

# LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE

## NORTHERN AREA & 9<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2003

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>A106</b> - Approve subject to S106	<b>DOEC</b> - Refer to DLTR (Committee) Now DTLR	<b>REF</b> - Refusal
<b>APP</b> - Approve	<b>NOBJ</b> - No objection	<b>REV</b> - Subject to Revocation Order
<b>APPC</b> - Approve with conditions	<b>OBJ</b> - Objection	<b>DOED</b> - Refer to DLTR
<b>APRE</b> - Part approve / refuse	<b>OBS</b> - Observations to Committee	<b>Now DTLR</b> - (delegated)

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO OFFICER	LOCATION	REC	PARISH / WARD	PAGE NOS	WARD & COUN- CILLORS	NOTES
------------	---------------------------	----------	-----	---------------------	-------------	----------------------------	-------

Item	Application No. Office	Applicant's Name Location	Rec	Parish/Ward	Page Nos.	Ward Councillors
<b>1</b>	<b>S / 2003 / 1878</b> Miss A Rountree	MR & MRS HIGTON ROLLESTONE COTTAGE ROLLESTONE ROAD SHREWTON	REF	SHRE	2-4	TILL VALLEY & WYLYE Cllr Mills Cllr West
<b>2 SV</b>	<b>S / 2002 / 1075</b> Mr J Hammond	J S BLOOR (NEWBURY) LTD LAND SOUTH OF BOSCOMBE ROAD AMESBURY	A106	AMES	5-43	AMESBURY EAST & WEST Cllr Brown Cllr Noeken Cllr Peach Cllr Westmoreland
<b>3 SV</b>	<b>S / 2002 / 1651</b> Mr J Hammond	J S BLOOR (NEWBURY) LTD/PERSIMMON HOMES (SOUTH)LTD LAND SOUTH OF BOSCOMBE ROAD AMESBURY	A106	AMES	44-49	AMESBURY EAST & WEST Cllr Brown Cllr Noeken Cllr Peach Cllr Westmoreland

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

# Part 1

## Applications recommended for Refusal

Item No.	Case Officer	Contact No.	
App.Number	Date Received	Expiry Date	Applicant's Name
Ward/Parish	Cons.Area	Listed	Agents Name
Proposal			
Location			

<b>1</b>	<b>Case Officer</b> <b>Miss A Rountree</b>	<b>Contact No</b> <b>01722 434312</b>	<b>1</b>
----------	---	--	----------

S/2003/1878	04/09/2003	30/10/2003	MR & MRS HIGTON
SHRE			PLANNING & DESIGN LTD
Easting: 407184.800905421	Northing: 143128.42857039		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -ALTERATIONS AND 2 STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND REAR VERANDAH EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF CAR PORT AND STORE TO FORM STUDIO ACCOMMODATION KITCEHN AND WC INCLUDING RAISING OF RIDGE HEIGHT
LOCATION:	ROLLESTONE COTTAGE ROLLESTONE ROAD SHREWTON SALISBURY SP3 4HG

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Rollestone Cottage is a whitewashed, thatched cottage located just off Rollestone Road, Shrewton. It is located within the Housing Policy Boundary of Shrewton and the Special Landscape Area.

### THE PROPOSAL

Permission is sought to construct a two-storey extension to the rear of the property with single storey rear veranda. In addition the carport and store located to the rear of the property will be converted to form studio accommodation.

- The extension will protrude 5.7 metres, with a chimneystack extending a further 0.45 metres beyond, and will be 4.5 metres in width. The clay pantile roof will be pitched adjoining the hipped roof of the existing property. To the south east elevation there will be a gable window with French windows to the ground floor. There will be two small windows either side of the chimneystack to each storey of the south west elevation and no windows to the north west elevation. The walls will be rendered to match the existing cottage on a random rubble plinth.
- To the south east elevation of the extension and the south west elevation of the main house there will be a glazed veranda with cast iron posts/beams. This will protrude 1.75 metres with a mono-pitched roof to a height of 3.1 metres.

- The existing three bay carport will be converted to form studio accommodation with kitchen and WC. To facilitate this the height of the existing roof will be increased by 0.2 metres to a height of 3.6 metres. To the front of the building a glazed extension will be added measuring 5 metres by 1.35 metres. This will have a pitched roof adjoining that of the main building to a height of 3.9 metres. Three conservation rooflights will be inserted to the rear elevation. Reused slate tiles will be used for the roof.

## PLANNING HISTORY

Permission was granted in 1995 for a two-storey extension similar to this one and renewed in 2000. This was slightly smaller with half hipped roof, smaller gable window and less prominent chimneystack.

## CONSULTATIONS

Environment Agency - No Objection subject to conditioning for floor levels of the proposed studio to be submitted

## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No	
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expired 02/10/03
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expired 25/09/03
Neighbour response	No	
Parish Council response	Yes	No Objection but would prefer roof to be thatch

## MAIN ISSUES

Scale & Design, Impact on Neighbour

## POLICY CONTEXT

G2, D3, C6

## PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

### Scale & Design

Although the property has consent for a similar two-storey extension granted in 1995 and renewed in 2000 this was a smaller construction and was less bulky by virtue of the half-hipped roof and less prominent chimney. The proposed extension represents an incongruous addition particularly by virtue of the gable end and prominent outward projecting chimney. This in addition with the proposed veranda, which is Victorian in style, is not in keeping with the simple character and charm of the existing cottage. The fact that the extension is to be rendered to match the existing property negates the point of making it appear to be an extension by the use of clay pantiles. The combination of these factors results in an extension which does not integrate well with the existing building and surrounding Special Landscape Area. The proposed conversion of the carport increases the height of the existing roof with a glass addition, which protrudes above the increased ridge height. It will provide kitchen and WC facilities enabling it to be used for business purposes or subletting; but this can be avoided by the use of a suitable condition. Although the property will lose its garaging facilities there is enough off-street parking to comply with Appendix V of the Adopted SDLP.

### Impact on Neighbour

The proposed extension and converted carport are considered to have minimal impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of overshadowing & loss of privacy. The extension will be located close to the adjacent building but no windows are proposed on the elevation which faces "Halfway Cottage" which itself has no windows on the south-west elevation. The carport is located some distance from any properties.

## CONCLUSION

The proposed extensions of the dwelling are considered contrary to policy D3 and C6 of the Adopted SDLP in that they will not integrate well with the existing property and surrounding Special Landscape Area in terms of design, scale, massing and character. Although there are no objections in principle to the conversion of the carport and the proposed design, the protrusion of the gable end above the ridge height presents an incongruous rear view and further impacts on the simple charm of the cottage.

**RECOMMENDATION:**            **REFUSE** for the following reasons:

The proposed extension of the dwelling in the manner proposed and the conversion and extension of the carport, would significantly alter and adversely affect the simple uncomplicated character of the existing thatched cottage, and would also have an adverse impact on the character of the Special Landscape Area. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to policies D3 and C6 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

---

**NOTES:**

## Part 2

### Applications recommended for Approval

Item No.	Case Officer	Contact No.	
App.Number	Date Received	Expiry Date	Applicant's Name
Ward/Parish	Cons.Area	Listed	Agents Name

Proposal  
Location

<b>2</b>	<b>Case Officer</b> <b>Mr J Hammond</b>	<b>Contact No</b> <b>01722 434380</b>	<b>2</b>
----------	--	--	----------

S/2002/1075	29/05/2002 09:10:00	24/07/2002 09:10:00	J S BLOOR (NEWBURY) LTD &
AMES			TERENCE O ROURKE
Easting: 416358.581131935	Northing: 140387.729977131		

PROPOSAL:	O/L APPLICATION -UP TO 550 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS INC AFFORDABLE HOUSING THE SOUTHERN SECTION OF THE AMESBURY LINK ROAD AND FOUR ASSOCIATED JUNCTIONS BETWEEN UNDERWOOD DRIVE AND STOCK BOTTOM A LOCAL CENTRE COMPRISING RETAIL FACILITIES LOCAL SERVICES A COMMUNITY BUILDING AND ASSOCIATED CAR PARKING FACILITIES A PRIMARY SCHOOL A CEMETERY TWO INFILTRATION BASINS AND ANCILLARY SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE FACILITIES FORMAL OPEN SPACE COMPRISING PLAYING FIELDS TENNIS COURTS AND ANCILLARY PAVILION INFORMAL OPEN SPACE ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPE PLANTING
LOCATION:	LAND SOUTH OF BOSCOMBE ROAD AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7XG

#### Executive Summary.

##### The Proposal

To construct 550 dwellings, including affordable housing, associated community buildings, retail facilities, play areas, cemetery, school and the southern section of the Amesbury Link Road.

##### Consultee Views

No sustainable objections, however conditions are required to address concerns submitted by English Nature and Environment Agency and to overcome the initial objection submitted by Qinetiq. Additional conditions are required to meet archaeological and highway requirements.

##### Views of the community.

Strong objections have been raised to this development, principally relating to the provision of the final phase of the Link Road. These concerns relate to need for the route, separation of parts of East Amesbury, pedestrian safety, the condition of existing elements of the Link Road and impacts upon residential amenity. Other areas where objections have been raised relate to the scale of

development, loss of habitat, impact upon future of Boscombe Down and the lack of community facilities in this part of Amesbury.

### **Policy Framework.**

**National policy.** There is a preference for brown field development to take priority over green field proposals. Following this assessment developments should closely relate to existing settlements with an established range of social facilities.

**Local policy.** Given the limited brown field potential, a limited number of large sites have been allocated in Salisbury and Amesbury. The Amesbury site is intended to provide housing availability to match the Solstice Park employment development. The lack of social infrastructure is recognised in the Local Plan's requirement for the development to deliver community facilities, playing fields, retail space and education provision.

