations.

The proposal involves the removal of a number of mature and semi-mature trees and the provision of amenity space around the building with associated landscaping.

## PLANNING HISTORY

80/652	Conversion of dilapidated shed to double garage	A	15.08.80
81/580	Erection of 6 detached dwellings with garages	R	10.06.81
81/41LB	Form opening in wall to allow vehicular access to proposed residential development	R	10.06.81
82/1068	O/L 3 dwellings with double garages + new access	R	09.02.83 App dis 15.02.84
82/121LB	Alteration & extension in facing brick only as necessary to gain access to site at Kent Orchard	R	09.02.83 App dis 15.02.84
86/936LB	Rebuild wall to Countess Road from ground level using original materials at Comilla House	AC	24.09.86
88/269	Erection of dwelling, garage, access	R	18.05.88
88/270	Erection of dwelling, garage, access	R	18.05.88
88/322LB	Reconstruction of flint stone & brick wall with 15m opening	WD	09.09.88
88/323	Reconstruction of flint stone & brick wall with 15m opening	WD	09.09.88
88/1714	Erection of dwelling house, garage & access	AC	12.10.88
88/1715	Reconstruction of boundary wall to match existing	AC	11.01.89
88/1716	Erection of dwelling house, garage & access	AC	12.10.88
88/1717	Reconstruction of boundary wall to match existing	AC	11.01.89
90/1235	Extension at Kent House	AC	11.10.90
90/1236LB	Extension at Kent House	AC	09.11.90
02/486	Pruning and felling of various trees at Kent House	NOBJ	16/04/02

## CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways No Highway objection subject to the following

In order to improve facilities for pedestrians and electric scooter users resulting from the development, the paved footway fronting the site should be widened, as part of the development, to an overall minimum width of 3.0 metres.

Furthermore the existing bus shelter outside the side should, as part of the development, be upgraded to show red bus time information and be set back at the rear of the widened footway which should include improved kerbing at the bus stop.

The applicant will be required to enter into a legal agreement with the County Council in respect of the above works which should be completed to the satisfaction of the local planning authority before the apartments are first occupied.

WCC Library/ Museum Thank you for your consultation on the above application.

A recent study of Amesbury indicates that the site lies within the grounds of the Priory of Fontrevault which was refounded on site of the Saxon abbey in 1177. At the Dissolution in 1541 of the priory, it is described as having 37 acres of meadow, mills, pasture and parkland. The priory itself lay within a paled park containing a graveyard, gardens, orchards and fishponds covering 12 acres. The main priory building is believed to be on the site of the current Amesbury Abbey, but other buildings known on the site such as barns, a gatehouse, a bakehouse and a laundry are recorded

On this basis, there is the potential to find outbuildings relating to the Priory within the area of the above proposal.

I therefore recommend that under the terms of PPG16 on archaeology and development, that you require the applicant to carry out an archaeological evaluation of the site before the planning application is determined. The purpose of this evaluation will establish the nature and extent of any archaeological features and the result of the evaluation will enable me to advise you of the impact of the full proposal.

The archaeological evaluation would need to be in the form of a trench on the proposed location of each new building, excavated by a professional archaeological contractor. The excavation work would be subject to a monitoring visit by myself and I would need to see a copy of the report following excavation

If the evaluation results are positive, it may be necessary for me to recommend to you that further excavation will need to be specified by an appropriate planning condition to be carried out prior to development. The cost of the evaluation report and subsequent excavation will of course fall to the applicant.

Wessex Water Authority

There is public foul sewer in the vicinity of the site. The foul sewerage system should have adequate capacity to serve the proposals. Flow calculations to be submitted in due course. There is no public surface water sewer in the vicinity of the site, The use of soakaways should be possible. There is sewage treatment capacity available. There is adequate capacity at the terminal pumping station. There are public water mains in the vicinity of the site. There should be adequate capacity in the distribution system for the new development. There may be private supply services connections crossing the site.

Environment Agency

No objection to the development subject to a condition covering water efficiency and informatives covering water efficient appliances, Flood risk and surface water drainage, sustainable construction, pollution prevention during construction.

English Heritage

The proposed development is located in close proximity to Kent House, a grade II\* listed building, the grade II\* registered park and garden to

Northern Area Committee 17/01/2008

Amesbury Abbey and within the Amesbury Conservation area. The proposals would involve demolition of the existing structures on the site. It is noted that these include the two houses which are of little historic and architectural value. The plans indicate that demolition of the buildings along the northern boundary is also proposed. The historic maps show buildings in this location in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in the grounds of Kent House. This raises the question as to whether these are curtilage listed buildings by association with Kent House.

The proposal is to replace two small scale houses with one large development. We consider that a building of this height and bulk in this location would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation area and the setting of the grade II\* listed building and is therefore contrary to Government Advice in PPG 15 and should therefore be refused.

#### English Heritage Advice

As the proposed site is in close proximity to Amesbury Abbey and its associated buildings it is important in assessing the proposals to understand some of the history and significance of the site, in the area of the proposed development. During the medieval period the Benedictine Abbey of Amesbury formed part of the land of a priory manor. After the dissolution a new house was erected on the site between 1595 and 1601 for the second Earl of Hertford. In 1600 a gatehouse known as Diana's House was built followed by another gatehouse Kent House in 1607. Between 1720 and 1725, new entrance gates were erected near Kent House, and a formal ride, later called Lord's Walk was planted to provide a new approach to the Abbey. The Abbey itself, the garden and parkland were subsequently redesigned during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries. Kent house is a significant building of both architectural and historic value dating from the early development of the site.

At present, Kent House is a visually important building in views along Countess Road, and the relatively new houses of on the proposal site are set back from the road and are of a scale and mass appropriate to the area.

#### Demolition

The houses are of little historic or architectural merit and therefore there is no presumption in favour of their retention. It is noted that there are some smaller ancillary buildings on the site to be demolished however the accompanying report makes little reference to these structures. The 19<sup>th</sup> century maps (copy enclosed) show these buildings forming part of the curtilage to Kent House. This raises the question as to whether the existing buildings on the site are defined as curtilage structures as set out in paragraph 3.34, for example, are they pre 1948, were ancillary to Kent House and formed part of its curtilage at the time of listing? If this is the case listed building consent may be required for their demolition.

#### New Building

The proposed scheme replaces the existing individual houses with one large apartment block. It is considered that in terms of its height, bulk and overall quality of design and materials the proposed building would have an adverse impact on the setting of the grade II\* gatehouse and the character and appearance of the conservation area. The building would be significantly larger than other properties within the vicinity and be visually dominant particularly in relation to Kent House.

#### Impact on the Registered Garden

The impact of the proposal on the registered garden is a material consideration to assessing the proposals. In order to fully assess this impact it would be useful to have a visual of the view of the proposed new building from the park surrounding Amesbury House.

#### Recommendation

We recommend that the council refuse the application due to the adverse impact the proposal would have on the Conservation Area and the setting of the listed building.

SDC Housing Officer I would raise an objection to this application based on the fact that the applicant has not addressed the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance requiring 40% affordable housing provision on any site over the threshold. A calculation has been made for an off-site contribution representing only 25% affordable housing (7 units). We would in this instance consider an off-site contribution rather than provision on site, although we would expect a contribution equivalent to 40% (11 units)

Any objection to the provision of 40% affordable housing contribution would need to be supported by financial evidence in the form of the Grimley Model.

Garden History Society On the basis of the information supplied we do not wish to comment, but we would

emphasise that this does not in any way signify our approval or disapproval of the proposals

Wiltshire Constabulary No objections

Natural England Under Regulation 48 (3) of the habitats Regulations 1994 Natural England objects to this application. Natural England is concerned about the impacts of the development on water resources and water quality.

The nature conservation importance of the river system arises from the range and diversity of riparian habitats and associated species. The SAC qualifying features include one habitat (the watercourse characterised by floating Ranunculus (water crowfoot) and Callitriche (starwort) vegetation and five species (brook and sea lamprey, bullhead, salmon and Desmoulin's whorl snail). All are dependant upon the maintenance of high water quality and sympathetic habitat management.

The supporting information with the planning application does not address how the developer will protect ground water sources during construction. In addition the developer should confirm that the likely foul water inputs and surface runoff can be accommodated by Wessex Water within the sewerage network and that the potential long term demand for water can be met within their abstraction license.

It is the responsibility of the local planning authority to fully assess the impact of the proposal on Protected Species under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation (Natural Habitats &c.) Regulations 1994 (as amended) and the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Paragraph 98 of the Circular states that "the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a planning authority is considering a development proposal that, if carried out, would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat." A list of all protected species of animals and plants can be found in Annex A of circular 06/2005 accompanying PPS9. In particular, as existing buildings occur on the site, it is likely that bats may be present. The site, located on the edge of the town may also provide habitat for other protected species reptiles or badgers.

Natural England endorses the sustainability and energy and water efficiency measures designed to minimise impact on the environment during and post construction.

It is the responsibility of the developer to provide this information to enable Natural England to make a substantive response and for the

local planning authority to fully assess the proposal. Circular 08/2005 states that the 21 day consultation period for statutory consultees will not start until receipt of adequate information to make a substantive response.

Wiltshire Gardens Trust No comment assuming that the development site is in the town and will not impinge on the historic park of Amesbury Abbey.

#### Campaign to Protect Rural England

There appears to be only one disabled parking space (adjacent to the front door); we are concerned that, given the nature and situation of the residents, all spaces should be a proper width for those with disabilities. If friends or relatives wish to take residents for a drive, then space should be allowed for wheelchairs, walking frames etc. at each space.

#### Salisbury Campaign for better transport

comments as per CPRE (above)

#### Design Forum (5/7/2007 pre- application)

##### Building Design

The Forum thought that the design and the materials employed did not adequately reflect the local context. The external appearance was considered to be rather bland and suburban in character, devoid of anything special or distinctive.

The position of the larger dormers at either end of the roof slope facing Countess Road do not reflect the traditional structure of such a building. To do so, they should ideally be set further apart from the four central dormers, i.e., in the middle of the roof over the smaller wings. The plan showing the materials (drawing number 07.049 DS09) seems to suggest that the hipped-roof on each dormer would have little or no overhang over the cheeks and possibly the window of each one. A more generous overhang to throw off more rainwater from the sides should be designed.

The largely symmetrical design of the building suggests the need for a more prominent central architectural feature in the front elevation perhaps, for example, a projecting gable.

##### Sustainability

It was noted that approximately half of the predominantly single-aspect flats in the building face north and as such would fail to optimise passive solar gain making the building less energy efficient and more reliant on artificial heating and lighting.

We would also expect to see recycling and composting facilities included in the design, the latter of which could be directly used to maintain planting in the garden areas.

##### Site Layout

We thought that the provision for visitor parking was likely to be insufficient. In addition, we were concerned at the lack of space required to allow larger vehicles, such as shopping deliveries, furniture removal vans, and emergency vehicles to turn within the site and leave in forward gear. It is our experience that there will be a need for such vehicles to enter the site from time to time and that the number of such visits while less frequent than car trips would not be insignificant.

##### Conclusion

The potential clearly exists for a good quality building that would work with the character of the town. However, we feel the proposal needs further work in the areas suggested above before we could support it.

Northern Area Committee 17/01/2008



## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes	Expired 6/12/2007
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expired 6/12/2007
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expired 26/11/2007
Third Party responses	Yes	

44 letters of objection received to this planning application the principal points of which were:-

1. Consider that there will be an adverse impact on the setting of Kent House, PPG15 requires local authorities to have regard to the setting of such buildings.
2. Grayan and Orchard House were only approved after a whole series of earlier larger planning applications were refused including schemes that were dismissed at appeal.
3. Current dwellings are set back from the road ensuring there is no harm to Kent House.
4. The new building will be of a very significant bulk and height resulting in a severe and adverse impact upon the setting of the listed building.
5. Considers that a listed building application should be made in relation to the structures adjacent to the listed wall.
6. It is considered that the proposal will be contrary to policy HE7 of the Adopted Swindon and Wiltshire Structure plan and policy CN3 and CN5 of the adopted local plan.
7. The objection from the local authority's conservation officer and English Heritage indicate that the planning application should be refused.
8. Consider that the new building because of its bulk and design fails to preserve or enhance the conservation area and it is considered that the proposal is contrary to policy CN8 and CN11 of the adopted local plan. The proposal will cause significant harm to the historic heritage of Amesbury as such the proposal is contrary to PPG15.
9. Considers that there will be overlooking of adjacent Kent House.
10. Consider that the building by virtue of its height, and extent particularly on the North West elevation will constitute an overbearing, oppressive and dominant feature in close proximity to the boundary of Kent House.
11. Consider that the design is inappropriate for inclusion on this sensitive site and is contrary to the Amesbury conservation area appraisal and policies G1, G2 and D2 of the adopted local plan.
12. Considers that the proposal could have a significant effect on the river Avon special area of conservation.
13. Considered that the committee could open itself up to judicial review if the application were to be approved in its current form contrary to a significant number of local and national policies.
14. Consider that the site of the old co-operative store in the centre of Amesbury would be more appropriate to this type of development.
15. The proposal will contribute to the worsening of traffic coming down Countess road.
16. Amesbury has enough of this type of development already.
17. Application will overlook the gardens of Kent House to the detriment of that property.