### **Key planning considerations.**

The key planning issues relate to:

1. The need to allocate this level of housing in Amesbury.
2. The impact upon the River Avon habitat
3. The completion of the Link Road and its implications for traffic movement, road safety across the whole Link Road and amenity implications
4. Relationship to Qinetiq and implications for development design
5. Provision of comprehensive community facilities
6. Views of the neighbours and the Town Council

### **Summary and conclusions**

This application has proved very contentious, principally because it completes the provision of a Link Road serving East Amesbury. The level of examination afforded to this scheme through the public consultation process has been fair and constructive, if not supportive. These concerns have been examined in detail with the Highways Authority and Environmental Health and provisions have been included within the Legal Agreements and conditions that address these issues.

The scheme represents a greenfield development, however it serves to balance other developments in Amesbury. It will provide a good range of community, recreational and retail provision as well as significant affordable housing and a new school.

The scheme accords with the detailed requirements of the Adopted Development Brief and Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and represents a well conceived and comprehensive proposal.

### **REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS**

Councillors Brown, Noeken and Peach have requested that this item be determined by Committee due to: the interest shown in the application  
the controversial nature of the application

### **SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

The application site comprises approximately 58 hectares of elevated grassland located to the south east of Amesbury and adjoining the Boscombe Down Airfield as well as the MoD sports pitches and Stockport Road. The site is crossed by byway 20. The site is currently accessed by the uncompleted element of the Link road (Underwood Drive)

To the west of the site lies the River Avon which is a SSSI and cSAC. The application site comprises a mix of grade 3a and 3b agricultural land. The application site lies within an Area of Ecological Significance and adjoins to the west the local Special Landscape Designation.

## **THE PROPOSAL**

This application proposes the creation of a 550 dwelling community serviced by a primary school, neighbourhood retail centre, a community centre, playing fields and changing accommodation and a cemetery.

Additionally, the scheme will include the provision of the final stage of the Amesbury Link Road, a hierarchy of estate roads and inner distributor road, structural landscaping, informal play areas, equipped children's play areas, surface water drainage systems.

The application is phased to deliver the 550 dwellings over the period to 2011.

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

The planning history for this site comes in three parts;

1. The Local Plan designations,
2. The planning applications for housing development to the east of Amesbury and,
3. Other public documents and resolutions relating to the future development for Amesbury.

### **1. LOCAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS & REFERENCES.**

#### **The Northern Parishes Local Plan.**

This Plan was published in draft in October 1989, considered at a local public inquiry in November 1990 and, following modifications, was adopted in November 1991, running until 1996. The relevant sections within this plan address housing allocations and transport.

The Plan made provision for development proposals that were, at 1991 uncommitted. It did not allocate sites that had the benefit of planning permission which were considered to be committed. It did not therefore commit the development known as Butterfield Down which, at the time of adoption had the benefit of an outline planning permission. The plan noted the existence of completions and commitments equating to 830 dwellings.

The Transportation chapter noted that the Examination in Public into the draft South Wiltshire Structure Plan had considered a proposal to replace the A.338 with the A.303 and A.345 as Primary Route. The Secretary of State decided that the A.338 should remain the Primary Route, however in the longer term the substitution of the A.345 for the A.338 could be considered when funds allow for the construction of a South Eastern bypass for Amesbury and improvement works to the north of Salisbury. The Plan supported the delivery of a south eastern bypass to Amesbury at the earliest opportunity and encouraged the DoT and WCC to include the Amesbury bypass in their forward capital programmes (Paragraph 9.5) The Plan contained no policy requiring a protected route for the by pass and did not identify any alignment within its settlement plans.

#### **Salisbury District Local Plan. (Now superseded)**

The draft plan was the subject of a public local inquiry in 1994 and adopted in March 1996. It established a district-wide development framework for the period to the end of 2001. Again, the most relevant sections relate to housing and transportation.

The plan noted the environmental constraints on a number of villages within the district and proposed to concentrate the majority of development in the larger settlements of Amesbury, Durrington and Mere, all of which had good access to the A.303 and a good range of services.

Paragraph 3.15 noted the lack of capacity for further infill development within the built up area of Amesbury and proposed a 9.5 hectare site to the south of Boscombe Road stating: "It is intended that an initial



development up to 2001 of about 200 dwellings will form the first phase of a longer term development..... The construction of that part of the south –eastern by pass of Amesbury which falls within the site will be sought (see Transport Chapter).” (Proposal H12)

The by pass issue was referred to in paragraphs 9.16 & 9.17. This latter paragraph stated:

“ The South-Eastern Bypass of Amesbury is not therefore a formal proposal of the County Highways Authority, although it is subject to a resolution to protect the route corridor ... The Local Planning Authority continues to regard (it) as potentially useful addition to the local highway network and will, by agreement with developers, take such opportunities as may arise to incorporate the road(s) in whole or in part within acceptable development proposals on land affected by the protected route corridors.”

Policy TR3 stated: “The construction of a South-Eastern Bypass of Amesbury (A.303 to A.345) and an all movements junction with the A.303 Trunk Road at Folly Bottom, Amesbury will be sought.”

### **Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.**

This plan was published in draft in June 1998, was the subject of a Public Inquiry between October 1999 and July 2000 and following modifications, was adopted by Salisbury District Council in July 2003. This plan runs until 2011

This plan proposed to allocate the majority of new housing development between Salisbury and Amesbury with 550 dwellings across the plan period on land to the South of Boscombe Road (Paragraph 4.8, Adopted SDLP)

Draft paragraph 4.26 noted the earlier allocation of 9.5 hectares south of Boscombe Road as a first phase of a longer term development of this area that would incorporate a range of uses including 25% affordable housing split 89% rental / 11% shared equity. The construction of that part of the Amesbury link road which falls within the site will be sought as an integral part of the scheme. This is confirmed at policy H9.

The Local Plan Inspector’s report accepted the Plan’s sustainable development strategy of concentrating the main bulk of the housing in Salisbury and Amesbury. The Inspector accepted the identification of a development opportunity capable of delivering housing beyond the 2011 Plan period to enable a comprehensive approach to be taken in respect of overall layout, infrastructure and use distribution. (Inspector’s Report paragraph 2, p. 95)

The Inspector required the scheme to address the delineation and landscaping of its Southern boundary, the provision of a cemetery, mix of house types and affordable housing, the physical limit to development areas to address the requirements of PPG 24 (Planning and Noise), the phased delivery of social infrastructure and accepted the requirement for the scheme to provide one of the two remaining sections of the Amesbury Link Road.

These requirements were confirmed by the Adopted Plan’s Policy H9. The requirement for a cemetery was established by policy PS10.

Within his assessment of the draft Transport Policy TR22, the Inspector considered whether:

- the Link road should be safeguarded on the Plan’s inset map,
- linked to specific developments,
- the status of the A.338 should alter, and
- alternative routes or deletion of the Link road should be considered.

The Inspector considered that a route could be adequately shown on the Local Plan, that it would be necessary to service the east Amesbury developments proposed or committed and that there remained a difference of view between the County and District Councils regarding the preferred primary route between either the A.338 or the A.345. The Inspector considered that the alignment of the Link road should pass through the H9 development and this could be achieved whilst retaining resident’s amenity. (Note, the Inspector was considering the link road’s alignment as illustrated within the draft Development Brief. This routed the link road through rather than around the new development.) The Inspector also accepted the

continued need for the Link Road to serve developments to the east of Amesbury and divert traffic from the town Centre.

The construction of the Link Road is required by Adopted Local Plan policy TR19.

## **2. PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT TO THE EAST OF AMESBURY.**

Two key development sites are relevant to the consideration of the current proposal's context and evolution, namely the outline approval for 'Butterfield Down' and the "Phase 1" Bloor / Persimmon scheme south of Boscombe Road.

### **S/88/2199. Outline application, Residential development of 475 dwellings, open space, neighbourhood centre, roads and paths (MJ Gleeson),**

Determined by the SDC North Western Planning Sub-Committee in April 1989 and formally approved September 1989. (Prior to the adoption of any Local Plan covering the Amesbury area.)

It was subject to Legal Agreement with SDC to provide play areas, structural landscaping, affordable housing and neighbourhood centre and Legal Agreement with WCC to allow for land alongside Porton Road to be transferred to WCC to allow for road widening, junctions on Porton Road and Boscombe Road and to provide a 7.3m carriage and verges between the Porton Road roundabout and the Boscombe Road junction. (now known as Pendragon Way)

The Development and Design Brief submitted as a part of this proposal set out a development context and included a Diagrammatic Highway Framework for the site. This framework identified the proposed alignment of Pendragon Way as the "Route of proposed By Pass". The Development and Design Brief at page 12 stated:

"Following discussions with ATC, SDC & WCC, the proposals for Butterfield Down make provision for part of a new north to south by-pass to Amesbury... This route is not included in the highway improvement strategy for the County as set out in the Structure Plan and TPP. Present policies concentrate on improvements to the A.338.... Nevertheless there is a strong feeling that a better solution, especially as far as Amesbury is concerned would be to improve the A.345 to the south of the A.303 and this fits with the proposal to by-pass the town to the east. Gleeson have carefully considered this strongly held local opinion and provision has therefore been made in the proposals for that part of the by-pass which crosses the site."

### **S/89/225&6 Outline application, construction of new link road between A.345 and Boscombe Road with approximately 450 dwellings and services on land South of Lynchetts and South of rear of Beaulieu Road and lying between A.345 to west and Boscombe Road to East. (J.B. Developments & MoD.)**

These applications proposed a joint development on land to south East of Amesbury. The area covered by these applications incorporated the now constructed Bloor Phase 1 and the northernmost elements of the current outline application.

The North West Planning Sub-Committee in April 1989 considered that the joint proposals exceeded Structure Plan allocations during the period to 1996.

The report to that Sub-Committee noted that all three applications (Gleesons, J.B. Developments & MoD) would allow for the provision of a by pass to the South East of the town, financed entirely by the housing developments. The report noted that a by-pass for Amesbury is not included in the current County Roads Programme or the Structure Plan and would not therefore be provided using public funds. WCC had resolved to protect the by-pass route contrary to the recommendation of its Transport & Highways Committee, establishing "in principle" support for a by-pass.

The joint J.B. / MoD scheme was however considered too large against Structure Plan allocation and the offer of the by pass would not outweigh the excessive scale of development and landscape impact. A smaller, MoD and Gleesons scheme may be capable of implementation, subject to phasing. In the event

however both the J.B. Developments and MoD schemes were refused by the Planning Committee in May 1989.

**S/95/1264      Outline application, Residential development, open space and relief road, approved subject to Legal Agreements with SDC & WCC in September 1996.**

The North West Planning Sub-Committee considered this proposal in February 1996. That committee noted that application S/95/1264 accorded with the SDLP policy H12, allocating about 9.5 Ha for about 200 dwellings. They also noted that the 1995 application was envisaged as a first phase for a larger development, although these latter phases did not represent a formal allocation.

The Sub-Committee also noted that 244 proforma objections had been received objecting to the scale of development, adverse impact upon landscape, increased danger, noise and pollution from the proposed relief road. Additionally a petition with 181 signatories objected to the location of the development and the link road from Folly Bottom to the A.345. A further 27 individual letters were received relating to over development impact upon countryside / ecology, inadequate employment and social and physical infrastructure, no need for relief road & increased congestion in Amesbury.

This outline scheme has now been fully developed and comprises McKie Road, Kickdom Close, Harvard Way, Bayer Road and associated housing.

### **3.      THE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF AND OTHER PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.**

#### **The Approved Development Brief.**

The Development Brief for this site was adopted by the Northern Area Committee in February 2001 and represents Supplementary Planning Guidance that informs the development of the current outline planning application and its determination. A copy of the relevant committee report setting out the consultation process is attached at Appendix 2. The Committee will note that the alignment of the Link road was altered from a route through the site to its eastern boundary following local representations made at the Development Brief's public exhibition.

This brief set the site context in terms of landscape assessment, tree survey, noise impacts, archaeological & ecological potential, design and layout principles, the development proposals including provision of a primary school, local centre, cemetery, link road, playing fields, community building, informal open space. Referring to the link road it proposed that this should be a local distributor road and likely preferred alternative to the A.338.

The framework plan indicated the roads alignment to the eastern boundary of the proposed development area. The Brief also confirmed the need for about 3.15 hectares of youth & adult play facilities and 0.5 hectares of equipped children's play space. The brief identified a northern location within the site for the concentration of shopping & community facilities to ensure accessibility to residential areas beyond the development itself. The brief confirmed the need for a 10-class primary school at an early stage, with scope to expand to 14 classes. A local centre will contain retail facilities and a community centre capable of accommodating a range of uses. Additionally, changing accommodation and sports pavilion would be provided to serve the sports pitches. A cemetery of 1 hectare would be required. The scope for CCTV within the centre would be encouraged. These issues would generally be addressed via a series of legal agreements between the developers and the County and District Council.

#### **Amesbury Vision Statement.**

This document evolved from concerns felt at local and Northern Area Committee level in 1998 about the rate of growth planned for Amesbury over the ensuing 15 – 20 years. Comprising representatives of the local public authorities, residents association, Chamber of Commerce, developers and English Heritage, the vision Group Working Party distributed 3,000 questionnaires were issued in January 1999 with 566 being returned. The vision statement used this information to a series of social, recreational and built enhancements that were considered locally relevant and important.

The Vision Statement has no formal planning status but it is acknowledged that this is a useful background document to inform the early scoping work for the community facility and infrastructure requirements from new development.

In relation to the housing site, the vision Statement noted the additional provision of open space, a cemetery, new school, recreation and community facilities as well as that element of the link road, which falls within the site.

Specifically, at paragraph 5.10, the Statement notes:

“On the roads front, the provision of an all movements junction at Folly bottom and the construction of the link road with the A.303 with the A.345 in association with development will enhance the role of the town by freeing land for economic development and relieving pressure on other parts of the town’s highway network....”

## **CONSULTATIONS**

### **Highways Agency.**

No comments to make.

### **WCC Highways.**

(The Highways Authority has entered into extensive correspondence with both SDC and local interested parties. This section of the report sets out the requirements of WCC Highways in relation to the planning application and other elements of the Link Road. Comments relating to more general concerns made by individual 3<sup>rd</sup> parties will be addressed within the “Planning Considerations” section of the report.)

The developer shall enter into Legal Agreements to contribute towards off site highway works in the town centre, Porton Road and other locations where works are identified to accommodate (i) the safe passage and convenience of pedestrians and cyclists travelling to and from the development, (ii) the demands on the local network of site generated traffic, including town centre measures, (iii) improvements in the public transport network serving the development.

Specific legal / conditional controls are required to secure:

- Controlled pedestrian crossing at the northern end of Underwood Drive,
- Provision of pedestrian footway to the eastern side of Pendragon Way,
- An enforceable trigger to deliver the completed distributor road linking Underwood Drive to the A.345,
- Foot / cycle link to agreed site boundary point with Beulieu Road,
- Foot / cycle link to agreed site boundary point with Adjoining residential developments,
- Contributions to highway drain interceptors and SUDs,
- Agreed lighting scheme to that part of byway 20 that lies within the development.

### **Hampshire County Council.**

Concerns about the number of trips to Andover being generated by new developments around Amesbury and elsewhere within Hampshire, particularly the am peak at Hundred Acre Corner roundabout in Andover.

## **WCC Planning**

The principle of developing this site for 550 dwellings is established within the SDLP and is considered to be in accordance with Policy DP 4 of the Adopted Wiltshire Structure Plan to 2011, however the development description does not ensure that an appropriate mix of housing in terms of type, size and affordability will be secured as required by Structure Plan Policy DP8 and PPG 3.

It is noted that a new supermarket has been approved for the town centre and local centres are allocated for both Butterfield Down and land south of Boscombe Road to meet the qualitative local shopping needs. At face value the application description for a “local centre comprising retail facilities” complies with SDLP

policy however the description is loosely worded and the detail and content of any retail element of any local centre needs to be well defined. Without this the delivery may either not properly provide for everyday local needs or alternatively be in excess of the scale necessary to deliver local provision, thereby possibly prejudicing the implementation of the town centre supermarket, in conflict with PPG 6 and Structure Plan Policy DP6

### **WCC Library/ Museum**

The archaeological evaluation of the site has now been completed and a copy of the report received. The final stage of the evaluation comprised 108 machine excavated trenches, 50m long and 2m wide, covering the entire site with the exception of the area of the proposed school which was excavated in May 2002. Many of the evaluation trenches produced no significant archaeological features, however a few localised areas of high archaeological potential were identified within the site. These included a probable round barrow, an extensive ditch and other discrete features all dating to the Bronze Age period (c. 220BC – c. 800BC). A burial was also identified, which was likely to be of Romano – British date, and residual human remains were also recovered in the valley. Most of these features occur in the eastern part of the site, while in the north a number of Second World War air raid shelters still survive.

On the basis of the information from the evaluation none of the features identified are considered to be of national importance. However all these features contribute to the understanding of the archaeology of this area and will need to be fully recorded by excavation prior to the development taking place. It is therefore recommend that the condition set out in paragraph 55 of Annexe A of the DoE Circular 11/95:

“No development shall take place within the area of the application until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.”

In the case of the proposed primary school an investigation of this site has already taken place. This recorded a Romano-British cemetery and two Bronze Age burials. However a further two cemeteries were identified which have not been excavated which should remain preserved in situ, as they lie beneath the proposed school playing field. The applicant's archaeological consultants confirm that a proposal for importing of material to create the playing fields was proposed but has not, as yet, been produced. Whilst WCC recommend that this proposal becomes part of a Section 106 obligation. As the site is wholly within the applicant's control a condition can be provided the necessary control to approve the proposals for preserving the Romano-British sites prior to the grant of planning permission.

It is therefore recommend that the following conditions are also placed on the application:

- No development shall take place until fencing has been erected in a manner to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, around the site of the proposed playing fields; and no works shall take place within the area inside that fencing without the consent of the Local Planning Authority.

This condition is to protect the Romano-British cemeteries identified beneath the site of the proposed playing fields during construction of the school and related buildings and services.

- Before December 31<sup>st</sup> 2003 a full report on the archaeological excavation of the proposed school site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

This condition is to ensure that the archaeological excavation of the Romano-British cemetery and Bronze Age burials that took place in May 2002 are fully reported and therefore available to the public.

### **English Heritage.**

This is an area of high archaeological significance. We consider that additional excavation over the pre-submission assessment should be undertaken. (Subsequently done and Archaeological Report submitted to WCC and EH for observation / information)

They object to any development that may affect the Scheduled Ancient monument, particularly the 4 strip lynchets (SAM no. 28941), although we welcome the fact that the main development area has been pulled away from the monument and other areas of known archaeological sensitivity.

Initially concerned about the impact of new development upon the Stonehenge WHS skyline, however further assessment of the Landscape Impact submissions as a part of the EIA have overcome this concern.

#### **Housing & Health Officer.**

Suggest that wherever practicable a close boarded fence or similar barrier is constructed between the road and housing, where there is no effective barrier at present. That said, it is simply not possible to erect such a barrier at all positions, the necessary permissions and agreements will not be in place and there may be no method of instructing the developers to construct a barrier. There is however one key position near the proposed roundabout at Underwood Drive where I understand a barrier may be agreed.

Regarding acoustic fencing along Pendragon Way, there is little to be gained from raising the height of the fence to 2 m, and given that it would require a separate planning permission to do so therefore a 1.8m high fence would be acceptable

Regarding the barrier to the playing field / open space there is no requirement for a height greater than 1.2m, but would advise that the transport planners are better placed to make recommendations re road safety. This also relates to the cycle barrier.

Re proposed housing, it is recommended that to ensure that the WHO guideline level of 55 dB Laeq 16 hr is not exceeded at house facades. Further noise investigation may be required as different phases of the development progress in order to ensure that this is met. I would be happy to address noise attenuation within dwellings by condition.

The air quality technical appendix to be satisfactory.