Parish Council response                      Yes: No objection

## MAIN ISSUES

Principle of sheltered accommodation on this site  
Historic context and setting  
Design Issues  
Highways Issues  
Affordable Housing  
Archaeology  
Nature Conservation  
Impact on neighbours

## POLICY CONTEXT

G1, General Principles, G2 development criteria, G9, provision of infrastructure, D1 Extensive development, D2 Infill development, D8 Public Art, H16 Housing Policy Boundaries, H24

Northern Area Committee 17/01/2008

residential housing for the elderly, H25 Affordable Housing, CN3 development affecting listed buildings, CN5 Development within or outside the curtilage of a listed building, CN8 devpt in conservation areas, CN9 devpt in conservation areas CN10 open spaces in a conservation area. CN11 views into and out of conservation areas. CN17 Trees, CN18 historic parks and gardens, CN20 archaeology, CN21 request for archaeological evaluation. CN22 preservation of archaeological remains. CN23 archaeology, C8 landscape quality, C13 Wildlife habitat, C12 Protected species, TR11 Car parking Standards, TR14 Secure Bicycle Parking. R3 recreational provision for the elderly.

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### Principle of sheltered accommodation on the site

The proposal site lies within the Housing Policy Boundary of the local plan where policy H16 applies, policy H16 states that –

“In addition to the areas specified in policies H2-H15, and except as provided by policies H17-H18, infilling, small scale development and redevelopment will be permitted within the Housing Policy Boundaries of” *amongst others Amesbury*

“The policy will be subject to the following criteria:

- (i) the proposal will not constitute tandem or inappropriate backland development;
- (ii) the proposal will not result in the loss of an open area which makes a positive contribution towards the character of the settlement; and
- (iii) in Wilton, the proposal will not exacerbate current problems associated with sewage disposal.
- (iv) the proposal will not conflict with the Design Policies of the Plan.”

The site is considered to comply with this policy in terms of points i, ii and iii it is not considered to comply in terms of point iv (see section on design below). The principal of providing development therefore at this location is considered acceptable providing it complies with the design (and any other relevant policies in the local plan).

Policy H24 of the adopted local plan states that

*H24 Within the Housing Policy Boundaries of this Local Plan, residential development suitable for the elderly will be permitted provided that:*

- (i) it includes adequate amenity space and has a high quality setting; and*
- (ii) the development is well located in relation to local services and amenities.*

In relation to point one of this policy, officers consider that the proposal provides adequate amenity space (to the rear and either side of the building) to provide for the accommodation that is proposed and it is considered that any potential scheme could be adequately conditioned. In order to ensure that external amenity space and planting is provided to a high standard.

The building is set within a conservation area directly adjacent two listed buildings (one of which is grade 2\* listed) and close to an historic listed parkland as such it is considered that the setting for the building is of a high quality as required under this policy.

The second criteria is also considered to be met in that the site is situated very close to the town centre which is within a very short walk of this site. The town centre provides shops, healthcare facilities, cafes and all any other types of amenities you would expect to be associated with a small town such as Amesbury. Given that this is the case and that the majority of these facilities are within a short walk of the application site officers consider that the proposal in principle also meets this criteria.

In summary therefore it is officers opinion that in principle sheltered apartments are acceptable on the site.

### Historic context and setting

Given that it is considered that the proposal has been placed in a high quality setting as required under policy H24 above and that this high quality of setting is derived primarily from the historically important nature of the site the effect that the development will have in itself on that setting is equally important.

Policy CN5 of the adopted local plan states that -

*CN5 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 concerned.*

Concern has been expressed by both English Heritage to the proposal (see comments above) and by the district council's own conservation officer. The conservation officer's comments are as follows –

*I still have significant concerns about this scheme, in spite of the pre-application advice which was given. The site lies within the curtilage of the grade II\* listed Kent House, historically a lodge to Amesbury Abbey; the garden was subdivided for the construction of Grayan & Orchard Houses long after the date of listing (10/01/53). This makes it especially important that any new development in this space respects the setting of the LB (as well as the conservation area and adjacent grade II\* registered park). The remaining garden of Kent House is within the registered park, as is the land to the south-west of the site.*

*Views of Kent House from Countess Road are particularly important, and any development should preserve its pre-eminence in the streetscene, so that nothing competes with it in scale, design or materials. The degree of visual separation from the Camelot buildings (on Countess Road side) forms an important part of this scene, giving Kent House space and showing that it belongs to the park rather than the town centre. While the existing houses do encroach on this in a small way, they are of a significantly lower scale than the proposed development and are set sufficiently back and down within the site to limit the harm done; the new structure proposed, while set back from the road, is substantially higher, and by combining the joint width of the existing houses into a single block under a vast tiled roof, forms a much more prominent and bulky structure. The sketch shown on the front of the Design, Access & Sustainability Statement gives a reasonable representation of the view from the south-east, and demonstrates the undesirable competition between the new building and Kent House.*

*The proportion of the building to its plot is also uncharacteristically high, maximising the built form in a way which doesn't reflect the character of the conservation area, which largely comprises buildings on the back of the pavement with small, or at least narrow, rear extensions. The 'backland' developments of Fairfax Close and Abbey Lane are all but invisible from the public realm, whereas the scale of the proposed rear wing means that glancing views may well be had of it from Countess Road in both directions.*

*As for materials, should the application be approved, then the tiles and bricks will need to be carefully chosen, and the windows must be painted timber; upvc/aluminium windows of this number will have a huge impact on the quality and character of the building and its relationship to the conservation area, and make a seriously adverse impact on the setting of Kent House.*

In terms of policy CN5 therefore and the criteria that new development should not harm the character or setting of the building concerned it is the professional opinion of the historic advisers that the building would not respect the grade II\* listed Kent House in terms of its scale, bulk and massing. It is pointed out that Kent House is a visually important building in views in both directions down Countess road and whilst the proposed building has been substantially set back within the site in order to try to preserve views of the house it is the opinion of English Heritage that the building would still be visually dominant, the conservation officer considers that the new proposal would be a much more dominant and bulky structure than the existing two smaller houses and that this would produce undesirable competition between the new building and Kent House. In terms of scale therefore, the height, bulk and massing of the building proposed is not considered to respect the building's position in relation to Kent House.

It is officers' opinion that the existing two dwellings on site whilst visually uninspiring are of a smaller scale and their smaller footprint makes them far more appropriate to the setting of the listed building and the conservation area. The conservation officer points out that in setting back the building to try to keep its large bulk and form away from Kent house the development becomes untypical of the back of street edge developments that are typical of this part of the conservation area.

*CN8 In Conservation Areas, only development which preserves or enhances the existing character of the area will be permitted.*

*The Local Planning Authority will seek to ensure that the form, scale and design of new development, and the materials used in it, respect the character of the area.*

Given the large scale of this building and the form and massing that it takes it is not considered by officers that the proposal preserves the existing character of the area as the building will be visually dominant within it for the reasons outlined above and it therefore follows that it is also considered by officers that the building does not enhance the character of the area but detracts from it.

The outbuildings along the Northern boundary are considered to be curtilage listed and would need LBC to be demolished. Although the applicant has been made aware that Listed building consent would be required for their demolition no application has yet been received and no justification has been put forward for the loss of this historic fabric. Without such a justification it is considered that there is the potential for considerable harm to the listed building fabric and the proposal would be contrary to policies CN1 and CN9 of the adopted local plan.

#### Design and materials

Prior to the submission of this application the applicants presented to the design forum and their comments are shown above, as a result of these comments the applicants amended their proposal principally the front elevation in order to try to overcome the design issues. The front elevation of the proposal has therefore been amended with a new gable end and tile hanging to the first and second floors and flint at ground floor level. This officers consider is an improvement to this façade of the building but does not negate the fact that the design forum had substantial concerns about the building as a whole.

#### *D2, Infill, Development*

*Proposals for street and infill development will be permitted where proposals respect or enhance the character of appearance of an area in terms of the following criteria:*

*(i) the building line, scale of the area, heights and massing of adjoining buildings and the characteristic building plot widths;*

*(ii) the architectural characteristics and the type, colour of the materials of adjoining buildings; and*

*(iii) the complexity and richness of materials, form and detailing of existing buildings where the character of the area is enhanced by such buildings and the new development proposes to replicate such richness*

In terms of this policy much of criteria (i) has been discussed above under the heading historic context, however points two and three are also relevant to the consideration of this application.

The use of tiles, render brickwork and flintwork is typical of the materials found in the area and as such these materials are not considered inappropriate for a building on this site. However as the applicants have plainly chosen to design a building that is intended to reflect the vernacular of the area in which it is situated the way in which some of these materials have been used is clearly inappropriate and not typical of the area. In particular the groundfloor wall of flint on the front elevation is not a feature found elsewhere in Amesbury. Whilst flint is used on a regular basis throughout the town this is usually either in flint banding covering half or all of the building or used completely on the whole building. The decoration of just one level of a building and only one face is entirely untypical and where trying to replicate the vernacular of an area as it appears the applicants are trying to do this is considered untypical and inappropriate.

The mix of materials found primarily on the front elevation but also used elsewhere on the building appears cluttered and ill thought out, the mixture of potentially two types of tiles, flintwork, render and brickwork appears gives a muddled appearance to the front elevation which is inappropriate in this very sensitive location. The materials that are proposed which include painted timber doors and windows clay roof tiles are considered to be appropriate although the use of plastic fascias and gutterings in this sensitive location are clearly inappropriate.

Officers have concerns about the style of windows chosen which are not typical of window design in Amesbury as this is a building clearly seeking to mimic the vernacular of Amesbury; the attention given to the window design is considered poor as the window sizes and design appear to reflect the use of the rooms within the building rather than considering the context into which the building is to be developed. In particular the dormer windows are overly large and intrusive compared with traditional dormer windows in the area and appear as an overly heavy feature particularly on the front elevation of this building. Dormer windows will, in the hierarchy of windows in an elevation, usually be the smallest of the windows and yet in this design they are the largest. This contradicts the advice given in the councils adopted SPG on design, *Creating Places*.

In summary therefore, whilst officers consider the materials proposed per se to be largely acceptable, although not in their employment, with the exception of the plastic fascias and guttering, the design is considered to be poor being neither high quality modern design nor a good standard pastiche of buildings found elsewhere in the area. It is therefore considered that in design terms the application should be refused.

#### Highways Issues

The County highways officer has raised no objections to this development subject to the footway in front of the site being widened to 3.0m in order to accommodate electric scooters and pedestrians. He has also stated that the bus stop situated outside the site should be upgraded to one that shows real time passenger information. Both of these requests appear directly related to the proposal and the reduced level of parking proposed for this sheltered accommodation. However whilst it is considered reasonable to ask for an upgrade to the bus shelter at this location. The widening of the footpath is unlikely to be possible without demolishing part of the listed wall and therefore it is not considered appropriate to request this.

#### Affordable Housing

The applicant has proposed that a contribution to off site affordable housing provision be made at 25%. As can be seen from the above the authorities housing department has objected to this as although they consider a contribution to off site affordable housing provision to be appropriate they consider that this should be in line with the local authorities SPG on affordable housing which suggests a contribution of 40% should be sought unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The applicants opinion is that they have demonstrated that the application site is not financially viable if they are required to provide 40% affordable housing. The council's housing department is of the opinion that the applicants should use the model in the adopted SPG to demonstrate that this is the case. At the time of writing the applicants had stated that they were talking to the housing department about this issue and negotiating on it. However no agreement has yet been reached. If an agreement is reached before this application is brought to committee, members will be updated on this issue and the officer's report changed. However at present given the apparent shortfall in affordable housing provision it is recommended that the application be refused on these grounds.

The SPG states that –

***“Accordingly, by means of clarification, it would be appropriate to identify for all parties concerned with the application of Policy H25 that the District Council considers a minimum of 25% to be the basic affordable housing requirement.***

***However, in light of material considerations related to housing need, the Council may negotiate for proportions of up to 40% on qualifying development sites in order to***

**address the established target in the Local Plan to provide 150 affordable dwellings per year.**

**All parties should note that the Council will assess affordable housing provision on a case by case basis and, in line with what is already set out in the policy, requirements will be balanced against site suitability and the economics of provision (including the costs of other planning obligations) which are required to achieve the delivery of successful housing developments.”**

(Members should note that the applicants agents had been advised in pre-application discussions to seek agreement with the councils housing department on this matter but the application was subsequently submitted without an agreement having been reached).

At the time of writing the applicants had stated that they were talking to the housing department about this issue and negotiating on it. However no agreement has yet been reached. If an agreement is reached before this application is brought to committee members will be updated on this issue and the officers report changed. However at present given the apparent shortfall in affordable housing provision it is recommended that the application be refused on these grounds.

#### Archaeology

As can be seen above, the county archaeologist has asked that an archaeological evaluation be carried out of the site prior to the grant of planning permission in view of the relatively high potential for finding archaeological artefacts in the area as advised in PPG16. The applicant at the time of writing was due to undertake an archaeological evaluation of the site but the results were not available and therefore at present there is an objection to developing the site without such an evaluation. Again members will be updated if the results of any archaeological evaluation are made known to the local authority prior to the committee date.

#### Nature conservation and the effect on the River Avon SAC

As can be seen from the above Natural England have objected to the application on the basis that they do not have sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposal will not have a negative impact on ground water sources within the vicinity of the river Avon SAC this is a material consideration under the provisions of PPS9. As such it is considered that the proposal could have a negative impact upon the River Avon SAC and as such without such information should be refused.

Additionally Natural England have noted the existence of existing buildings on the site and therefore consider that there is potential for protected species to be found on the site in particular bats. The presence of protected species on site is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and without a protected species survey being carried out the local authority is not in a position to judge the effect that the proposal will have on any potential protected species in the area as such this should form a further reason for refusal.

It is understood that the applicant is endeavouring to complete both of these requirements and as such if further information on these issues becomes available prior to the Northern Area meeting this will be reported to members.