The effects of military aircraft are not properly considered by PPG 24 with the noise exposure category being designed for large commercial airfields. It is therefore considered that the EIA has underestimated the effect of aircraft noise on the proposed development. It is therefore suggested that a more robust scheme of sound insulation for the proposed housing and suggest the application of Condition M13A to the entire development.

Construction work or spoil movement should not take place on Sundays or Bank Holidays and be limited during weekdays and Saturdays, although this should not preclude internal fitting out.

#### **Arboroculturalist.**

A number of individual trees, groups of trees and woodland within this site are subject to a TPO. Without a detailed layout, the impact of the proposal is problematic. The presence of the Order is a material constraint and proper consideration must be given regarding likely physical impact on the trees themselves. The requirement to adequately protect them and manage the site with regard to vulnerability and impact of service runs / utilities / roads and footways is important.

#### **Wiltshire Bridleways Association.**

Accept the need for a temporary diversion to byway 20 but hope the final plans ensure an attractive environment / setting to the bridleway. Concern about the safety of bridleway 23 in relation to the A.345 / Stock Bottom junction remains.

#### **Trail Riders Fellowship.**

The developers have taken notice of pre-application comments and the current scheme is an improvement on the draft proposals. Byway 20 is an historic feature which should be retained for public enjoyment. SDC should resist any temptation to "improve" this route by metalling the surface.

#### **Wessex Water Authority.**

WW considers that foul and surface water should be addressed on a comprehensive basis for the total development area. WW has identified connection points and off site improvements for water supply and foul drainage.

Water supply is provided by 2 borehole supplies, Newton Toney & Durrington. The Amesbury system is at hydraulic capacity and without network reinforcement and with the addition of the new development some 1,000 properties would be at risk from low pressure. A phased programme of reinforcement to distribution is proposed.

There is foul drainage capacity available within the existing system, however over the life of the development there will be a need for additional works to the Flower Lane sewerage pumping station.

Concerns exist about the use of SUDs and the potential impact of surface water runoff during flood conditions. The SUDs design should ensure that flood risk to land and property should not be adversely affected. Surface water only drainage would not be adopted by WW. A comprehensive surface drainage system should be delivered across the site including private soakaways, infiltration basins and SUDs. The ongoing maintenance of the surface drainage network is therefore important.

### **Environment Agency.**

The Agency broadly supports the conclusions within the Environmental Statement although the impact of this scheme should be assessed in combination with other major proposals in the Amesbury area. As required by the Habitat Regulations.

The Agency supports the use of sustainable drainage techniques for the disposal of surface water from the link road. We have no objection in principle to the scheme proposed subject to acceptable details relating to swales, infiltration basins and interceptors. A SUDs approach can enhance nature conservation opportunities

Do not accept that the Environmental Statement's reference to the abstraction licence regime and the return of water to the river within the catchment actually represents the true position and ignores any developer responsibility, however works relating to the Appropriate Assessment under the "Habitat Regulations" 1994 has identified a series of water efficiency management measures that can improve this matter.

The proposed code of Construction Practice is encouraging and will provide some certainty over ground water protection.

The development of a cemetery site could cause pollution of groundwater and appropriate prevention measures are necessary. Any planning consent should require a Water Interest Survey to identify wells, springs or boreholes, licensed and unlicensed within an appropriate radius of the burial site. The potential risk of contamination should be assessed. The Agency can provide appropriate guidance on this matter.

### **English Nature.**

English Nature require conditions to be in place which ensure that the measures outlined by the developers are adhered to, for example:

- Strict application of the construction management regime. The developers have agreed to consult both English Nature and Environment Agency with regard to the appropriate location for site compounds as development progressed.
- A condition to ensure that the water saving and efficiency measures outlined are installed.
- A condition to ensure that the sustainable drainage systems are put in place and that the continued maintenance (and responsibility for maintenance) of both these and other measures (such as gullies and petrol interceptors) are clearly outlined and adhered to.

The overall site offers opportunities for wildlife gain, however mostly in phase 3. further consultation should take place on these issues at that stage.

The potential contamination of the River Avon system through construction requires a management plan to be enforced.

It should be noted that all nesting birds are protected by law and works which may impact upon their habitat should be completed outside the months of April to August (incl.)

#### **Countryside Agency.**

No observations in this instance.

#### **Health & Safety Executive.**

HSE, Explosives Inspectorate has recently licensed the storage of explosives by Quinetiq Ltd at MoD Boscombe Down and have advised SDC of an initial consultation distance of 1,530m from the site boundary. The Hazardous Installations Inspectorate arm of HSE is interested in the storage of aviation fuel, however for land use planning purposes this interest only extends approximately 200m from the fuel storage facilities. As a consequence, the larger consultation distance required by the Explosives Inspectorate arm will take precedence.

Based upon our current understanding of the nature and layout of the proposed development, we would not expect it to affect the explosives licence for MoD Boscombe Down. This should be regarded as an indicative reply only. We will consider the detail of each feature of the proposed development when the individual planning applications are referred to us in due course. In particular, our indicative reply is on the basis that there would be no buildings in excess of 3 storeys in height or of vulnerable construction included within the development.

(Note; Local concerns relating to the proposed development upon the licensing of MoD Boscombe Down for explosives storage was also dealt with under the HSE consultation with Wiltshire County Council's Environmental Services Department. Public objections were presented to the WCC Explosives Panel which was also advised by the HSE.)

#### **Qinetiq (Submitted by Bell Cornwell on their behalf).**

Following discussions with the applicants a number of comments are submitted relating to both the current application and the proposed phase 3.

**Explosives Storage.** The explosives area has an inner and outer zone, affecting development either by preventing development within the inner area, or the erection of buildings for assembly or the design of the buildings themselves. Parts of the overall scheme will be affected by the safeguarded area. No vulnerable buildings should be planned in the school / housing / retail area. The cemetery should not be considered a place of assembly and the Public Open Space should remain open. The second phase area appears acceptable subject to development complying with MoD regulations on design. The latter phase 3 is likely to be affected by the safeguarding and should not be taken as acceptable by Qinetiq.

**Noise and vibration.** Issues relate more to activities on the airfield rather than the development. These activities occur across the day, into night and on occasion at weekends. The main sources relate to Harrier / Helicopter take off / landing, the University Air Squadron, and Fast jet take off / landings and test circuits. The ES does not acknowledge the noise created on certain occasions by jet engines and helicopters, however the airdrome operator receives complaints relating to noise from existing residents. It is likely that additional development will bring with it further complaints. New residents should be made aware of the airfield as a noise source as part of an information pack for new residents and be identified on land charges. Quinetiq does not favour phase 3 with its southern encroachment. Neither MoD nor Quinetiq would provide soundproofing for new dwellings. Quinetiq objects to the position of the cemetery, which will not benefit from tranquillity and quietness and will not accept future requests to alter operations based upon the cemetery's use.

**New roads, lights and landscape.** Landscaping proposals should ensure that no encouragement is given to bird populations near the airfield. Lighting proposals to the roads and residential areas need to take account of the adjoining airfield operation and be kept to a minimum. Additionally, the links back to the



existing road network from the new link road need to facilitate the airfield operation including emergency vehicles and fuel delivery. The SUDs design should not facilitate standing water and hence bird activity.

**Summary.** The airfield is guided by MoD regulations and is not the subject of control over noise or numbers of movements or time of activity. Quinetiq is contracted to deliver MoD test / evaluation work for the next 25 years and development proposals which prejudice this activity would not be acceptable. Quinetiq objects to the location and extent of phase 3, the location of the cemetery, any open water storage, landscaping that encourages bird populations and lighting that prejudices air safety. Quinetiq also seeks assurances on the level of lighting, sound attenuation, the absence of vulnerable buildings, design of buildings within the safeguarded area, the Stockport road capacity and advice to new residents relating to the airfield's presence.

### **Defence Estates, MoD Safeguarding.**

Confirm that the MoD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.

### **C.P.R.E.**

Regret the need for a large Greenfield expansion, however it is well related to the existing settlement. In principle however the CPRE object to this allocation until the outcome of the urban capacity study has been assessed. Object to the visual impact of the development. There should be no impact upon the WHS setting. Planting should be undertaken to screen the development from outside views including the A.345. Given the site's prominence the design & choice of materials are important and should be in keeping with the remainder of Amesbury. Byway 20 should be retained as an important feature and local amenity.

### **REPRESENTATIONS**

Advertisement	Yes – Expired 4 <sup>th</sup> July 2002
Site Notice displayed	Yes – Expired 4 <sup>th</sup> July 2002
Departure	No

### **Town Council**

Initially, this Council was minded to object to this application as there were serious reservations concerning the commitment of the developer to ensure that necessary infrastructure was in place at the earliest opportunity but after a lengthy discussion, ATC raises no objections BUT it is essential that the completed road, Underwood Drive to White Railings on the A.345 and the school be made the subject of a legally binding Section 106 Agreement ensuring both start before further housing commences. It is also necessary that the shopping facilities follow on as soon as possible to provide necessary infrastructure for residents of the Boscombe Down area.

Further comments submitted in relation to the Detailed Designs for the Southern Section of the Link Road raise more detailed concerns relating to the safety of the elements of the A.303 – A.345 link already constructed together with the management of traffic along Underwood Drive and the design of the Stock Bottom junction.

### **Amesbury Society.**

Question the need for so many houses given lack of local jobs and inability of social infrastructure to meet additional demands. Additionally, the following points are made:

Proposal will further exacerbate the previous formless extensions to Amesbury.  
The existing character of byways 20 & 23 should be retained.  
Impact upon secondary education needs to be addressed.  
Retail parade will fail unless focused upon a supermarket.  
No need for 4 storey buildings.  
Stock Bottom requires a crawler lane  
Traffic impacts should take account of other major developments around Amesbury  
New community building is welcome provided it is of sufficient size.  
The development will mar the downland landscape setting.

Vista to west should ensure no development is visible above the Lynchetts skyline  
Tall buildings should be on lower ground  
No locally characteristic building materials other than chalk and flint.  
HGV traffic will have a significant impact upon link road.  
Streets should be pedestrian focused with limited vehicle access.  
Query impact of cemetery upon water quality.  
Development will destroy vital bird habitat, which cannot be re-created.  
Detrimental impact arising from construction noise.

#### **The Barcroft Practice.**

Query the EIA assessment that there is sufficient health service capacity within Amesbury to address the needs of this scheme. Would prefer to expand the existing operation rather than create a branch surgery.  
Request that the developer funds the expansion of primary health care facilities within Amesbury.

#### **Bulford P.C.**

Bulford Parish Council is concerned about the likely increase in traffic arising from the range of local major developments, including Project Allenby, Solstice Park, the Stonehenge Visitors Centre, the completion of the link road. The parish is concerned that people avoiding the Amesbury town Centre will use the link road and return through Bulford and Durrington to re-join the A.345.

### **PUBLIC REPRESENTATIONS & RESPONSES TO PUBLIC EXHIBITION.**

#### **Public Representations.**

SDC has received significant correspondence from properties raising a number of objections and concerns relating to the outline application. The most strongly held objections relate to the proposal to complete the Amesbury Link Road, thereby altering the character and usage of the existing sections of the overall Link road, Porton Road, Pendragon Way & Underwood Drive. The objections comprised a combination of letters, more detailed reports from local residents and a petition signed by 306 people. For ease, the objections are grouped into (i) Road related issues, and (ii) Other objections / Areas of Concern.

#### **(i) Road related issues.**

- The A.345 is not congested and Amesbury does not need a by pass,
- Additional traffic passing through the town if a link road is not built would be unacceptable and a hazard to children within the town accessing shops and schools
- Underwood Drive will become an A Road by default,
- Increased noise & air pollution from HGV's using link road will detract from amenity of adjoining residents,
- Stockport Road provides a better route to link the A.303 & A.345 as much of the infrastructure exists and Pendragon Way & Underwood Drive will be avoided. Additionally this would better serve the Quinetiq main gate and proposed car parks,
- The original route of the Link road proposed in about 1996, taking a direct route from Boscombe road to the A.345 at Stock bottom, without the encumbrance of roundabouts and the additional length required to follow the housing development perimeter was a better solution,
- Taking an A road through a residential setting is contrary to advice within PPG 3 relating to safe and healthy design,
- The historic planning for the Link Road is not relevant to the determination of this application,

- Link Road was not revealed upon searches.
- Link road plans have been in place since the earliest houses in East Amesbury,
- Link road will adversely impact upon pedestrian safety, segregating parts of East Amesbury & creating safety problems accessing the new school,
- The existing situation whereby Pendragon Way is served by a footpath to its western side only is unacceptable,
- To design road speeds for the Southern Section of the Link road for speeds up to 50 m.p.h is unacceptable,
- Road design fails to provide adequate pedestrian crossings over the Link Road and to serve the Stockport Farm Employment site,
- Will traffic-calming measures be provided along Link Road?
- Costs to society of accident's upon Link Road
- Signing of the Link Road as an alternative Salisbury – A.303 route is unacceptable,
- There are safety implications arising from the Link Road passing the phase 1 playing field without adequate safety barriers,
- Concern about glare from headlights impacting upon rear of Beyer Road properties by roundabout,
- The double roundabout on Boscombe road would be inadequate to deal with additional traffic,
- The linking of Underwood Drive to the A.345 would in some ways be welcome as Stockport Road is dangerous with a number of accidents in the past,
- The creation of the Link Road will negate the benefits of living in a countryside setting,

**(ii) Other objections / Areas of Concern.**

- Loss of important green field,
- Too many houses proposed & too dense. There should be no flats, The proposal is out of keeping with the setting,
- 3 – 4 story buildings inappropriate to the setting of Stonehenge WHS & out of keeping with the town,
- Archaeological importance of the site should not be destroyed,
- Development will have an unacceptable impact upon Amesbury's social and retail infrastructure,
- Community centre should be close to the school opening up possibilities for dual usage
- The sewerage systems within Amesbury are already unable to cope with demand,
- There is no assessment of the health of those using the proposed sports facility,
- Can WCC afford the new school?
- Will the school be provided with traffic calming?
- The publicity period and time available for public assessment and comment is inadequate,

- Why do Gleasons' locally claim not to know about the Link Road?
- The E.S. Does not give the Link road's status sufficient prominence,
- The level of impact (of the Link Road) upon residents / sensitive receptors is disputed,
- The provision of local shops does not address Amesbury's need for another supermarket. Small shopping parades are poorly managed and not respected.
- Boscombe Down needs improved infrastructure and retail facilities anyway,
- Existing recreational facilities within Boscombe down are already being vandalised,
- Local play facilities should be well lit.
- There will be a detrimental impact upon Amesbury Town Centre if vehicles are diverted away from it via the Link road.
- Adequate visitor off road parking is required,
- Opening up of link into Beyer road will adversely impact upon local safety both pedestrian & vehicle
- Construction Traffic should access the site via Stockport Road,
- Conditions should be imposed relating to hours of construction and delivery as well as construction vehicle routing and worker parking areas,
- Weekend working should not start before 9.30,
- Controls should be imposed to prevent the developers leaving local roads muddy,
- There will be local inconvenience to residents arising from construction workers accessing local shops during the day.
- Creating a new access into Beyer Road is inappropriate and the estate was not designed to accept additional traffic,
- Scheme does not make habitat available for existing skylark and butterfly populations,
- Bats are present in this area,
- Cemetery could prove attractive to vandals

#### **Public Exhibition of Link Road Proposals, 5<sup>th</sup> March 2003.**

To address strongly felt local concerns within East Amesbury, an all day exhibition of the proposed development together with illustrations of the traffic calming measures considered appropriate by WCC Highways was undertaken at the Baptist Church, Butterfield Down. This exhibition allowed the public to discuss their concerns and the scope to address these concerns with officers representing the District and County Council. Additionally, representatives for the developers were present and contributed to the ongoing discussions. The opportunity to submit further comments to the planning authority was available via a comments sheet.

About 230 people attended and 28 completed comments sheets were returned to SDC.

Of these 5 responses were supportive of the link road whilst 23 raised various areas of concern / objection (although 2 related to timing of meeting & housing designs)

The key areas of concern relating to the link road were:

### **General.**

- The impact of the road is to separate East Amesbury from the remainder of the town including shops / schools etc.
- The link between the A.303 & A.345 should not run through a residential area. Another bypass route is required.
- Concern that people will use the link road as a rat run to avoid Amesbury Town Centre, thereby increasing traffic through Bulford.
- The link road will not provide the required bypass given the number of roundabouts.
- Searches in 1999 did not reveal proposals for the link road.
- Signing should include weight restriction.
- Speed should be 25 m.p.h. according with Government Guidance for roads within housing estates.
- Speed limit along link road should be 30 m.p.h. Traffic calming should include road narrowing.
- Increased noise and air pollution along the route, impacting upon adjoining residential areas.
- Wish to see more traffic calming by road narrowing / speed humps rather than roundabouts to discourage heavy traffic from passing through the housing development.

### **Comment upon particular traffic calming proposals.**

- No provision for safety measures at the Underwood Drive / McKie Way junction
- Additional traffic will use McKie Road as an alternative to the double roundabout, particularly if this junction is light controlled.
- Lack of adequate lighting of footpath proposals for Porton Road.
- Lighting of the existing double roundabout will promote light jumping. Speed cameras should be introduced.
- The double roundabout should remain as it exists but with improved pedestrian crossings.
- Additional footpath links along Gleeson Link are a waste of money that should be spent elsewhere.
- No new pedestrian use of the Gleeson Link will be created as these developments are complete. This area should be landscaped and not have pedestrians encouraged along it.
- The Baptist Church crossing requires additional pedestrian crossing.
- Prefer to see path rather than road widening along Porton Road.
- Taking a new main gate into Quinetiq via Solstice Park will take a considerable amount of peak hour traffic off the link road.
- Fence / hedge by Underwood Drive play area should be supported by railing / barrier to prevent children cycling / running from paths onto the link road.
- Alterations to McKie junction to reduce traffic speed for users of this junction.

- Junction of McKie road / Allington Way should be closed to prevent rat running.
- Has the occupation of dwellings at the north of Porton road by people with learning difficulties been taken into account within the safety measures?
- Baptist Church junction is inadequate for heavy vehicles. Additionally, the Baptist Church blocks views from the north of traffic leaving Butterfield Down.

#### **Noise / air quality implications.**

- Separation between some dwellings in Beyer Road and the link road is by chainlink fence and limited planting, the additional noise and pollution will make use of the gardens untenable and additional boundary screening is necessary.
- Would like additional planting along the Wilcon side of Gleeson Link to mitigate noise / air pollution and aid privacy from users of the new path link.

The views expressed above have been discussed with both the County Highways Authority and the District Council's Environmental Health Department.

The range of responses include areas of individual concern which do not carry sufficient weight or relevance to planning issues to bring them into the assessment process; opposing views upon single issues; challenges to historic planning decisions & strategies as well as the principle of new housing at the proposed scale, and areas where local knowledge can benefit the decision making process by identifying common local priorities for traffic calming measures.

A number of commonly expressed views relating to the priority areas for safety and amenity measures to be retrofitted were identified and solutions agreed with the developers. These issues are discussed in more detail in the "Planning Considerations" section.

#### **MAIN ISSUES**

1. Planning Framework, delivery of Green and Brown field sites and mixed use scale.
2. Habitat Regulations & water management proposals
3. Urban Capacity Study
4. Assessment of the ES by IEMA
5. Sensitivity of receptors within the E.S.
6. Archaeology
7. Completion of the Amesbury Link Road
8. Alternative routes for the Link Road
9. Status & Signing of Amesbury Link Road
10. Amenity implications of the Amesbury Link Road
11. Other highway implications arising from the Link Road
12. Public transport infrastructure
13. Education provision
14. Neighbourhood centre & retail proposals.
15. Affordable Housing
16. Provision of Community Centre
17. Provision of Public Open Space and Changing Facilities
18. Provision of Cemetery, location & noise issues
19. Review of Section 106 Agreement by Fordham Research.
20. Health services
21. Construction practice
22. Construction methods in relation to the HSE safeguarding zones
23. Design Code
24. Location of proposed play facilities
25. Extent & location of traffic calming
26. Lighting
27. Landscaping to the Southern boundary of the development site
28. Public Art
29. Recycling facilities

30. Provision of Closed Circuit Television Systems
31. Habitat protection & enhancement
32. Publicity for application
33. Knowledge of the link road proposals within earlier planning approvals.
34. Searches.