#### Impact on neighbouring properties/overlooking/loss of amenity

The potential for this proposal to overlook neighbouring properties is significant due to the building's large scale and the numerous windows that have been positioned on all of its elevations in particular there are principal windows positioned on the rear south-western elevation which are situated within 18m of the rear windows of properties that back on to this site in Fairfax Close. The windows proposed on the back of the new building are bedroom windows and are therefore classed as habitable rooms. These would directly overlook neighbouring properties and overlook the windows in numbers 20,21 and 22 Fairfax Close to the detriment of the amenity of those properties.

It is not considered that there would be direct overlooking of other properties surrounding the site. However because of the significant change in the number of windows that will be positioned on all the elevations there is considered to be a change to the perceived sense of being overlooked from the number of windows on the elevations to this new property. The applicant has not provided any evidence to show that there would not be a sense of overlooking from the large number of windows on the south-eastern and north-western elevations and without such information, it is considered that there will be a significant perception of being overlooked in the garden areas of both Kent House to the north-west and nos 25 and 26 Fairfax Close to the detriment to the amenity of these properties.

It is therefore considered that there will be both direct and indirect overlooking from this proposal of neighbouring properties to the detriment of the amenity of those properties.

### Conclusion

The application site is considered in principle to be capable of accommodating some form of sheltered housing, and the scheme as shown makes efficient use of brownfield land and contains energy saving and sustainable measures that help meet criteria as expressed in the companion document to PPS1. Notwithstanding these measures the scheme shown at present is considered to represent a substantial form of overdevelopment of the site in terms of its height bulk and massing given its very close proximity to the neighbouring grade II\* listed building and the conservation area within which it sits which will degrade the setting of the listed building and have a negative impact on that structure.

The design of the building is considered to be neither a high standard of modern design nor an accurate replication of other buildings found in the local area and as such the building is considered to represent a poor standard of design and does not meet the high aspirational standards of buildings as required in the governments PPS1 or the councils own adopted SPG on design 'creating places, particularly given the high quality setting within which the building is to be placed.

The lack of information provided on the issues of Archaeology, effect of the development on the River Avon SAC and the need for more information to prove the viability of the development with a higher percentage of affordable housing should all form further reasons for refusal.

In view of the above it is recommended that the planning application be refused.

### **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL**

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposal by reason of its scale, height and massing is considered to be an intrusive development which will have a negative impact on views of the grade II\* listed building (Kent House) particularly when viewed from the south along Countess Road and will have a negative impact on the conservation area, being out of character with that area because of its scale, height and massing which it is considered are unrelated to surrounding buildings. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies CN5 and CN8 of the Salisbury District Councils retained planning policies.
2. The proposal by reason of its design and appearance is considered to be an incongruous form of development out of character with adjacent properties by reason of its poor architectural design and lack of traditional detailing. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to policies D2 of Salisbury District Councils retained planning policies and objective 13 of Salisbury District Councils adopted Design Guide SPG, 'Creating Places'.
3. The proposal lies within the grounds of the Priory of Fontrevault which was refounded on the site of a saxon Abbey in 1177, buildings known on the site such as barns, a gatehouse, a bakehouse and a laundry are recorded and as such there is the potential to find outbuildings relating to the Priory within the area of the development proposal. PPG 16 advises that where there is potential to find features of archaeological

importance an archaeological evaluation should be undertaken prior to the commencement of development. No such archaeological evaluation has been undertaken and the proposal it is therefore considered could have a detrimental impact on features of archaeological importance contrary to PPG16 and contrary to policy CN21 of Salisbury District Councils retained planning policies.

4. It is not considered that the applicants have adequately demonstrated that the proposed development would be financially unviable with the provision of 40% affordable housing as required in the councils adopted SPG, Delivering affordable housing in Salisbury District, as such the proposal for the provision of an off site contribution of 25% is considered to be contrary to the aims of this SPG and the government's published guidance as contained within PPS3.
5. The site lies close to the River Avon Special Area of Conservation, the information provided with the application does not address how the developer will protect ground water sources during construction. As such it is considered that the proposal could have a serious and adverse effect on nature conservation interests within the river Avon SAC and as such the proposal is considered to be contrary to PPS9. It is also considered that insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse effect on protected species in the form of a protected species survey and as such the proposal is considered to be contrary to policy C12 of the Salisbury District Councils retained planning policies and PPS9.
6. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that there will not be overlooking of neighbouring properties in the form of sectional drawings of the proposed building and the surrounding dwellings. As such it is considered that the proposal by reason of the positioning of windows on its south-western elevation will directly overlook neighbouring properties at no's 20, 21 and 22 Fairfax Close to the detriment of the amenity of the occupiers of those properties and will also indirectly give the perception of overlooking in the gardens of properties at Kent House and nos 25 and 26 Fairfax Close from windows on the north-western and south-eastern elevations respectively of the new development to the detriment of the amenity of those properties and contrary to policy G2 of Salisbury District Councils retained planning policies.
7. The proposal by reason of its siting, scale, height and massing would have an adverse impact on the setting of the grade II\* Kent House, furthermore it is considered that insufficient information has been provided to justify the demolition of the curtilage listed outbuildings adjacent the Boundary of Kent house (in the grounds of Grayan House) which forms part of it's historic setting and without such justification it is considered that the development would have an adverse impact on the historic fabric of the area contrary to policy CN1 and CN9 of Salisbury District Councils retained planning policies.
8. The proposed development fails to make provision for the requirement for a commuted sum in respect of the provision of recreational public open space required under policy R3 of the adopted Salisbury district local plan.



Application Number:	S/2007/2046		
Applicant/ Agent:	ALEX OLIVER ASSOCIATES		
Location:	WISMA FARM BERWICK ST. JAMES SALISBURY SP3 4TQ		
Proposal:	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS EXISTING DWELLING AND OUTBUILDINGS. CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT DWELLING AND REPLACEMENT AGRICULTURAL BUILDINGS		
Parish/ Ward	WINTERBOURNE STOKE		
Conservation Area:	LB Grade:		
Date Valid:	11 October 2007	Expiry Date	10 January 2008
Case Officer:	Mr A Madge	Contact Number:	01722 434541

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor West has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to the strong local interest shown in the application including the parish council views.

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises a currently unused poultry farm that is located on the eastern side of the B3083, about 700 metres to the north of the village of Berwick St James and approximately 350 metres to the south of the junction of the B3083 with the A303. The site is also located a short distance (about 150 metres) to the south west of the settlement boundary of Winterbourne Stoke. The B3083, from which the site is accessed, links into the A303 west of Winterbourne Stoke and into the A36 at Stapleford.

The site extends to an area of about 2.2 hectares and was formerly used as a poultry farm and has been occupied by two timber framed poultry sheds that were constructed from blockwork and timber boarding and measured about 80m x 15m, together with ancillary grain silos that are located at the eastern end of these units. The existing poultry sheds are both single storey and are relatively low-key buildings in terms of their overall height, although the grain silos stand at a much greater overall height. There are also two large areas of hardstanding to the southern side of the poultry sheds where two former poultry units that have been destroyed by fire previously stood. In addition, there is also a steel framed hay barn measuring about 12m x 18m that is located close to the site frontage and is enclosed by metal cladding to the road (west) elevation.

The site is also occupied by a detached, single storey bungalow that is located towards the south eastern corner of the site. The existing dwelling has a pitched roof form and is finished in render under a concrete tiled roof. As such, the site is clearly divided into two separate uses, the agricultural use that occupies about three quarters of the site area and the residential area that occupies the remainder of the site. There are also several small outbuildings scattered around the eastern end of the overall site.

The remainder of the site forms an open and grassed area that is largely devoid of vegetation and effectively forms an agricultural field. The site is generally level, although the area of land between the existing poultry sheds and the frontage boundary forms a small terrace at a slightly higher level to the rest of the site and there is a gentle slope down towards the east. The boundaries of the site are predominantly demarcated by post and wire fencing, although there is a conifer screen along part of the length of the northern boundary and a line of hawthorn trees along about half the length of the frontage boundary to the site.

The site has two vehicular access points from the B3083, one at each end of the frontage (western) boundary to the site.

The site is located outside of any settlement boundaries within the open countryside of the Special Landscape Area.

## THE PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission to demolish the existing bungalow, the redundant poultry sheds and silos, and other outbuildings and to redevelop the whole site by the erection of a replacement dwelling together with three additional garages a large cycle store and garden store. The proposal also includes the development of a tractor shed and farm office along with a number of loose boxes. The proposal also includes associated access works and landscaping.

The proposed replacement dwelling has been designed with a traditional façade to the principal front elevation to reflect the design of a manor/farmhouse and is proposed to be finished in brick and flint elevations under a clay/slate tile roof. The property will be two-storeys in height with a fairly steeply pitched hipped roof form and will accommodate the principal habitable accommodation (Drawing room, study, Dining room, kitchen etc) on the ground floor with 4 bedrooms (two en-suite) and a bathroom at the first floor level.

Attached to the side of the property is a triple garage, a garden store area and an additional cycle store. These are housed in a single storey building with a steeply pitched roof constructed of slate/clay. The walls to this building are clad in weatherboarding.

The proposal also includes the erection of an associated stable block and an additional machine store and farm office. The stable block will incorporate five loose boxes to house the applicant's own horses, one of which is a double size box. The loose boxes in a similar style to the house will have clay/slate roof with timber weatherboarding to the sides. The proposed machine store will be triple bayed and a farm office with toilet is proposed adjacent the store. Similarly to the loose boxes the building will be part timber clad but will also be flint and brick with a clay/slate roof.

In addition to the above, this application includes the splitting of the current two accessways such that the existing hay barn (which is to be retained) is served by the main existing accessway into the site in the south western corner of the plot, whilst the new dwelling, Loose boxes, tractor shed and farm office will be accessed from an existing access which will be reopened in the North western corner of the plot. A long drive will bend round through the field to the house from this point. A large new hardstanding area will be created in front of the house of unspecified materials. A new garden will be created to the west and a paddock created to the north east.

## PLANNING HISTORY

The planning history indicates a poultry use on this site dating back to 1973 with the earlier use of the site as a piggery. Since this date, there have been various applications relating to the poultry use of the site, including:

- S/1996/1202 Planning permission was refused for the provision of a mobile home for an agricultural worker in November 1996.
- S/2000/2036 In January 2001, planning permission was granted for the erection of a replacement agricultural building (poultry unit) to replace earlier units lost to fire. *This permission has not been implemented and has now lapsed.*
- S/2000/2037 At the same time, planning permission was also granted for the erection of a second agricultural building (poultry unit) to replace an earlier unit lost to fire. *This permission has not been implemented and has now lapsed.*

More recently, and of particular relevance to the current proposal, the planning history includes the following planning applications:

- S/2003/0586 Planning permission was refused in June 2003 for alterations to and conversion of the former agricultural buildings to provide 11 B1/B8 industrial/storage units. This application was refused for the following reasons:

1. *"The proposed development, by virtue of its range of uses, scale and location represents a significant employment development which is likely to be served*

*primarily by private motorised vehicles and therefore will increase the number and length of such trips, contrary to the aims to achieve sustainable patterns of development including influencing the rate of traffic growth and reducing the environmental impact of transport overall, as established by the Wiltshire Structure Plan Policy DP1, Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan Policy G1 and PPG13.*

2. *In the absence of any Traffic Assessment the Local Planning Authority is not convinced that the resultant traffic arising from this development can be safely accommodated within existing road capacities, including the A.303, A.36 and B.3083 and therefore the scheme is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy G1 (iv) and C21 (ix) of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, and policies G2 (ii) and C24 (ix) of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.*
3. *The County Class II road B3083, by reason of its restricted width, poor alignment and sub-standard junction with the Trunk Road A.36 at Stapleford is considered unsuited to serve as a means of access to the proposed development, contrary to the requirements of Policy G1 (iii) of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and Policy G2 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.*
4. *Vehicles resulting from the proposed development leaving the site access at a point where visibility from and of such vehicles is restricted, would be a source of danger to other road users to the detriment of highway safety, contrary to the requirements of Policy G1 (iii) of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and Policy G2 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.*
5. *The proposed development, by retaining two large and utilitarian structures, in addition to the introduction of vehicle parking areas and any ancillary outside storage and signage required for the normal operation of the resultant development will represent an alien and harmful form of development within the open countryside setting of the Special Landscape Area, contrary to the requirements of Policy C7 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and Policy C6 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan”.*

S/2005/2522 A planning application to redevelop part of the site of Wisma Farm through the demolition of the existing poultry sheds and the erection of two office buildings, a store building, a manage and associated parking provision was withdrawn in January 2006.

S/2006/2122 Demolish existing derelict poultry sheds and silos, steel framed barn and associated outbuildings, redevelop site by erection of replacement dwelling, stable block, lambing shed and stores, office building, storage building, construction of a ménage and associated access & landscape works. The application was refused for the following reasons -

1. *“As a matter of principle, in the interests of the character and appearance of the countryside, the Local Planning Authority considers that the establishment of new employment sites in the countryside should be resisted. In that the proposal represents the development of a new employment site in the countryside, other than by the conversion or replacement of suitably located and constructed existing buildings, for which there is no overriding justification it would be unacceptable in principle and contrary to Policies E21, C1, C2 and C6 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and Government guidance in PPS7 “Sustainable Development in Rural Areas”.*
2. *The proposed development, with particular regard to the employment use, by reason of its location within the open countryside is likely to encourage additional vehicle trips and create further dependence on the private car for travel to, and from the site, contrary to the principles of achieving a sustainable pattern of development. As such, the proposed development is contrary to*

*Policy G1 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003), Policy DP1 and DP3 of the Adopted Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 (April 2006) and the aims of PPS3 "Housing", PPS7 "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas" and PPG13 "Transport".*

3. *The proposed replacement dwelling would be significantly larger than the existing dwelling and as such would conflict with the principle of Policy H30 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) that seeks to restrict the size of replacement dwellings so that they are not significantly larger than the dwelling that they replace in the interests of the character and appearance of the countryside. Furthermore, by reason of its greater scale, massing and height the replacement dwelling would be more prominent in the landscape than the existing dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the countryside and high quality landscape of the Special Landscape Area. As such, the proposed development is contrary to Policies G1, C1, C2, C6 and H30 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003), Policy C9 of the Adopted Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 (April 2006) and the advice contained in PPS7 "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas".*
4. *The proposed development, by reason of the excessive scale and massing of the stable block, office and storage buildings, together with the cumulative impact of the development as a whole, would appear as an intrusive form of development and lead to an undesirable encroachment into the countryside and the proliferation of non-agricultural buildings/structures, for which there is no overriding justification, in the countryside and Special Landscape Area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies G1, C1, C2, C6, H30, E21 and R1C of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003), Policy C9 of the Adopted Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 (April 2006) and the key aims of PPS7 "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas".*

There is no planning history relating to the existing bungalow on the site.