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

Adopted Wiltshire County Structure Plan 2011

DP6

DP8

Adopted SDLP Policies

- G1 (General Principles)
- G2 (General Criteria for Development)
- G3 – G6 (The Water Environment)
- D1 (Extensive Development, Design)
- H9 (Housing Development, Amesbury)
- H25 (Affordable housing)
- C18 (rivers and River Valleys)
- S4 (Out of Centre Retail proposals)
- S8 (Amesbury town Centre Retail Proposal)
- S9 (Local Shops)
- TR11 (District Wide parking standards)
- TR12 (Major development promotion of non car trips)
- TR13 (Improvements to existing routes)
- TR14 (Cycle parking provision)
- TR19 (Amesbury Link Road)
- R1A (New recreational facilities)
- R2 (Open space Provision)
- R4 (Indoor community & Recreation Provision)
- R8 (Recreational use within Application Site)
- R17 (Public rights of Way)
- PS5 (New Education facilities)
- PS10 (Cemetery provision within application site)

PPG1

PPG3 (Housing)

PPG 3 (Housing) Revised draft for consultation

PPG7

PPS 7 Consultation Draft

PPG13

Approved Development Brief, Land South of Boscombe Road (February 2001)

Design Bulletin 32

Places, Streets and Movements, A Companion Guide to DB32

Better Places To Live (DETR / CABE)

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Planning Framework, delivery of Green and Brown field sites and mixed use scale.**

Section 54a of the Town & Country Planning Act 1991 (as amended) requires that applications are determined in accordance with the Local Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Policy H 9 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) states:

“Land south of Boscombe Road, Amesbury, is allocated for residential development and associated uses, including educational, recreational, retail and community facilities, subject to the provision of satisfactory on and off site surface water drainage and disposal systems. A planning obligation will be sought in respect of the provision of the above issues, and any other on and off-site infrastructure and facilities necessitated by the development where they are relevant to planning and directly related to the proposed development. A mix of housing types and sizes will be sought on the site including a proportion of at least 25% affordable housing which will be negotiated with the developer, and which will take account of the need identified in Amesbury. Development will be phased and limited to 550 dwellings during the lifetime of this Local Plan. Land between the site, Salisbury Road and the A.345 will be available for informal / formal recreational uses and a cemetery. The provision of that part of Amesbury Link Road which lies to the south of Boscombe Road will be sought as an integral part of this scheme.”

The submission of an application for 550 dwellings together with primary school, playing fields, community building, neighbourhood centre, a commitment to SUDs drainage, 25% affordable housing and the delivery of the Southern Section of the Amesbury Link Road would therefore comply with the requirements of policy H9.

Before accepting this proposal therefore the planning decision needs to there are material considerations that suggest the provisions of policy H9 should not be the determining factor.

The material considerations considered relevant to the determination of this application are set out at points 2 – 31 below. Points 32 – 34 relate to the planning process itself rather than to factors that could carry weight in determining the application.

In addition, the Planning Authority needs to consider whether relevant new planning policies have been established by PPG or similar Government Advice. Such issues would represent material considerations in determining the application.

Since the publication of the Adopted Local Plan, draft versions of PPG 3 (housing) and PPS 7 (Sustainable Development in Rural Areas) have been published for consultation.

Both documents place significant emphasis upon the efficient delivery of brownfield sites and regular review of their likely availability in order to minimise the need for green field development.

Local Plan Inspector noted the absence of significant brownfield sites and the significant role that greenfield housing would have to play in delivering new housing development. The Inspector deleted one of the 3 major housing sites proposed by the draft Plan (Fugglestone Red) and accepted proposals to redevelop the former A E Goetzee Industrial site adjoining Harnham to provide some 120 dwellings. Outline planning permission has subsequently been granted on this site for 144 dwellings.

The Inspector accepted the draft Plan's approach to the delivery of sustainable housing development, focusing the major sites upon Salisbury and Amesbury, where a good range of services and social infrastructure exists.

Since the Inspector's Report the Authority has commissioned an Urban Housing Capacity Study, which is considered in more detail at Section 3 below.

Whilst the application provides a well serviced housing scheme with good access to new facilities and provides the retro-fitting (where offered by the developer) of services required by existing housing areas to the east of central Amesbury, it is not a “mixed use” or “Urban Village” scheme wherein employment (other than at the school, community centre and neighbourhood centre) is delivered.

This approach reflects the earlier decision by SDC to grant approval, over 2 plan periods to the major Solstice Park employment site to the north east of Amesbury, adjoining Boscombe Down and the A.303. Rather than deliver a series of smaller, finely integrated housing and employment neighbourhoods, SDC has chosen to consider East Amesbury as a larger mixed use area. Within this concept, the delivery of the current application within a development brief masterplan addressing the scope to promote a 3<sup>rd</sup> phase of housing following 2011 runs in parallel with the delivery of employment land.



The scale of employment allocation forming Solstice Park would only represent a balanced development for Amesbury if delivered in association with a major housing allocation. Without a significant Amesbury housing site, the continued development of Solstice Park as the district's largest employment allocation would necessitate new employers to draw staff from further afield.

Within the market town scale of Amesbury the 2 sites, located as they are to the eastern edge of the town are accessible to each other by modes other than the private car. They are within a short cycle distance of each other although outside the normal pedestrian 400 m walk distance. The scope to link the 2 sites and the town centre by a hopper bus circuit is discussed at Section 12.

### **Conservation (Natural Habitats & c) Regulations 1994 & Water Management proposals.**

The River Avon system is a candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC) under the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c) Regulations 1994 (Habitat Regs.)

This designation places a requirement upon the planning authority as the Competent Authority to consider whether a plan or project, alone and in combination with other plans or projects will have a significant effect upon the cSAC.

As a result of detailed discussions between SDC and both English Nature and the Environment Agency, SDC undertook an "Appropriate Assessment" which took into account the in combination impacts of:

- Project Allenby at Tidworth, Bulford and Larkhill
- The impacts of the Solstice Park Employment site and Folly Bottom highway works
- The proposals for the Stonehenge WHS Visitor Centre
- The H9 Amesbury housing scheme
- Various road schemes comprising works to A.303, Wylde by-pass and Harnham / Brunel links
- The Maltings City centre re-development, and
- Retail re-development in Ringwood.

The series of development proposals, water related issues and method of assessment were agreed with English Nature and Environment Agency.

The conclusions from the Assessment were that the housing scheme could be undertaken without significant impact upon the cSAC River Avon subject to a series of control measures being put in place. These controls relate to construction management and groundwater pollution risk, method of dealing with surface water drainage in terms of pollution control and attenuation rates and water demand minimisation measures based upon the use of more efficient household utilities.

Whilst the type of household fittings is not usually a detail addressed by the planning system, given that it relates to a package of water management features required to protect the water environment each reserved matter application should be accompanied by a statement setting out the water management measures to be provided within buildings, hard surfaced areas and gardens. Additional conditions will address the detailed delivery of surface drainage proposals.

A code of construction has been submitted and will be addressed via condition.

### **Urban Housing Capacity Study.**

In his Report, the Local Plan Inspector accepted the draft Plan's sustainable development strategy of concentrating the main bulk of housing in Salisbury and Amesbury, followed by medium scale developments in other main settlements.

The Inspector confirmed that he had appraised all sites in light of PPG 3 using the sequential approach as a material factor in making recommendations.

SDC subsequently appointed Baker Associates (February 2002) to undertake an Urban Housing Capacity Study. The purpose of this Study was to estimate potential future housing yield from all sources from the main settlements together with defined smaller settlements.

The Study reported that “windfall” sites should produce an annual yield of 172 dwellings. This figure is close to, but below the 183 annual “windfall” rate considered appropriate by the Inspector.

The Study does not identify potential new brownfield sites that could be offset against the larger strategic Greenfield housing allocations. The Capacity Study therefore reinforces the approach taken by SDC to the number, size and settlements in terms of identified housing allocation. The Final Report was presented to SDC in May 2002 and informed the Local Plan Modifications process and eventual adoption.

### **Assessment of the Environmental Statement by The Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment.**

SDC has required the submitted Environmental Statement to be independently assessed by the IEMA to determine whether it adopts current best practice and ensures that all relevant information is available to the decision makers. It will be the case however that complex technical issues will benefit from specialist advice.

The IEMA assessment considers the ES provides sufficient detail to give a clear indication of the impacts of the development. No significant issues have been omitted or treated inadequately. The ES does not make it clear whether alternative layouts were considered or how the proposed plan evolved. This point relates more to the Development Brief public consultation process and the evolution of the local centre siting, relationship to the school and routing of the southern section of the Link Road from Underwood Drive. Whilst not included within the ES, the assessment of development pattern options has therefore been undertaken.

The IEMA report considers that the methods used within the ES to establish baseline conditions, prediction of environmental effects, assessment of magnitude and treatment of mitigation is acceptable. There is an absence of detailed mitigation, including code of construction practice (subsequently submitted) and assessment of social / community impacts which might have been useful. Whilst elements of the original ES have been revised as a result of detailed responses to the consultation process, the methodology within the ES has been capable of accommodating the revisions without bringing the overall approach and level of detail within the ES into question.

Overall, the IEMA assessment of the ES varies between “Excellent, no tasks left incomplete” to “Good, only minor omissions or inadequacies.” Two sections are rated “Satisfactory, despite omissions”. These are the consideration of alternatives to the selected site and alternative designs for the illustrative masterplan. The Assessment notes that the consideration of alternative sites is a matter for the Local Plan process. The alternative masterplan layouts issue is addressed above. The second area related to monitoring and management of mitigation, particularly construction practice. A code of practice has subsequently been submitted and assessed by Environmental Health, Environment Agency & English Nature.

In conclusion therefore the Environmental Statement, as amended during the consultation process is considered to be a clear and comprehensive document upon which to base the planning judgement.

### **Sensitivity of Receptors within the E.S.**

Objectors have identified certain “receptor” areas such as playing fields and the Baptist Centre where the E.S. did not appear to reflect the appropriate level of sensitivity to the Link Road’s impacts. This point has been accepted by the developer and a supplementary assessment has been submitted to the Planning Authority. This revised section within the E.S. forms the basis for SDC’s Environmental Health assessment and response to the outline application.

The E.S. identified impacts arising from the development relating to increased traffic flows both as a result of the development and by the completion of the Link Road. Following on from this there is an increase in noise upon properties adjoining the length of the Link road as well as construction noise during the development process. Within the development site the noise arising from its position adjoining Boscombe Down Other impacts identified relate to landscape character, social infrastructure and water management. These issues are discussed in more detail in the relevant sections below.

### **Archaeology.**

The application site has been the subject of considerable archaeological evaluation prior to determination and the views of the County Archaeologist are set out in the Consultee Responses Section Above.

The excavation of the school site has revealed finds of importance. The two excavated burial sites include the "Amesbury Archer" and represent a significant early Bronze Age Beaker burial dating from 2,400 – 2,200 BC. The bodies together with artefacts have been excavated, researched and recorded and a full report is required by the County Archaeologist to contribute to the public record.

The investigation identified two further cemeteries that were not excavated and are recommended to remain "in situ" with conditions controlling the manner in which the school playing field is brought into use and subsequently retained. The requirements can be delivered via condition as the site is wholly within the control of the applicant.

### **Completion of the Amesbury Link Road.**

The delivery of the Southern Section of the Link road will complete the connection between the A.303 and A.345. As such the nature of use of existing sections, provided through earlier residential development will alter. This has raised concerns that the earlier sections are not sufficiently well designed, or provided for in terms of safety measures to fulfil their changed role. A number of points have been made through neighbour correspondence relating to these issues. In addition, the Link Road exhibition day allowed for more detailed discussion of particular concerns.

This process has required a comprehensive and detailed assessment of both the current road proposals and the condition of the existing elements.

Both SDC and WCC have considered local proposals to delete the link road and instead route additional traffic via the town centre. Similarly, the suggestion that the town centre is not and during the lifetime of the Traffic Assessment will not reach a congestion level that would justify an alternative route has been reviewed.

Following the review of the need for the Link road and discussions with WCC Highways, the planning officers have taken note of the County Council advice that the proposed scale of development will adversely impact upon the town centre without the provision of this Link Road and continue to accept the need for the Link Road to provide future traffic relief for the town centre.

The Highways Authority required additional land from Gleeson homes to be transferred to it to provide for the widening of Porton Road / footpath. WCC are in the process of finalising boundary & splay details to the last phase of Butterfield Down.

The design of the Pendragon Way element of the Link Road provided for a single footpath to the west of the road. An additional footpath to the east is considered reasonable and can be delivered via the S.106.

Arising from the Public Exhibition, the need to provide some form of crossing to Underwood Drive by the double mini roundabout was consistently identified as a local priority. The developers have agreed to this and submitted design details for such a crossing which can be secured from them within a S.106 Agreement.

The lack of fencing to the Underwood Drive play area was identified by both SDC and local representations as being a safety issue. Following discussions with Environmental Health and WCC Highways a barrier fence of not less than 1.2 metres is necessary to prevent free access onto the roadside footpath from the play areas. Equally, the provision of cycle barriers at the points where the play areas internal footways meet the roadside footpath will be required. Within the S.106 therefore the developer has agreed to submit a scheme for approval to provide the necessary fence and barriers prior to the first development of the site. This would provide the required safety before construction traffic uses the road.

Additionally, WCC are seeking a capital sum from the developer to allow them to monitor actual pedestrian movements and numbers and then, where necessary install further safety measures. Sums have been agreed between WCC and the developer and can be secured via the S.106.

In conclusion, the completion of the link will result in increased flows along its length. The local representations have provided both SDC and WCC with a significant breadth of opinion regarding the various elements within the Link Road and views about their safety. Clearly, not all representations should result in the retro-fitting of new crossings and / or traffic calming measures, however the re-assessment of path and crossing provision to date has identified areas where improvements are justified. Where these have been identified the developer has agreed to either resolve the matter of fund the County Council's works. Additionally, a sum of money is available to WCC to monitor and amend / add to existing measures in the light of actual usage.

### **Alternative routes for the Link Road.**

Objectors to the link road route have suggested alternative routes designed to take the route away from housing areas. These have included routing the Link Road through the Solstice Park Employment site and via land adjoining or, alternatively through land owned by Quinetiq and extending to an upgraded Stockport Road. Alternative proposals have retained Porton Road but routed the link road past the Boscombe Down main gate and along Stockport Road.

The provision of a route past the Boscombe Down main gate would link into Quinetiq proposals for additional parking adjoining the main gate.

Firstly, to route the Link Road via the Solstice Park development raises practical and legal issues. The outline approval for Solstice Park contains no requirement for a Link Road to be routed through the site. There is a requirement to provide access to the Quinetiq site, linked to the promotion of the Salisbury Research Triangle and the need to provide alternative access to such a facility apart from the Airfield main gate.

The Area Committee has approved reserved matters proposals for the development of three parcels of land within the Employment site. Additionally, the outline approval at Solstice Park contains requirement for highway improvements to Porton road, including junction improvements. As such, the development of Solstice Park is progressing within the constraints and requirements of its planning approval. The planning authority does not have powers to make additional requirements of this development in terms of introducing the Link Road.

Any question of revoking the extant consent would bring with it compensation claims from the Solstice Park developer against the District Council. Were the Planning Authority to pursue a revised Link Road via Solstice Park it would therefore have to balance the costs to SDC arising from possible revocation against the lack of objection from WCC as the highways authority to the Link Road alignment as currently proposed.

The issue of using an upgraded Stockport Road as an alternative to the proposed route along Pendragon Way, Underwood Drive and through the application site has been previously discussed at the Local Plan Inquiry and subsequently with WCC as Highways Authority.

At the Local Plan Inquiry it was made clear that the link road could only be delivered through developer funding. This point reflects the position expressed in planning policy documents relating to Amesbury since the ideas for an East Amesbury Road were initially conceived. As has been set out in the planning history above, the absence of WCC funding for the route due to its strategic priority within county transport priority planning requires the route to be delivered via a series of developers providing sections of the route within their site.

On the issue of the alternative Stockport Road route, WCC Highways does not consider that an enhanced Stockport Road would offer a viable and realistic alternative to the link road as its vertical and horizontal alignment does not offer the opportunity to re-design the road to modern standards.

To summarise the status of the alternative route options therefore, the scope to take a route via Solstice Park is not available as the site has consent to develop without providing the link road route within it and the use of Stockport Road is not considered feasible in terms of construction capability.

### **Status & Signing of Amesbury Link Road.**

A strong, and widely held concern regarding the link road relates to its status and signing. Key elements within this issue relate to whether the route is seen as a preferred alternative to the town centre, a route promoted for H.G.V. traffic or a replacement for the A.338 as a primary route and / or preferred route to Salisbury from the A.303.

This issue goes to the heart of a long-standing debate between SDC and WCC regarding the status of this route. This historic failure to resolve this debate has led to the various terms used to describe the route, including by – pass, relief road and link road.

Historically, SDC considered the East Amesbury route serving as a part of the primary road network, replacing the A.338 as the preferred eastern link between the A.303 and Salisbury. This approach was seen by SDC as dovetailing with highway improvements to the North of Salisbury.

The WCC position however has been that the A.345 / A.303 link is not a County priority that would be funded via any county roads programme. Equally, the A.338 would, in the view of WCC remain as the primary eastern connection between the A.303 and Salisbury.

WCC has therefore generally resisted protecting the proposed alignment of the road, as it did not form a part of the County Council's roads programme.

Against this background therefore, the District Council through its negotiations with developers and Local Plan has identified the need for the development of East Amesbury to deliver a series of connected sections of road, which, once connected, would form a new connection between the A.303 and the A.345.

The Local Plan Inspector in considering the now Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan noted that between the District and County Council, the status of the route remained unresolved.

Within the current application the route is described as a Link Road. Consultation with WCC has confirmed that the Stock bottom A.345 roundabout would sign the Link Road as serving local destinations only. It would not indicate the link road as connection into the A.303. The Folly Bottom junction is controlled by the Highways Agency. As such, the signing policy is for that Agency to determine. The HA has sought advice from WCC Highways regarding the signing strategy for the new Folly Bottom junction. Based upon the view expressed by WCC the Highways Agency has indicated that it would be signing this junction for local destinations only and would not be identifying it as a route to Salisbury.

To an extent, the description afforded to this route is less relevant than its design, route, width and ease of use. Between Folly Bottom and Stock Bottom, the route will comprise a single carriage in either direction passing through 6 roundabouts and a single, double mini roundabout. The length of journey has been extended following the Development Brief's revisions that routed the road around the development rather than through it.

The roundabouts are capable of accommodating H.G.V. traffic, protecting the interests of Boscombe Down and facilitation movement southwards from Solstice Park, however the design of these junctions is not "friendly" to H.G.V. traffic and would prevent it from being an easy alternative to the town centre or even the A. 338.

In summary, therefore the completed route will not be signed as a part of the primary network. Its design included a number of blockages to high speed and easy vehicle movement. It will provide a local alternative to the town centre and reduce potential congestion and accident implications within the centre. It is not designed to draw traffic that is already within the town centre or to be a defined alternative to the town centre.