## **CONSULTATIONS**

WCC Highways	No Highway objection is raised to the proposed new dwelling and new agricultural buildings subject to conditions. The proposed access for the new dwelling is at an improved position where visibility is much improved to the north (but obtainable through the adjacent field boundary fence) and visibility to the south is acceptable but partially obstructed by the beech trees. The beech trees form an obstruction to visibility at the existing main access point but I note that the existing hay barn only will gain access from this existing access and therefore the likely traffic at this access is much reduced.
Highways Agency	No objection and has confirmed that it does not propose to give a direction restricting the grant of planning permission.
WCC Archaeology	No objection, subject to the imposition of a condition requiring an archaeological watching brief takes place during the initial stages of construction.
Environment Agency	Raise no objections but strongly recommend that the development includes sustainable design and construction measures which comply with the code for sustainable homes. Also recommend that water efficiency measures are incorporated into the scheme.
Wessex Water	The site is not located within a Wessex Water sewered area. The developer has proposed to dispose of foul flows to existing mains. As there are no existing public foul sewers in the vicinity of the site it is advised that the developer investigate alternative methods for the satisfactory disposal of foul flows from the site (e.g. septic tank).

There is a water main in the vicinity of the proposal. It will be necessary for the developer to agree a point of connection onto the system for the satisfactory supply of water for the proposal. This can be agreed at the detail design stage.

Natural England No objection. We advise that the mitigation proposals are assured through a planning condition, using all the recommendations contained within the survey for protected Wildlife Species undertaken by Country Contracts in September 2006.

Wiltshire Wildlife Trust No objection although would recommend that the entire site is resurveyed as the report prepared by the applicants specialists is now over a year old.

Wiltshire and Swindon Biological Records Centre In carrying out the planning screen, records for bats and barn owls were found at this site. Bats are fully protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and the habitats Regulations. Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 9, paragraph 16, states that planning authorities should ensure that species which receive statutory protection under a range of legislative provisions should be protected from the adverse effect of development, by using planning conditions or obligations.

Environmental Health - No objections subject to a condition restricting the hours of construction.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes -	expired 15/11/07
Site Notice displayed	Yes -	expired 15/11/07
Departure	Yes	
Neighbour notification	Yes -	expired 05/11/07
Third Party Response	Yes	

One letter of representation has been received in response to the proposed development:

My Wife and I live in the adjacent property on the eastern border. We heartily support this proposal, which will remove an eyesore and replace it with a property and surroundings more in keeping with the neighbourhood.

Parish Council: No objections and support the proposal to redevelop the site of the old chicken farm at Wisma Farm. We note that the proposal shows a new entrance and ask for confirmation that the old entrance is to close because, in the Council's opinion, it is on a dangerous stretch of road with poor sight lines for traffic. It is noted that at paragraph 12, the applicant has ticked "yes" to having a public footpath or bridleway over the land-to the Council's knowledge no rights of way exist over this land.

## POLICY CONTEXT

The following policies are relevant to the current proposal:

Retained Local Plan policies (June 2003): G1, G2, H30, CN21, CN22, C2, C6, C8, C12, TR11, TR14 and R1C.

Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 (Adopted April 2006): DP1, DP3, DP9, DP14, T5, C1, C9 and HE2.

Northern Area Committee 17/01/2008

Also of relevance to this application are PPS1 "Delivering Sustainable Development", PPS7 "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas" PPG13 "Transport" and PPG16 Archaeology.

## MAIN ISSUES

1. Principle of development
2. Visual Impact of Development upon the Landscape/Design
3. Sustainable Patterns of Development
4. Impact upon Highway Network
5. Residential Amenity
6. Flood Risk
7. Drainage
8. Impact on Protected Species
9. Nature Conservation
10. Archaeological Issues
11. Provision of Recreation Facilities

## PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of Development:

The application site represents an agricultural site that lies outside of the settlement boundaries of Berwick St James and Winterbourne Stoke and forms part of the Special Landscape Area within the open countryside. The current application, proposes the redevelopment of the site for the erection of a replacement residential dwelling related equestrian use, farm offices and machinery storage as well as agricultural use. As such, this application represents a proposal that raises a number of complex policy issues.

Given the location of the site within the open countryside, the proposed development falls to be considered against the relevant countryside policies that represent an appropriate starting point for the assessment of this application. Within the open countryside, Government guidance set out in PPS7 "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas" makes it clear that new development should be strictly controlled and that there is a presumption against new development for which there is no demonstrable need. In this respect, PPS7 states at Paragraph 1 (iv) that, "*New building development in the open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled; the Government's overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and beauty, the diversity of its landscape, heritage and wildlife, the wealth of its natural resources and so it may be enjoyed by all*". The guidance also identifies at paragraph 15 that "*Planning authorities should continue to ensure that the quality and character of the wider countryside is protected and, where possible, enhanced*".

The retained countryside policies of the Salisbury Local Plan uphold the guidance set out in PPS7 and in particular that new development should maintain or enhance the environment. Policy C2 identifies that development in the countryside will be strictly limited in order to fulfil the objective of conserving the countryside and will not be permitted unless it would benefit the local economy and maintain or enhance the environment. Policy C6 that deals specifically with development proposals in the parts of the countryside designated as a Special Landscape Area is also of particular relevance. This policy requires that development within the Special Landscape Area must have particular regard to the high quality of the landscape and that the siting and scale of development must also be sympathetic with the landscape and of a high standard of design.

### a) Replacement Dwelling

The development proposes a replacement dwelling, Policy H30 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan that specifically relates to the replacement of existing dwellings in the countryside is directly relevant to this aspect of the application. This policy is permissive of such development, but only where, amongst other criteria, "*the proposed replacement dwelling is not significantly larger and has no greater impact than the existing dwelling*". The explanatory text to this policy provides further advice in relation to the reason for this policy and states, "*A replacement dwelling should not be significantly larger than the one being replaced in order to maintain the overall character of the countryside. The fact that a house on a particular site would be unobtrusive is not considered sufficient justification for a substantial increase in size, as the*

*cumulative impact of proposals, if not carefully controlled, would lead to the long-term erosion of the character of the District's countryside".* This makes it clear that it is not just the site specific impact of a replacement dwelling that has to be considered, although this is of course of importance, but also the cumulative impact on the wider countryside of allowing significantly larger dwellings that would result in long-term harm to its character.

In this case, it is considered that the proposed replacement dwelling would be "*significantly larger*" than the existing dwelling. In terms of a comparison of the footprint of the proposed replacement dwelling with the existing dwelling, it is considered that the proposed footprint would be decreased from 165m<sup>2</sup> to 151m<sup>2</sup> – a decrease of about 9% that is well within the terms of the replacement dwelling that could be tolerated by this policy (an increase of about 30% in the size of the replacement dwelling is normally considered to represent an acceptable limit). A decrease in the ground floor space of 9% is therefore considered acceptable.

The replacement dwelling, however, is proposed to be two-storeys in height with the habitable accommodation provided on two separate floor levels whereas the existing dwelling is a single storey bungalow with the habitable accommodation restricted to the ground floor only. As such, in terms of floor space, it is considered that the replacement dwelling would represent a significant increase in comparison to the existing property. The applicants state that there would be an increase in floorspace from 197m<sup>2</sup> at present to 302m<sup>2</sup>. The correct existing floorspace is however 165m<sup>2</sup> excluding existing outbuildings and therefore the increase in floorspace would be 83% larger than existing.

In terms of the physical size of the existing and replacement dwellings, the proposed dwelling would be some 8.8m high to the main ridge and 6.0m to the eaves level (in comparison to the ridge and eaves heights of the existing dwelling of 4.4m and 2.5m respectively), while the overall depth would be 12.5m (compared to 9.9m) and the width would be 12.5m (compared to 18.8m). As such, the replacement dwelling would result in an increase in the height and bulk and again it is considered that this clearly reflects that the replacement dwelling will be significantly larger than the existing dwelling. Furthermore, it is also clearly evident that as a result the volume of the replacement dwelling would be significantly greater than that of the existing dwelling.

In light of the assessment that the replacement dwelling would be significantly larger than the existing dwelling, it is considered that the proposed development will clearly be contrary to Policy H30. This requirement is a matter of principle and the policy identifies that even where a site is unobtrusive a significantly enlarged dwelling should be refused. As such, in the absence of any overriding justification for the proposed development there is also a principle policy objection to this aspect of the application.

#### b) Stable Block

As mentioned above, as a general rule, new development in the countryside should be strictly controlled and there is a general presumption against new development in the countryside for which there is no demonstrable justification in accordance with the advice in PPS7 and the countryside policies of the Retained Local Plan Policies. The policy stance towards equine related activities, however, is more permissive. In this respect, paragraph 32 of PPS7 states, "*Horse riding and other equestrian activities are popular forms of recreation in the countryside that can fit well with farming activities and help to diversify rural economies*". However, such development should maintain the environmental quality and countryside character. This advice is also echoed in Policy R1C of the Retained Local Plan policies that also advises that proposals for outdoor recreational facilities in the countryside may be permissible provided that there will be no significant adverse impact on the surrounding landscape and where it is not dependent upon the construction of large structures or buildings. As such, an assessment of the visual impact of the proposed stable block and ménage on the surrounding landscape is required.

#### Visual Impact of Development upon the Landscape/Design:

With regards to the visual impact of the proposed development, as mentioned above Government guidance states that new development in the open countryside away from existing settlements should be strictly controlled and that planning authorities should continue to ensure that the quality and character of the wider countryside is protected and, where possible, enhanced. In accordance with local plan policies, development proposals in the parts of the countryside designated as a Special Landscape Area must have regard to the high quality of the

landscape and the siting and scale of development must be sympathetic with the landscape and of a high standard of design.

At present, the existing buildings are of a relatively low, single storey form and as such do not dominate any prominent or skyline location. Indeed, due to the relatively low lying position of the site, together with the topography of the surrounding landscape and existing tree cover, distant views of the site are limited. The existing poultry sheds by reason of their scale, reflective roof materials and the height of the grain silos, however, are more prominent features in the landscape when viewed from some more localised vantage points. In particular, there are clear views of the existing buildings when the site is approached from the A303 to the north as well as from the footpath that runs immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site. Nevertheless, while it is recognised that the design of the existing poultry sheds is functional and the appearance of the site as a poultry farm does not enhance the visual qualities of the landscape character of the Special Landscape Area, it must be borne in mind that the design, layout and materials of the existing poultry units are typical of agricultural development in general and are of a format that is expected to be found in rural locations.

In considering the visual impact of the proposed development, the office and storage buildings have been designed to replicate traditional vernacular agricultural buildings with timber clad elevations under a slate/clay tiled roof. Whilst it is recognised that these buildings would generally be of an acceptable design and would occupy a substantially reduced footprint in comparison to the existing poultry units, it is also evident that due to the steeply pitched roof form they would be of a much greater overall height. In this respect, the proposed office and storage buildings would have an overall ridge height of about 6.0 metres in comparison to the existing poultry sheds that are about only 3.5 metres in height. As such, it is considered that due to their overall ridge height and roof massing, the proposed office and storage buildings would be visually more prominent in the wider area.

With regards to the proposed replacement dwelling, in addition to the 'in principle' concerns outlined above, Policy H30 requires that the replacement dwelling "*has no greater impact than the existing dwelling*". While it is recognised that the existing dwelling is of little or no architectural merit, due to its relatively modest scale and height, together with its siting towards the south eastern corner of the site, it is considered that the existing dwelling has little visual impact on the surrounding landscape. In contrast, the replacement dwelling has been designed as a more traditional farmhouse that reflects the local vernacular and in this respect will be two-storeys in height and finished in brick and flint/stone elevations with a clay tiled hipped roof. However, due to the significant increases identified above, and in particular the fact that the proposed replacement dwelling will be two-storeys in height, it is considered that it will be of significantly greater bulk, scale and physical mass and as such would be significantly more prominent in the countryside and the Special Landscape Area than the existing dwelling. In turn, it is also considered that to some extent this would have the effect of giving the site a more domestic appearance to the detriment of the character and appearance of the countryside.

Turning to the proposed stable block, it is considered that in general terms stable buildings would normally be expected to be low profile buildings and restricted to a size that meets the required needs only. It is considered that the overall scale and massing of the proposed stable building would still be excessive, measuring approximately 16m x 12m and 6 metres at its highest point. As such, it is considered that it would be visually intrusive within the Special Landscape Area.

With regards to other aspects of the proposed development, the proposal also includes the provision of a paddock area for the keeping of the applicants' own horses for recreation purposes, although this will be for grazing purposes only. While this will result in the use of the land for non-agricultural purposes, it is not considered that the use of the land for this purpose is likely to have any more impact in visual terms over its use for agricultural grazing.

The current proposal also includes an enlargement of the proposed residential curtilage to the replacement dwelling in comparison to that of the existing dwelling on the site. In this respect, the applicant's agent for the previous planning application advised that the existing residential curtilage extends to approximately 1.1 acres, while the area of residential curtilage associated with the proposed replacement dwelling would be approximately 1.4 acres. While it is recognised that this represents a fairly limited extension to the residential curtilage it is



nevertheless considered that it still constitutes an encroachment into the countryside for which there is no demonstrable justification. Furthermore, the extent of the existing residential curtilage identified by the applicant's previous agent is questioned. In this respect, it was argued that an area of land to the east of the existing dwelling forms part of the existing residential curtilage but given the physical appearance of this area of land and the fact that it is fenced off from the domestic garden it has to be questioned whether this is the case. If it were indeed the case that it does not form part of the existing curtilage, then the proposed development would represent a further unjustified encroachment into the countryside.

Although it is the applicant's contention that the proposed development will enhance the visual appearance of the site by the removal of the existing poultry sheds, it must be borne in mind that the design, layout and materials of the existing poultry units are typical of agricultural development in general and are of a format that is reasonably expected to be found in rural locations. Indeed, the only reason that the site has been developed at all is due to an agricultural need. By contrast, it is considered that the current proposal will result in the undesirable proliferation of non-agricultural buildings in the countryside for which no overriding justification or need has been demonstrated, while the scattered arrangement of the development would amount to an undesirable encroachment into the countryside. As such, the proposal would be contrary to the desirability to preserve the countryside for its own sake. It is further considered that the proposed development could also act as a precedent for similar inappropriate schemes, if permitted, particularly as the circumstances surrounding the application are clearly not exceptional. In fact, there is an argument to say that the applicant has a responsibility to keep the site in a clean and tidy condition and that once the existing buildings cease to be required for agricultural purposes, and subject to them not being worthy of retention, as is considered to be the case in this instance, they should be demolished and the land restored as open countryside (agricultural field).

#### Sustainable Patterns of Development:

The previous application at this site identified that a key issue was the sustainability of the site and its location within the open countryside. As this application proposes one replacement dwelling with another and the erection of an additional stable block to be associated with that dwelling. It is not considered that this is likely to result in any significant further traffic being produced from this site and as such it is not considered that the sustainability of this site over any other needs to be considered further. Although it should be noted that potentially there could be a reduction in traffic to the site from the removal of the Poultry sheds.

#### Impact upon Highway Network:

The highways officer has raised no objection to this application and therefore it is not considered that this development will have any further significant detrimental effect on highway safety or the local Highway network and therefore complies with the retained policies.

#### Residential Amenity:

With regards to the issue of residential amenity, it is not considered that the proposed development would result in any material harm to the amenities of the surrounding residential properties.

The nearest residential property to the application site, that is most likely to be affected by the proposed development, is "Over the Hill" that is located immediately adjacent to the south. The proposed replacement dwelling, however, would be distanced from this neighbouring property by about 50-60 metres at its closest and although it is proposed that the replacement dwelling would be two-storeys in height, in contrast to the existing single storey bungalow on the site, it is considered that it would be sufficiently distanced so as not to cause any harm to neighbouring amenity.

Similarly, it is also considered that the proposed stable block, office and agricultural storage buildings that are even further distanced from this neighbouring property will not have any adverse affect upon the amenities of its occupants. As such, it is considered that there is no

justification to refuse the application on the basis of the impact of this aspect of the proposal on the amenities of the neighbouring property.

#### Flood Risk:

According to the Environment Agency's indicative flood maps, the application site lies within Flood Zone 1 that is land outside of the flood plain (i.e. areas not shown as within Flood Zone 2 or 3 on the flood maps) where there is than 1 in 1000 year chance of flooding from rivers or the sea. Within Flood Zone 1, the primary flood risk from new development is that posed either to the site or other sites by increases in surface water runoff.

In support of the application, the applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment. This assessment identifies that at present impermeable hard surfacing covers approximately 50% of the site area. The proposed development will result in a substantial reduction of the area of impermeable hard surfacing and as a result a reduction in the volume of surface water runoff. As such, it is advised that the proposed development will have a positive effect on flood risk elsewhere. In addition the flood risk assessment states that as the site lies on rising land outside of the 1 in 100 year flood zone, and some distance from the boundary of this flood zone, and having regard to the significant reduction in surface water runoff resulting from the development there are no implications for flooding when taking potential future climate change into account.

The Environment Agency has advised that the submitted flood risk assessment is considered to be acceptable and on the basis of the submitted details there is no objection to the proposed development.

#### Drainage:

With regards to the issue of drainage, the application site is not located within a sewered area for the disposal of foul or surface water drainage. Accordingly, it is proposed that the disposal of foul sewage will be a treatment plant that accords with the guidance contained in Circular 03/99 that advises that where connection to a public foul sewer is not feasible a sewage treatment plant should be considered as the next preferred option of foul waste disposal. The Environment Agency has not raised an objection to the proposed development in respect of this issue.

#### Impact on Protected Species:

With regards to the impact of the proposed development on protected species, a protected species survey was undertaken in September 2006 and a report of the findings has been submitted in support of this application. This report identifies that no bats or bat droppings were found in any of the buildings, although there was evidence of discarded butterfly wings in the most northerly poultry house indicating that it has been used as a feeding roost by bats. A number of potential day roost sites, however, were identified at the existing bungalow and the poultry sheds. The survey also identifies that there is anecdotal evidence that Barn Owls have used a nest box provided in the hay barn, while pellets, mutes and feathers from this species were also found in the barn and corroborates this anecdotal evidence. A similar indication of use by Little Owls was also found in the barn. In addition, the submitted report states that no indications of other protected species were found during the survey although the established hedgerow and tree line along the southern boundary and trees to the other boundaries all provide opportunities for birds to nest.

As mitigation, the submitted report recommends that the hay barn should be retained on site until other buildings have been constructed and suitable alternative roost sites have been made available to Barn and Little Owls. This proposal envisages the retention of the Hay Barn. In this respect, it is suggested that the provision of a Barn Owl loft is more likely to be successful than a nest box. It is also recommended that bat boxes and bird nesting boxes should be introduced on to the site to compensate for potential bat roosts that will be lost as a result of the development. In addition, it is also recommended that caution must be taken when all roofing materials are removed and that they must be checked for roosting bats. In the event that bats are found to be present, it is advised that works must stop and expert advice sought, while if birds are found to be nesting they must not be disturbed.

Natural England has confirmed that it has no objection to the proposed development.

**Nature Conservation:**

The site lies within the vicinity of the River Till Site of Scientific Special Interest (SSSI), a part of the River Avon System Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The nature conservation importance of the river system arises from the range and diversity of riparian habitats and associated species, all of which are dependent upon the maintenance of high water quality and sympathetic habitat management. Any development within the vicinity of the river obviously carries a risk of damage to the river ecosystem through habitat loss and pollution both during and after construction, for example through accidental spillage or run-off carrying exposed soil or building materials into the river. In this instance, however, Natural England has advised that it has no objection to the proposed development. It is therefore advised, that, the development, either alone or in combination with other development proposals, would not be likely to have a significant effect on the important interest features of the River Avon SAC, or any of the features of special scientific interest of the River Till Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

**Archaeological Issues:**

The application site is located within an Area of Special Archaeological Significance. The County Archaeological Officer has advised that features have been recorded from aerial photographs to the west of the site that are likely to be field systems while the medieval settlement of Winterbourne Stoke lies to the east. In light of the fact that part of the site has been terraced and disturbed by the construction of buildings, it is recommended that an archaeological watching brief takes place during the initial stages of construction that would allow an archaeological contractor to identify and record any archaeological features that may be uncovered. This can be secured by condition.

**Provision of Recreation Facilities:**

As this is a replacement dwelling no R2 payment is required.

**CONCLUSION**

In assessing this application, it is evident that there are aspects of the proposed development that would be beneficial, such as the visual enhancements to the site from the removal of the existing utilitarian poultry sheds. Indeed, a letter of support for the proposed development from a local resident and the Parish Council have to some extent supported these arguments.

The replacement dwelling would be significantly larger than the existing dwelling and by reason of the increased bulk, scale and mass it is considered that it would be significantly more prominent in the countryside and the Special Landscape Area than the existing dwelling contrary to the requirements of Policy H30. The applicants agent was informed of this prior to the submission of the application and subsequently during the course of the application and was advised to withdraw this application. It is further considered that the proposed development, by reason of the excessive scale and massing of the office, storage and stable buildings, would be visually intrusive and therefore fails to respect the character and high quality landscape of the Special Landscape Area. As a result, the proposal would result in the undesirable proliferation of non-agricultural buildings of an excessive scale in the countryside for which no overriding justification or need has been demonstrated, contrary to the desirability to preserve the countryside for its own sake. In addition, the approval of the proposed development on this site would create a precedent for similar sporadic development of isolated agricultural sites in the countryside, contrary to the tenet of sustainable development.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL**

Reasons for refusal:

1. The proposed replacement dwelling would be significantly larger than the existing dwelling and as such would conflict with the principle of Policy H30 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) that seeks to restrict the size of replacement dwellings so that they are not significantly larger than the dwelling that they replace in the interests of the character and appearance of the countryside. Furthermore, by reason of its greater scale, massing and height the replacement dwelling would be more prominent in the landscape than the existing dwelling to the detriment of the character and appearance of the countryside and high quality landscape of the Special Landscape Area. As such, the proposed development is contrary to Policies G1, C2, C6 and H30 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003), Policy C9 of the Adopted Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 (April 2006) and the advice contained in PPS7 "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas".
2. The proposed development, by reason of the excessive scale and massing of the stable block, office and storage buildings, together with the cumulative impact of the development as a whole, would appear as an intrusive form of development and lead to an undesirable encroachment into the countryside and the proliferation of non-agricultural buildings/structures, for which there is no overriding justification, in the countryside and Special Landscape Area. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies G1, C2, C6, H30, E21 and R1C of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003), Policy C9 of the Adopted Wiltshire and Swindon Structure Plan 2016 (April 2006) and the key aims of PPS7 "Sustainable Development in Rural Areas".

## Part 2

### Applications recommended for Approval

3

Application Number:	S/2007/1616		
Applicant/ Agent:	LIDL FOODSTORES		
Location:	LAND AT MINTON DISTRIBUTION PARK LONDON ROAD AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7RT		
Proposal:	DEMOLITION OF EXISTING VACANT MECHANICAL WORKSHOP AND THE ERECTION OF A LIDL NEIGHBOURHOOD FOODSTORE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING		
Parish/ Ward	AMESBURY EAST		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	13 August 2007	Expiry Date	12 November 2007
Case Officer:	Miss L Flindell	Contact Number:	01722 434377

#### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

HDS does not consider it prudent to exercise delegated powers

#### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site is located on the outskirts of Amesbury, opposite the new Solstice Park development site. It forms the east corner of the Minton Distribution Park. There is a single storey detached unit on the site with tarmac parking area surrounding. The main distribution centre buildings are in a raised position to the west of the proposed site.

#### THE PROPOSAL

This application is for the demolition of the existing vacant mechanical workshop on the site and the erection of a Lidl foodstore with associated car parking. The application proposes 1,358 square metres of retail floorspace, comprising 1,063 square metres sales floorspace and 103 customer car parking spaces.

Various works are also proposed on land currently owned by Wiltshire County Council, which form part of the application to include:

Improvements to the westbound bus stop to provide a full shelter with seats to replicate the east bound stop facilities

Relocation of the westbound bus stop further west of the existing stop to accommodate a pedestrian crossing island between the two bus stops

Addition of a 2 metre wide footpath from the site entrance to a pedestrian crossing across the store car park in line with the store entrance.

A second footpath close to the bus stops to link the edge of the site to the pedestrian crossing

Landscaping works (removal of the existing shrub land at the front of the site and replacement with new planting)

The applicants have stated that the proposed foodstore will provide a limited range of mainly convenience goods (circa 1200 lines) at discounted prices to include fresh and frozen pre-packaged meat, own branded dry groceries and frozen foods, tertiary branded wines and spirits, a limited range of pre-packaged fruit and vegetables lines, pre-packaged sliced bread and a basic range of non food household items.

## PLANNING HISTORY

77/0755	Paint spray shop servicing bay & covered parking area	AC	19.10.77
82/0320	Vehicle workshop & additional parking/hardstanding at Folly Bottom Field	AC	09.06.82
90/0579	Approval of reserved matters – new headquarters office building, 3 storeys; new welfare building, single storey & alteration to access	A	06.06.90
90/1151	Approval of matters reserved – extension & alterations to workshops	AC	06.10.90

## CONSULTATIONS

### WCC Highways

Following discussions with the consultant acting on behalf of the applicant, **we are satisfied that, with a couple of conditions, the impact on the highway will be acceptable.**

In terms of sustainability I feel I need to raise the fact that the old Co-op in the centre of Amesbury is vacant and would provide much better potential for reducing the proportion of car journeys than the proposed site. Have the applicants sufficiently considered this site and given robust reasons why it not appropriate for their needs.

I have some concerns about the impact of the development on the London Road A345 signal junction but I do not feel the impact is sufficiently significant to have a serious impact on capacity and safety at the junction. The submitted analysis is considered a worst case scenario for this development.

I am satisfied that the impact of this development on the surrounding road network is acceptable and could be accommodated without causing major problems. I have cc'd this response to Roger Dickinson at Faber Maunsell acting on behalf of the HA his predecessor Dafydd Rees asked to be included in our correspondence as the HA has raised concerns about the proposal.

The sight line to the east is slightly below the recommended standard but we believe the nature of the road is such that this will not be a road safety issue. I have asked for a revised plan to be submitted for approval.

It has been agreed with the agent that the cycle parking will be relocated much closer to the store entrance. 6 covered Sheffield stands will now be provided in place of the disabled parking space number 81 in Figure 4 in the TA. There will still be 6 disabled spaces. An amended plan should be submitted for further approval.

If you are minded to approve the application, I would recommend the following. The applicants have agreed to the below which should be reflected in a legal agreement.

1 A contribution of GBP25 000 towards improving the cycle network in the immediate area

2 They will install new public transport infrastructure as follows:

(a) A new bus shelter on the development side of London Road. The type of shelter is to be discussed with WCC before installation.

(b) A new pedestrian refuge between the proposed bus stops. Footway to link the existing bus stop to the refuge and associated dropped kerbs with tactile paving.

I would also recommend the following conditions

(1) Before the start of development the detailed design for the main access junction and the proposed island near the bus stops shall be approved in writing by the planning authority and the main access

Junction and additional works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings before the first use of the development  
(2) A Travel Plan, which must include targets, shall be approved by the planning authority before the start of development.

Highways Agency

I refer to our letter dated 30 August 2007, which attached a TR110 direction of non approval in order to provide the applicant with the opportunity to provide additional information to satisfy the Highways Agency's concerns. The Agency has subsequently received additional information provided by the applicant and has considered the performance of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in the area together with experience of existing and proposed Lidl stores elsewhere in the region.

**The Agency is now satisfied that the proposed development will not adversely impact on the SRN. The Agency is therefore in the position to amend the TR110 to direct conditions to be attached to any planning permission, which may be granted.** These conditions will require a full and comprehensive travel plan to be developed for the proposed Lidl foodstore.

The Agency also requires that a construction management plan is prepared for the proposed development to mitigate the impact of construction traffic on the SRN.

Environmental Health

I am in receipt of further correspondence from RPS acting on behalf of the applicants. In light of concerns with regard to air quality I have paid our air quality consultant to do further work in connection with a similar retail application. In light of his findings I do not propose to pursue this issue further. However we are in the process of developing policies in order to address development that has a potential detrimental impact on air quality. In connection with the other aspects of the application raised **I would recommend the following conditions should you be minded to grant consent:**

1. Noise from Plant and machinery.

Before commencement of the development hereby permitted there shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for the control of noise arising from compressors, refrigeration plant, extractors and any other similar equipment. Such scheme as is approved in writing by the LPA shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development is brought into use.

2. Noise from Construction.

No works of construction or demolition shall be carried out outside of the following hours:

Monday to Friday: 7am- 6pm

Saturday: 8am-1pm

No work Sundays or bank holidays

This condition shall not apply to works of fitting out and decoration.

3. Bonfires.

There shall be no burning of demolition or construction waste on the site at any time.

4. Deliveries.

There shall be no deliveries between the hours of 10.30pm and 6am.

5. Lighting

Before commencement of the development hereby permitted there shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for the lighting of external areas of the development site. Such scheme as is approved in writing by the LPA shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

#### 6. Land contamination

Before development commences the applicant shall commission the services of a competent contaminated land consultant to carry out a detailed contaminated land investigation of the site and the results provided to the Local Planning Authority:

The investigation must include:

A full desktop survey of historic land use data,  
A conceptual model of the site identifying all potential and actual contaminants, receptors and pathways (pollution linkages).  
A risk assessment of the actual and potential pollution linkages identified,  
A remediation programme for contaminants identified. The remediation programme shall incorporate a validation protocol for the remediation work implemented, confirming whether the site is suitable for use.  
The remediation programme shall be fully implemented and the validation report shall be forwarded to the Local planning authority prior to.... (habitation of the property/ use of the premises).

Natural England

#### Protected Species

Further to the Bat survey undertaken by Devon Wildlife Consultants for the above proposed development. As no evidence of usage by bats was found Natural England is now satisfied that protected species are not a material consideration in this application.

#### Habitats Regulations

Under Regulation 48(3) of the Habitats Regulations 1994 Natural England objects to this application. Natural England is concerned about the impacts of the development on water resources and water quality. The supporting information with the planning application does not assess either the potential impact of the development on water resources or water quality.

The nature conservation importance of the river system arises from the range and diversity of riparian habitats and associated species. The SAC qualifying features include one habitat (the watercourse characterised by floating Ranunculus (water crowfoot) and Callitriche (starwort) vegetation) and five species (brook and sea lamprey, bullhead, salmon and Desmoulin's whorl snail). All are dependent upon the maintenance of high water quality and sympathetic habitat management.

Provided that the developer can confirm that Wessex Water can accommodate the likely foul water inputs and surface runoff within the sewerage network, and also provide the potential long term demand for water within their abstraction licenses then it is our view that, this proposal, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, would not be likely to have a significant effect on the important interest features of the River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC), or any of the features of special scientific interest of the River Avon System Site of Special Scientific interest (SSSI).



Due to the location of the development on the edge of Amesbury we would like to see as much of the existing mature boundary habitat retained as possible and recommend that new planting uses native species of local provenance.

Wessex Water Authority

I enclose a Copy of our Records and confirm our Engineer's comments as follows:

#### Foul Drainage

There is a public foul sewer in the vicinity of the site. It may be possible to utilise the connection from the existing building. The foul sewerage system should have adequate capacity. Calculations to be provided.

#### Surface Water Drainage

Separate public surface water sewers are not available to drain the proposed development. The use of soakaways may be feasible. Discharge to watercourse or ditch may be possible with the approval of the appropriate authorities.

#### Sewage Treatment

There is sewage treatment capacity available. There is adequate capacity at the terminal pumping station.

#### Water Supply

There are public water mains in the vicinity of the site. There should be adequate capacity in the distribution system. An off site mains extension will be required to connect to the existing 125mm diameter main in Porton Road. There could be private supply services connections crossing the site.

Environment Agency

We have received additional correspondence dated 22 October 2007 from Lidl UK GmbH regarding confirmation of the historic activities undertaken at the site. This provides us with some additional information regarding the site setting. **The additional information clarifying the historic land uses coupled with the previously submitted report is sufficient to withdraw our objection subject to the following conditions and informatives being appended to any planning permission granted.**

#### Contaminated Land

The site overlies a Major Aquifer therefore groundwater is considered to be a potentially sensitive receptor and the site should be subject to appropriate assessment in order to determine the risks. Activities carried out at this site may have caused contamination of soil subsoil and groundwater present beneath the site and may present a threat to nearby surface waters especially as a result of the proposed development

CONDITION: Prior to commencement of development approved by this planning permission or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That scheme shall include all of the following elements unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

1 A desk study identifying all previous uses potential contaminants associated with those uses a conceptual model of the site indicating sources pathways and receptors potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2 A site investigation scheme based on 1 to provide information for an assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected including those off site

3 The results of the site investigation and risk assessment 2 and a method statement based on those results giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken

4 A verification report on completion of the works set out in 3 confirming the remediation measures that have been undertaken in accordance with the method statement and setting out measures for maintenance further monitoring and reporting

REASON: Although generic remedial options are available to deal with the risks to controlled waters posed by contamination at this site further details will be required to ensure that risks are appropriately addressed. The historic activity and assessment of the associated potential contamination should have been assessed in the Factual and Interpretative Report. It would be prudent to assess the condition of the subsurface in the area identified as a vehicle repair workshop and/or any associated infrastructure (e.g. are there any above or under ground storage tanks?) in order to better understand the contamination condition of the site. The Site Investigation has thus far not examined the condition of the site in the area where a previously potentially contaminative activity (workshop) was undertaken.

The above practice is considered important so that the site operator owner the regulatory authorities and other parties such as the general public potential purchasers or investors can have confidence in the outcome and any subsequent decisions made about the need for action to deal with any contamination at the site.

We recommend that developers follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11 Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination when dealing with land affected by contamination. It provides the technical framework for structured decision making regarding land contamination. It is available from [www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)

We also recommend that developers use BS 10175 2001 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites Code of Practice as a guide to undertaking the desk study and site investigation scheme

#### Water Efficiency

We strongly recommend water efficiency measures be incorporated into this scheme. It would assist in conserving natural water resources and offer some contingency during times of water shortage. Please note the following condition has been support by the Planning Inspectorate (North Dorset District Council Public Inquiry APP N1215 1191202 APP N1215 1191206 decisions dated 12 February 2007).

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 and prudent use of natural resources.

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. Applicants should visit <http://www.environment.gov.uk/Subjects/WaterResources/HowWeHelpToSaveWaterPublications/ConservingWaterinBuildings> for detailed information on water saving measures. A scheme of water efficiency should be submitted in accordance with the information supplied on the website. The following may also be helpful: <http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk>

#### Surface Water Drainage

##### INFORMATIVE

Surface water from car parking areas less than 0.5 hectares and roads should discharge to watercourse 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.

#### Pollution Prevention During Construction

##### INFORMATIVE

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. We recommend referring to our Pollution Prevention Guidelines found at [www.environment.gov.uk/business/444251/444731/ppg\\_version1\\_lang\\_e](http://www.environment.gov.uk/business/444251/444731/ppg_version1_lang_e)

#### Sustainable Construction

We strongly recommend that the proposed development includes sustainable design and construction measures. In a sustainable building minimal natural resources and renewables are used during construction and the efficient use of energy is achieved during subsequent use. This reduces greenhouse gas emissions and helps to limit and adapt to climate change. Running costs of the building can also be significantly reduced.

County Archaeologist: Nothing of archaeological interest is likely to be affected by the proposal and therefore **I have no issues to raise.**

Wiltshire Wildlife Trust Thank you for inviting the Wiltshire Wildlife Trust to comment on the above application. **We have no objection, though do have the following comments.**

#### Protected species and designated sites

The felling of trees and vegetation clearance may impact on breeding birds as well as roosting bats.

#### Bats

All bats are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and under the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) Regulations 1994. Any trees to be felled should be assessed for their bat potential by a suitably qualified person. If any are identified, further guidance should be sought from Natural England. This should be a condition of planning permission. Please note that if any evidence of bats is found during the development all works must stop immediately and Natural England contacted for further advice.

#### Breeding birds

All British birds, their nests and eggs are protected in law (excluding certain 'pest' species). It is an offence to deliberately take, kill or injure any wild bird or to take, damage, or destroy any nest (while in use or being built) or egg of any wild bird under Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). To reduce the likelihood of harm to breeding birds, clearance of trees and areas of scrub should avoid the bird breeding season (March to August inclusive). If this cannot be done, an ecologist should keep a watching brief during all works to ensure that no harm is caused to these species. This should be a condition of planning permission.

#### Measures to enhance biodiversity

The Trust understands that as well as a small area of grassland being lost through the new car park, the boundary hedge will be severed in one place and reduced in height significantly. The hedgerow works represent adverse impacts on biodiversity, and as such should be mitigated for.

Wildlife corridors, such as rivers and hedgerows, ensure that the landscape remains connected. Linear features such as these are very important, and are used by species to migrate to new areas and for foraging. For example, bats utilise hedgerows extensively for feeding.

All public bodies including the Council have a Biodiversity Duty under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act NERC 2006 to have due regard for conserving biodiversity. This includes restoring or enhancing a population or habitat. Simple measures could be incorporated into the proposal such as installing bird and bat boxes and the planting of native locally sourced species in order to fulfil the Duty of the Act.

Measures to enhance the site for biodiversity and as part of the mitigation for habitat loss, should be a condition of planning permission.

#### Measures to increase sustainability

It is unclear whether the site is already equipped with a sustainable form of drainage, though from the site survey there appear to be several interceptors and a possible soakaway. The applicant should ensure

that a Sustainable Drainage Scheme (SuDS) will be included for the development, to reduce runoff effects from impermeable surfaces and improve water quality, but also to provide new habitats for aquatic species.

We are pleased with Lidl's commitment to reducing its ecological footprint through the use of energy efficient appliances, and waste minimisation procedures.

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.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes, expiry date 13 <sup>th</sup> September 2007
Site Notice displayed	Yes, expiry date 13 <sup>th</sup> September 2007
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes, expiry date 3 <sup>rd</sup> September 2007
Third Party responses	

1 response supporting the application

4 responses objecting to the application, summarised as follows:

### Access/highways

Safety of access – on the apex of a blind bend in both directions

40 mph speed limit is ignored by high percentage of traffic

Congestion – traffic flow will increase from the A345 through Parsonage Way up through Antrobus Road as a 'rat run' and additional traffic calming measures will be required

Conflict between customer cars/pedestrians and delivery vehicles all using the same entrance

Closure of the access road to units 7, 6C and 6D by way of fencing to the site boundaries with unit 7 Minton Park will restrict access and manoeuvring of lorries delivering cargo of a fragile nature to the adjacent business premises (Avient warehouse) – no details of the fencing have been provided which may also compromise security

### Sustainability

The Lidl store will have a high carbon footprint – import up to 95% of products from Europe

### Sequential test (PPS6) – objection submitted by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP)

The application fails to satisfy the sequential test set out in PPS 6. There is a sequentially preferable site available at the former Co-op store offering 1,063 sq metre net sales floorspace, vacated in autumn 2006.

The Salisbury Street site fronts onto the Primary shopping frontage within Amesbury town centre suitable and viable for the 1,063 square metre net of retail floorspace proposed by Lidl.

The Co-op have been in discussions with potential operators, including Aldi, with regards to letting the premises, the site currently remains available.

1 third party letter removing a previous objection:

Objection in respect of the loss of security barrier separating Unit 10 (occupied by CAE) from the development site has been removed following the landlord confirming that they will install full height lockable gates to maintain the current security levels. (Lidl's have confirmed in writing "that Lidl will provide the aforementioned security as requested by CAE).

1 letter from Minton Industrial Properties (freehold owners of the site), summarised as follows:

Note the correspondence from Avient Ltd (tenants in Unit 7) adjoining the application site and the concerns that access to this unit and security may be compromised.

The access to unit 7 and the proposed changes to the boundary are a commercial matter between the landlord and tenant (not a material planning consideration)

The landlord intends to accommodate the access requirements of the tenants of unit 7 within the remainder of the site.

The landlord provides 24 hour manned security and will be reviewing security arrangements including new fencing if necessary to ensure existing security standard is maintained.

1 letter from Aldi, summarised as follows:

Confirming Aldi's intentions with regard to the adaptation and re-occupation of the Co-op store to provide a new supermarket in Amesbury Town Centre

"Aldi have now reached an in-principle agreement with Co-op regarding Aldi's occupation of the former Co-op premises at Salisbury Street. Heads of terms have been produced and these provide for Aldi to occupy the building as a supermarket on a leasehold basis for a period of 25 years."

Intention to re-occupy the former Co-op premises is fully in accordance with national and local planning policy and in particular with the sequential approach to retail site selection.

The applications for out-of-centre development around Amesbury should not be permitted when a sequentially preferable site is available.

If the Council was to grant permission for alternative supermarket development Aldi would not proceed with its proposed and much needed investment in Amesbury Town Centre.

1 letter from Atisreal in response to objection raised by Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (NLP), summarised as follows:

NLP have stated that the former Co-op store is both suitable and viable for the retail floorspace proposed by Lidl. This view contradicts NLP's retail statement submitted in support of the application for the new Co-op store, which relied heavily on the qualitative need for a new Co-op store based primarily on the inadequacies of the old store, which was not considered suitable for modern retailing:

"It should be stressed that the layout of the existing Co-op store is not ideal. It is a long and thin store with a limited street frontage which constrains the quality of the accommodation and the overall retail offer. This store is cramped with a limited number of checkouts due to the width of the store that means at busy periods there is considerable queuing".

The Retail Assessment submitted in support of the Lidl application details the reasons why the former Co-op store is unsuitable and unviable for occupation by a deep discount food retailer, summarised:

Prohibitively expensive refurbishment/refit costs. The unit is in a poor state of repair and will require considerable works to fit the store to an acceptable standard.

Unsuitable internal layout. The columns distributed in two lines in the sales area of the unit restrict the internal product aisles which will hinder the operation of Lidl who require standard layouts in order to facilitate an efficient no-frills approach to product display and re-stocking.

Limited car parking. There is a 22 space car park immediately adjacent, all the other car parks operate at high capacity despite the former Co-op being vacant, the service yard area is not considered suitable with potential for conflict with delivery vehicles, trolley collection control and the long term availability of these car parks is uncertain and beyond the control of any retailer.

Servicing. The service access to the unit requires daily servicing by HGV's entering the site from Salisbury Street. The encouragement of such movements along the street is incongruous with the highway improvements being undertaken (pavement widening to enhance pedestrian access and safety).

Surplus first floor accommodation. The unit has surplus first floor office accommodation, which will increase the operational costs of the store.

NLP states that the Co-op have been in discussions with potential operators including Aldi. The Council should be sceptical until there is firm evidence of a legally binding agreement.

Question motives and timings of objections raised by Co-op

The former Co-op remains vacant despite a thorough marketing exercise for over 12 months and continues to be marketed by King Sturge with a preference for letting as two units. Query whether the Co-op would enter into a lease for the whole store with a competing food retailer.

The application should be determined promptly to not unduly frustrate development for which GVA Grimley have accepted that there is a need for, have not raised concerns regarding impact on town centres and have not identified any sequentially preferable sites.

In the absence of a signed lease confirming the occupation by Aldi, we do not consider that the Council have any firm evidence upon which to refuse the application on sequential grounds.

Notwithstanding the above, even if the vacant Co-op store were occupied by Aldi, we consider that there is still demonstrable quantitative capacity to support the proposed development:

The original retail assessment audited by GVA Grimley concludes that there would be a surplus expenditure of £11.23 million in 2011 based on existing market shares which would more than sufficient to accommodate the proposed Lidl convenience goods turnover of around £2million. Assuming reoccupation of the whole of the Co-op store by Aldi, the turnover is likely to be in the region of £2.5 million to £3.2 million.

We have updated table 8 of our Retail Assessment to demonstrate that there is a quantitative capacity to support 2 deep discount food retailers based on existing market shares. This demonstrates that there would still be around £6 million of available expenditure even after allowance for a potential Aldi store and the proposed Lidl store.

There are material differences between a deep discounter and a main stream superstore.

In relation to the two major foodstore applications for Tesco and Asda stores currently under consideration, we consider that there is sufficient capacity to support one of these developments and the proposed Lidl store (both the Tesco and Asda retail assessments indicate that the required increase in market share to justify the quantitative need for these stores is not unreasonable based on the high levels of outflow from Amesbury to other large food stores (most notably those in Salisbury) and the proposed convenience turnover of the Lidl store could also be accommodated by 2011). PPS6 allows 'need' to be assessed 5 years ahead. It is legitimate to therefore consider the position in relation to 2012 and possibly 2013. The growth in available expenditure increases the potential for further floorspace provision.

Lidl have also submitted a summary of a business survey undertaken by Lidl on Thursday 6th September and Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> October of traders in Amesbury including a copy of the answered questionnaires. In summary, Lidl state that 83% of the traders questioned supported the proposal (to include Butchers, Newsagents, Bakery, Florists and Dry Cleaners) and considered the proposed Lidl foodstore would be a positive addition to the town and 86% considered that Lidl would either have a positive or no impact on their business. Lidl speculate that the support for the proposal "is mainly due to the fact that Lidl do not have a butchers or bakery counter in store. We sell a very limited range of flowers and we do not sell single item confectionary or tobacco."

They also submitted a summary of a business survey undertaken in Devizes to demonstrate that a Lidl food store in an out of town location would not impact on local traders. In summary, Lidl state that 91% of traders stated that the Lidl foodstore had not affected their business and 88% of traders thought that Lidl had either been a positive addition to the town or had made little impact.

Amesbury Town Council response                      No objection. We welcome this development as it will add to the rejuvenation of the town.

## **MAIN ISSUES**

Principle of development, Impact on the vitality and viability of the city centre  
Sustainability  
Scale, design and Landscaping  
Highways / Transportation  
Noise/air pollution/ contaminated land  
Environmental Impact  
Nature Conservation

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

### Salisbury District Local Plan 'saved' policies:

G1 (Sustainable development)  
G2 (General development criteria)  
G5 (Drainage)  
D1 (Design)  
TR11 (Parking standard guidelines)  
TR12 (New development)  
TR14 (bicycle parking spaces)  
C12 (Protected species)

### Wiltshire Structure Plan 2016 'saved' policies:

Northern Area Committee 17/01/2008

DP1 (Sustainable development)  
DP2 (Infrastructure)  
DP5 & DP6 (Shopping development)  
T5 & T6 (Sustainable transport modes/alternatives to private car use)

Government Guidance:

PPS1 Delivering Sustainable Development  
PPS1 Planning & Climate Change Supplement to PPS1  
PPS6 Planning for Town Centres  
PPS9 Biodiversity and Geological Conservation  
PPG13 Transport  
PPG16 Archaeology  
PPG25 Flood Risk

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **1 PRINCIPLE, IMPACT ON THE VITALITY AND VIABILITY OF AMESBURY TOWN CENTRE**

Policy S4 of the Salisbury District local plan included impact criteria to safeguard the vitality and viability of town centres, introducing the concept of need and sequential approach. However, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government in exercise of the power conferred by paragraph 1(3) of Schedule 8 to the Planning and Compulsory Act 2004 has directed that paragraph 1(2)(a) of Schedule 8 applies to policy S4 which does not become a 'saved' policy and therefore does not continue to have statutory effect as a development plan policy.

The relevant 'shopping' policy in the Development Plan for the principle of new retail development in this location is therefore policies DP5 and DP6 of the Wiltshire Structure Plan 2016. These policies support growth and development in existing centres in response to 'widespread concern about the impact of out-of-centre superstores' (para 4.50) and are in accordance with Central Government Policy objectives, which place an emphasis on the need to enhance the vitality and viability of existing centres, now encompassed in PPS6.

In order to deliver the Government's objective of promoting vital and viable town centres, development should be focused in existing centres in order to strengthen and, where appropriate, regenerate them.

In selecting sites for development, local planning authorities should:

- a) assess the need for development (paragraphs 2.32–2.40);
- b) identify the appropriate scale of development (paragraphs 2.41–2.43);
- c) apply the sequential approach to site selection (paragraphs 2.44–2.47);
- d) assess the impact of development on existing centres (paragraph 2.48); and
- e) ensure that locations are accessible and well served by a choice of means of transport (paragraphs 2.49–2.50).

Guidance in PPG13 is also consistent with the key objectives of PPS6. It endorses the broad principles of the sequential approach and the need to ensure that wherever possible new shopping is promoted in existing centres, which are more likely to offer a choice of access, particularly for those without a car.

GVA Grimley was instructed to carry out an independent review of the retail policy issues raised by the planning application. This review was based on the information submitted by the applicant and also drawing on the Salisbury Retail and Leisure Needs Study (RLNS) 2006.

This important assessment is discussed in more detail below with other relevant material planning considerations.

The GVA Grimley's review of the proposed Lidl store report concludes (Paragraph 5.8):

'Our overall conclusion is that in the event that the former Co-op unit is not regarded as being suitable, viable and available in its entirety to accommodate a convenience retailer capable of providing effective choice and competition to the Co-op we consider there is a sound basis for approving the current Lidl proposals. Conversely, if on further investigation there is a prospect



that the former Co-op store could become available in its entirety for a significant convenience operator we consider this would be likely to largely meet the defined need, provide a sequentially preferable site and give rise to more significant concerns in respect of its potential impact/effect on retailer confidence in the centre. In these circumstances we strongly recommend the Council clarifies the current position in respect of this unit before determining the application.'

Atisreal (the agents acting for Lidl's) consider that the former Co-op building is unsuitable for modern food retail needs and is in particular unsuitable and unviable for occupation by a deep discount food retailer. They also consider that in the absence of a legally binding lease, the Council should be sceptical over the proposal for Aldi (also a discount food retailer) to occupy the former Co-op store. However, regardless of whether or not Aldi occupy the existing Co-op building; or whether either the main stream Tesco or Asda planning applications are successful, Atisreal consider that there remains a demonstrable quantitative and qualitative need for the proposed deep discounter Lidl store.

Atisreal also consider that the proposed development would have only a modest impact on the town centre should the co-op be reoccupied by Aldi and in this situation both the Co-op and Aldi would not be materially harmed by the proposed Lidl store as Atisreal consider that the majority of the trade from the Lidl store will be derived from claw back from outside of Amesbury.

The GVA Grimley report concurs with Atisreal that there are no other sites identified within or on the edge of Amesbury Town Centre (as defined by PPS6), which could be regarded as being suitable, viable and available within a reasonable timescale and while the former Co-op store remains vacant, the Co-op store is currently overtrading and there is limited choice and competition in Amesbury Town Centre. However, the GVA Grimley report advises that should the entire former Co-op unit become available and provide attractive to a replacement supermarket operator or an alternative discount retailer (paragraph 5.5), they advise that this would go a significant way to meeting the identified quantitative/qualitative need within the town centre, and would clearly represent a sequentially preferable option to the out of centre proposal. Paragraph 4.23 of the report goes on to state 'if the former Co-op unit proved attractive to a leading discount food retailer this would not only reduce the indicated levels of overtrading at the Co-op but also suggest that the impact of a further out of centre discount foodstore as proposed by Lidl would be far more significant, by providing a more directly competing retail offer within the town centre.'

We have received a letter of intent from Aldi Stores Limited stating that they have reached an in-principle agreement with Co-op regarding Aldi's occupation of the former Co-op premises and that heads of terms have been produced which provide for Aldi to occupy the building as a supermarket on a leasehold basis for a period of 25 years.

GVA Grimley have advised that the former Co-op site is a sequentially preferable site which can accommodate the need and a statement of intent would suffice to be satisfied that the Co-op is to be occupied by Aldi. At the time of writing this report, we have received a statement of intent from Aldi but not from the Co-op.

The Town and Country Planning (Shopping) Development) (England and Wales) (No.2) Direction 1993) requires shopping developments over a specified size to be referred to the Secretary of State before granting planning permission. In this case the proposal remains below the 2,500m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area threshold to which the Direction applies and, therefore, consultation with the Secretary of State is not necessary.

## 2 SUSTAINABILITY

"Planning and Climate Change Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1" was published on 17<sup>th</sup> December 2007. It supplements PPS1 by setting out how planning should contribute to reducing emissions and stabilising climate change and requires planning authorities to have regard to the PPS as a material consideration. Paragraph 30 states that planning authorities should encourage the delivery of sustainable buildings.

The proposal will involve demolishing the existing mechanical workshop on the site. The applicants have confirmed in correspondence received during the application process that the

materials that can be reused will be and in the majority of cases suitable materials are crushed and re-used as fill elsewhere on the site.

The Design and Access Statement accompanying the planning application also states that 'Lidl utilises the Enhanced Capital Allowance Scheme to ensure the refrigeration plant it uses conforms to the highest energy efficient standards' and a list of principles and initiatives that enable Lidl to be as efficient as possible are provided including waste minimisation procedures.

Wiltshire County Council Highways has raised concern that the old Co-op in the centre of Amesbury is vacant and would be a more sustainable site, providing much better potential for reducing the proportion of car journeys than the proposed site. They have advised that the applicants need to have sufficiently considered this site and given robust reasons why it is not appropriate for their needs. This is considered in section 1 above.

### 3 SCALE, DESIGN AND LANDSCAPING

The scheme was considered at the Design Forum and amended plans have been received in response to the comments received. The Forum recommended that the appearance of the frontage of the building could be improved by upgrading the materials from the standard pilasters and white panels and that the building could take cues from the Solstice Park development opposite. They also recommended that the front row of parking bays could be set further back from London Road allowing more substantial and higher quality soft landscaping within the site; the verges on the London Road could be upgraded with structural tree planting and the car parking bays could accommodate trees/soft landscaping.

The amended plans propose to change the materials and colours of the original scheme (from walls finished with a limestone cement render painted white with the columns and plinths in agate grey to columns and plinth being in buff coloured brickwork). The proposed changes are considered to suitably reflect the appearance of the adjacent solstice park development.

The site is dominated by the two storey existing Minton Distribution Centre buildings to the west of the proposed store, which are single storey and set at a lower level to the existing buildings to remain.

It is not considered that the proposals would be objectionable on design grounds.

The amended plans also change the car parking and landscaping of the site. Low level planting has been added to the front of the site and between and around parking bays.

The applicants are also proposing to replace the existing shrub planting to the front of the site with new planting. They have offered to undertake this work and to manage and maintain the land on behalf of the highways authority.

### 4 HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

A Transport Assessment was submitted as part of the application to which the Highways Agency and WCC Highways originally objected. Notwithstanding the comments with regard to sustainability and the need to consider the old Co-op site as a preferential site to the proposed out of centre site; the applicants have provided additional information to which both Wiltshire County Council Highways Department and the Highways Agency have raised no objections subject to conditions.

Amended plans have also been received revising the sight line to the east of the entrance and relocating the cycle parking closer to the store entrance (in accordance with WCC Highway recommendations).

Wiltshire County Council Highways are satisfied that the impact of the development on the surrounding road network is acceptable and could be accommodated without causing major problems and do not consider that the impact of the development on the London Road A345 signal junction is sufficiently significant to have a serious impact on capacity and safety at the junction.

## 5 NOISE/AIR POLLUTION/ CONTAMINATED LAND

The Council's Environmental Health Officer originally raised an objection to the application on the grounds that insufficient information had been submitted to assess the impact to air quality, noise and light pollution and contaminated land. Further information has been submitted from RPS acting on behalf of the applicants, which is sufficient to withdraw the objection from environmental health subject to conditions.

## 6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

Following the receipt of additional information, the Environment Agency withdrew their original environmental objections to the application on the grounds that insufficient information had been provided to show that the risk of pollution to controlled waters had been addressed, subject to conditions and informatives listed above.

English Nature required Wessex Water would need to confirm whether they could accommodate the likely foul water inputs and surface runoff within the sewerage network and potential long-term demand for water within their abstraction licences. This has been confirmed.

## 7 NATURE CONSERVATION

The presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a local planning authority is considering a development proposal, which if carried out would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat. English Nature recommended that a protected species was carried out. A protected species survey was undertaken and report submitted for consideration. The site has no statutory nature conservation designation and in summary no ecological constraints to the site were discovered during the survey other than avoiding the bird-breeding season between March and September.

## CONCLUSION

Section 54A of the 1990 Act and S38 of the 2004 Act requires that where, in making any determination under the planning Acts, regard is to be had to the development plan, the determination shall be made in accordance with the plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. This application should first be considered against the policies referred to above. In particular Policies DP5 and DP6 of the Structure Plan 2016, which reflects government advice on, retail developments in PPS6 and PPG13.

We have received a letter of intent from Aldi Stores Limited stating that they have reached an in-principle agreement with Co-op regarding Aldi's occupation of the former Co-op premises and that heads of terms have been produced which provide for Aldi to occupy the building as a supermarket on a leasehold basis for a period of 25 years. However, at the time of writing this report we have not received a letter from Co-op confirming this arrangement and it is therefore considered that there is insufficient evidence that the former Co-op unit (as a sequentially preferable site) is suitable, viable and available in its entirety to accommodate a convenience retailer capable of providing effective choice and competition to the Co-op, and there is a sound basis for approving the Lidl proposals.

## RECOMMENDATION: APPROVE SUBJECT TO S106

Subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to include the following:

- 1 A contribution of £25,000 towards improving the cycle network in the immediate area
- 2 Installation of new public transport infrastructure as follows:
  - (a). A new bus shelter on the development side of London Road (the type of shelter is to be discussed with Wiltshire County Council before installation)
  - (b). A new pedestrian refuge between the proposed bus stops footway to link the existing bus stop to the refuge and associated dropped kerbs with tactile paving.
- 3 Restrictions on the range and type of goods to be sold from the premises (to enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise adequate control over the range of goods sold from the premises in the interests of maintaining the vitality and viability of the town centre).

## **REASON FOR APPROVAL:**

It is considered that there is a qualitative and quantitative need for the development, the development is of an appropriate scale, the projected levels of impact on Amesbury town centre are acceptable and there are no sequentially preferable sites.

The development by reason of its design and materials, and the proposed additional landscaping, is considered to be appropriate to the overall appearance of the site and area.

It is considered that adequate car parking is proposed and subject to the agreement of a travel plan to seek to promote alternative modes of transport and include the provision of cycle parking, it is considered that the proposal will be able to promote sustainable modes of travel to and from the site and is an accessible location well served by a choice of a means of transport.

## **And subject to the recommended conditions and informatives as follows:**

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

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

2. The net retail floor space shall be restricted to that shown in the approved plans and no additional retail floorspace shall be created whatsoever, whether by insertion of a mezzanine, by use of the ground floor or mezzanine storage areas hereby approved or otherwise, without written permission of the Local planning Authority upon submission of a planning application on that behalf.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise adequate control over the creation of additional retail floorspace, in the interests of maintaining the vitality and viability of the town centre and to restrict the adverse implications of store generated traffic.

3. The development shall be implemented in accordance with the following amended plans: (Plan refs SK02 RevC, SK05 and SK04 received by this office on the 4th January 2007) unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt.

4. All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with the programme agreed with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to secure the satisfactory implementation of all approved landscaping works, in the interests of visual amenity.

5. If within a period of 5 years from the date of the planting of any tree that tree, or any tree planted in replacement for it, is removed, uprooted or destroyed or dies, [or becomes, in the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, seriously damaged or defective,] another tree of the same species and size as that originally planted shall be planted at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure the satisfactory establishment of the approved scheme for the landscaping of the site.

6. The development shall be implemented in full accordance with the approved details and drawings for the car parking spaces layout and shall be made available at all times, and used for no other purpose

Reason: To ensure adequate off-road parking is available for customers and staff.

7. Before the start of development the detailed design for the main access junction and the proposed island near the bus stops shall be approved in writing by the planning authority and the main access Junction and additional works shall be constructed in accordance with the approved drawings before the first use of the development.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety

8. No development shall commence until a Travel Plan has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. No part of the development shall be occupied prior to the implementation of the approved travel plan (or those parts identified in the approved travel plan as capable of being implemented prior to occupation). Those parts of the approved travel plan that are identified as being capable of being implemented after occupation shall be implemented in accordance with the timetable contained therein and shall continue to be implemented as long as any part of the development is occupied. The records of the implementation shall be made available to the Local Planning Authority if requested.

Reason: In order to promote sustainable modes of travel to and from the site, and to reduce reliance on the private car.

9. No development shall commence until a construction management plan is submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be completed in accordance with the agreed plan.

Reason: In order to mitigate the impact of construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network.

10. Before commencement of the development hereby permitted there shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for the control of noise arising from compressors, refrigeration plant, extractors and any other similar equipment. Such scheme as is approved in writing by the local planning authority shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority before any part of the development is brought into use.

Reason: To minimise the potential for noise disturbance from the proposed development.

11. No works of construction or demolition shall be carried out outside of the following hours:

Monday to Friday: 7am- 6pm

Saturday: 8am-1pm

No work Sundays or bank holidays

This condition shall not apply to works of fitting out and decoration.

Reason: To minimise the potential for noise disturbance from the proposed development.

12. There shall be no burning of demolition or construction waste on the site at any time.

Reason: In the interests of the environment.

13. There shall be no deliveries between the hours of 10.30pm and 6am.

Reason: In the interests of amenity.

14. Before commencement of the development hereby permitted there shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for the lighting of external areas of the development site. Such scheme as is approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over the appearance of the lighting installation and the level of illumination in the interests of visual amenity and highway safety.

15. Prior to commencement of development approved by this planning permission or such other date or stage in development as may be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority the applicant shall commission the services of a competent contaminated land consultant to carry out a detailed contaminated land investigation of the site and a scheme to deal with the risks associated with contamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That scheme shall include all of the following elements unless specifically excluded in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

1) A full desktop survey of historic land use data, identifying all previous uses potential contaminants associated with those uses a conceptual model of the site indicating sources pathways and receptors potentially unacceptable risks arising from contamination at the site.

2) A site investigation scheme based on (1) to provide information for an assessment of the risk to all receptors that may be affected including those off site

3) The results of the site investigation and risk assessment (2) and a method statement based on those results giving full details of the remediation measures required and how they are to be undertaken.

4) A verification report on completion of the works set out in (3) confirming the remediation measures that have been undertaken in accordance with the method statement and setting out measures for maintenance and further monitoring and reporting.

The remediation programme shall be fully implemented and the validation report shall be forwarded to the Local planning authority prior to use of the premises.

Reason: The site overlies a Major Aquifer therefore groundwater is considered to be a potentially sensitive receptor and the site should be subject to appropriate assessment in order to determine the risks. Activities carried out at this site may have caused contamination of soil subsoil and groundwater present beneath the site and may present a threat to nearby surface waters especially as a result of the proposed development. The above condition will enable the local planning authority to ensure that appropriate measures are taken to avoid any threat, which the proposed development might pose to health and safety and the environment.

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

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.

17. Before development is commenced, a schedule of materials and finishes, and, where so required by the Local Planning Authority, samples of such materials and finishes, to be used for the external walls and roof of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To secure a harmonious form of development.

18. Before development commences, full details of the cycle storage provision to include the design, siting, numbers of and timing for provision and the allocation to users shall be

submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall subsequently accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that adequate and suitable cycle parking spaces are available in accordance with the requirements of policy TR14 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

19. Before development commences a scheme to restrict shopping trolleys leaving the curtilage of the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of the building and shall thereafter be retained in relation to the development hereby permitted.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

**INFORMATIVE:** Policy

This decision has been taken in accordance with the following 'saved' policies of the Salisbury District Local Plan:

G1 (Sustainable development)  
G2 (General development criteria)  
G5 (Drainage)  
D1 (Design)  
TR11 (Parking standard guidelines)  
TR12 (New development)  
TR14 (bicycle parking spaces)  
C12 (Protected species)

**INFORMATIVE:** Environment Agency

Contaminated Land

Although generic remedial options are available to deal with the risks to controlled waters posed by contamination at this site further details will be required to ensure that risks are appropriately addressed. The historic activity and assessment of the associated potential contamination should have been assessed in the Factual and Interpretative Report. It would be prudent to assess the condition of the subsurface in the area identified as a vehicle repair workshop and/or any associated infrastructure (2) in order to better understand the contamination condition of the site. The Site Investigation has thus far not examined the condition of the site in the area where a previously potentially contaminative activity (workshop) was undertaken.

The above practice is considered important so that the site operator owner the regulatory authorities and other parties such as the general public potential purchasers or investors can have confidence in the outcome and any subsequent decisions made about the need for action to deal with any contamination at the site.

We recommend that developers follow the risk management framework provided in CLR11 Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination when dealing with land affected by contamination. It provides the technical framework for structured decision making regarding land contamination. It is available from [www.environment-agency.gov.uk](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk)

We also recommend that developers use BS 10175 2001 Investigation of potentially contaminated sites Code of Practice as a guide to undertaking the desk study and site investigation scheme

Water efficiency

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. Applicants should visit <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/Subjects/WaterResources> How We Help To Save Water Publications Conserving Water in Buildings for detailed

information on water saving measures. A scheme of water efficiency should be submitted in accordance with the information supplied on the website. The following may also be helpful <http://www.savewatersavemoney.co.uk/>

#### Surface Water Drainage

Surface water from car parking areas less than 0.5 hectares and roads should discharge to watercourse 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 per hour may be allowed to bypass 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.

#### Pollution Prevention During Construction

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. We recommend referring to our Pollution Prevention Guidelines found at:

<http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/business/444251/444731/ppg/>

#### Sustainable Construction

We strongly recommend that the proposed development includes sustainable design and construction measures. In a sustainable building, minimal natural resources and renewables are used during construction and the efficient use of energy is achieved during subsequent use. This reduces greenhouse gas emissions and helps to limit and adapt to climate change. Running costs of the building can also be significantly reduced.

#### **INFORMATIVE:** Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service

The applicant should be made aware of the letter received from Wiltshire Fire and Rescue Service regarding advice on fire safety measures. This letter can be found on the file, which can be viewed at the planning office between the hours of 09:00 and 17:00 Monday to Friday.

#### **INFORMATIVE:** Protected Species

Certain species are protected under Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and others are protected under the Habitats Regulations. Some are protected under their own legislation. The protected species legislation applied independently of planning permission, and the developer has legal obligations towards any protected species that may be present.

Planning permission if granted does not absolve applicant's from complying with the relevant law including obtaining and complying with the terms and conditions of any licences required as described in Part IV B of the Circular 06 2005.

#### **INFORMATIVE:** Travel Plan

For more information about setting up a travel plan you are advised to contact Wiltshire County Council's Travelwise Team by email at: [travelwise@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:travelwise@wiltshire.gov.uk) or by telephone on 01225 713388.



**Part 3**  
**Applications recommended for the Observations of the  
Area Committee**

No Observations