### **Amenity implications of the Amesbury Link Road**

Upon completion, the Link Road will have implications not only for Amesbury's travel patterns, but also for those residents that live along side the proposed and existing sections of the Link Road.

The design of new development has limited the number of pedestrian and vehicular access points onto the full length of the Link Road, however there will be increases in vehicle numbers since the Link Road once completed will serve a purpose over and above the connection of immediately adjoining neighbourhoods.

The implications of the overall Link Road use has been assessed in terms of trip numbers and noise impacts. The impacts contained within the originally submitted E.S. have been revised in light of consultation responses to amend the number / sensitivity of receptors. The Highway and Environmental Health assessment therefore includes the revised data. Additionally, the Environmental Health Officer has walked the Link Road route, from Folly Bottom to the end of Underwood Drive.

Two areas of concern have arisen from this assessment of residential amenity:

- (i) The quality of fencing along Pendragon Way to its eastern boundary falls short of any acoustic barrier requirements. The fence is timber boarded, generally 1.8 metres in height and contains too many gaps to provide a noise barrier. The provision of such fencing may represent a failure in boundary quality management and compliance monitoring during the determination of this element of the Butterfield Down reserved matters proposal, however there is scope to mitigate this problem via the current application by agreement with the developer.

The developers will through the S. 106 Agreement offer those dwellings bounding the eastern side of Pendragon Way a replacement 2.0 m acoustic fence subject to the grant of planning permission, or a replacement 1.8 m fence if planning permission is not granted for the enhanced facility. The offer of a 2.0 m fence goes beyond the requirements of the Environmental Health Department, which considers that an acoustic fence of the height of the existing boundary screen is all that could be reasonably required offered by the developer.

- (ii) Those properties within Beyer Road that bound the proposed junction separating the Link Road from the phase II internal traffic are provided with a chain link fence only and reduced landscaping. Given the proximity of those dwellings to the new junction and the ancillary noise and headlight impacts that will arise, through the S.106 Agreement the developers will offer to provide a 2 m high acoustic barrier which will also reduce the direct impacts of headlights.

### **Other highway implications arising from the Link Road**

Representations submitted to SDC suggest that the completion of the Link Road will lead to additional road accidents and consequent costs to society. This point has been considered by WCC and the scope for accidents to occur based upon the provision of a new road in conjunction with additional use arising from both the new development and the use of a completed Link Road is accepted. However, in determining this application the Planning Authority must also bear in mind the requirement upon it to provide for additional housing as well as the alternative of delivering this scheme without the Link Road. This latter scenario would transfer trips from the Link Road back through the town centre and therefore would be likely to transfer the risk of accidents to other road areas. It would not remove the risk of road accidents arising as a result of the creation of 550 new dwellings and consequent traffic.

Individual comments have been made about the degree of visibility along Pendragon Way, particularly at the Baptist Church junction, the possible impact of providing a light controlled junction at the current Boscombe Road mini junction and rat running via feeder roads and the quality of junction at McKie Road. These issues have also been discussed with WCC Highways but are not considered to require alterations to the existing road layouts. The presence of the double mini roundabout has been commented upon locally as both a hazard and as a traffic calming benefit. Both arguments derive from its design and the way that it is negotiated by drivers. The scope to alter this junction at a future point is available to WCC following monitoring of capacity and use and may be an area that the developer's capital payment to off site works could be used. However based upon the accepted traffic forecasts contained within the submitted Traffic Assessment no alterations are currently required by WCC.

The impacts of the housing development and completion of the Link road further afield have also been raised, particularly relating to Bulford and, at the Hundred Acre Plantation junction at Andover along the A.303. Again, increasing the size of Amesbury as a result of this application will result in additional traffic flows onto the local and wider road network, however neither WCC nor the highways Agency, as managers of the local network and A.303 respectively have required off site highway improvements to extend this far.

Whilst Hampshire County Council has raised its concerns relating to the Andover junction in relation to this scheme as well as the MoD schemes to re-develop Bulford and Tidworth, Wiltshire County Council, as SDC's highways consultee considers that the distance from the Folly Bottom A.303 junction places the Andover junction beyond a sphere where traffic impacts could be reasonably argued to require further off site highway works, or refusal of a consent based upon capacity issues.

### **Public Transport Infrastructure.**

The Development Brief for the housing scheme identified a desire to divert the existing Stockport Road service into the site as well as the creation of a new "hopper" service for the proposed housing scheme, Solstice Park and the town centre.

The Solstice Business Park S.106 requires payments to be made into a sustainable transport account based upon built floor space and, eventually, the generation of 400 jobs at Solstice Park. The agreement does not require payments for public transport to be triggered by an annual date. As such, the Solstice Park S.106 cannot deliver a guaranteed public transport "income" over a definable period, such that could be relied upon to subsidise a public bus service.

The Housing scheme proposes to deliver a three-stage payment to subsidise local bus services based upon an initial commencement figure with ensuing payments regardless of subsequent housing completions. This proposal offers to subsidise a hopper type bus service at a sufficient level to finance a hopper bus for a three-year period.

The delivery of bus services capable of accessing and serving the application site therefore needs to be considered at two levels: Firstly, the delivery of a diverted service, providing access from the site to Amesbury Town Centre, and, secondly, the provision of a new service linking the housing development, the approved Solstice Park scheme and the town centre.

The delivery of the Southern Section of the link road will replace Stockport Road as the route for public bus services. As such, the site's local centre is capable of being accessed by a temporary bus stop upon the completion of the Link Road, upon opening, the Link Road will be a privately maintained public highway. As such the condition of the road to be controlled via the developer's Legal Agreement with WCC will be of adequate standard to facilitate bus access. This will provide bus accessibility to initial phases of residential development within the 400m walk distance.

Discussions with SDC's Transportation Group and WCC as Highways Authority have identified two approaches to the delivery of a new bespoke bus service. On one hand, the transport consultees would wish to see bus services provide at the development's outset. This will establish public transport an existing factor for new occupants and has the scope to influence living / movement patterns from an early stage in the development process.

Alternatively, the public transport subsidy could be used to provide a service between the housing scheme, Solstice Park and town Centre once a "critical mass" has been established at the two outlying development sites.

If this latter solution were pursued the new "hopper" service may be introduced at a later stage in the overall East Amesbury development at a point when there is scope to deliver meaningful public transport links serving linked communities of reasonable scale.

Following consultation with SDC's own Transportation Unit the latter; two phase approach to public transport is considered the more practical option. The first phase should be the delivery of temporary stops within the link road capable of serving the new housing scheme by diverting an existing route from Stockport Road onto the Link Road. The second phase Amesbury public transport service would be delivered following the Local Authorities' future review of public transport needs and comparative growth within the two key development sites at Solstice Park and the H9 housing scheme.

Such an approach would allow for public transport to be introduced once the developments merit service rather than simply because funds exist. It would also allow transport planners at County and District to review best service provision in light of the prevailing requirements once the respective housing and employment developments are in the process of delivery. It would also allow the two Council's to consider

subsequent development proposals upon brown field sites, which may influence subsequent demand and need for public transport.

If a longer-term approach is adopted to the delivery of a new bus service, the offer of support funding from the current development will represent a major subsidy element towards any new town service although not in itself sufficient in itself to deliver a bespoke service for a five-year period. The onus would return to SDC & WCC to define a new service taking into account the funds available from the incremental development of Solstice Park, the phased payments from this application, and any additional funds drawn from other re-development proposals to address public transport needs at a future point.

The approach of accepting three annual payments from the housing scheme which are capable of being retained by the LPA's for a 10 year term to address new bus link requirements is considered to be a reasonable solution to the delivery of new as opposed to diverted public transport service provision.

### **Education provision.**

The determination of the 1996 application for phase 1 and the development brief consultation process prior to the current application identified a pressing need to improve education facilities at both primary and secondary level within Amesbury.

The legal agreement between WCC, SDC and the developer will require:

- A capital sum to be paid to WCC towards the provision of additional secondary school spaces. This sum has been agreed with WCC, and
- The construction of a primary school of up to 14 classes over two phases and temporary access. The Legal Agreement will require the construction of the school to commence as one of the initial building operations (along with the link road and associated service infrastructure)

The masterplan identifies a site of about 1.6 hectares. The location proposed has evolved from discussions with WCC regarding the school's relationship to the neighbourhood centre and accessibility by the proposed bus service.

### **Neighbourhood centre & retail proposals.**

The Adopted Local Plan identifies the H9 as including retail facilities. The Adopted Development Brief notes that shopping & community facilities should complement the proposed development without detracting from facilities in the town or in the surrounding areas.

The Environmental Statement proposes ground floor retail space of up to 4,250 sq m with accommodation over. This overall area is proposed to accommodate the scope to meet demand arising from the, as yet, unallocated "Phase III" area. The application does not seek approval for 4,250 sq m as a part of this application. The S.106 will establish the acceptable level of retail provision for this application. The residual area would provide scope for expansion of retail facilities if a further phase were submitted and approved. The E.S. anticipates the retail environment accommodating small-scale food store, newsagent, take away, hairdresser, dentist, video rental & launderette. These types of uses are purely indicative of the types of uses that will be attracted towards a neighbourhood centre. The actual uses will be dependent upon the marketing strategy and to an extent the locations of existing similar uses within the town.

The figure is related not just to the current outline application, but also reflects the sites accessibility to existing housing within phase 1 as well as the Lynchetts and former Boscombe Down married quarters. Additionally, the Local Plan and its Inquiry considered the current application to be a part of a larger, phased development, matching the longer term (two plan periods) planning permission granted to the Solstice Park employment site.

The identification of an area within the overall masterplan capable of accommodating a retail area of 4,250 sq m therefore allows for a two phase approach to retail provision; Phase 1 within the current local plan period serving the proposed 550 dwellings, together with existing local housing; and Phase 2, allowing for the central, neighbourhood centre to be expanded to meet the eventual demands of a 1,250 house development as well as the existing local housing.



Locally, there is support for the neighbourhood centre accommodating a supermarket, rather than a neighbourhood scaled group of smaller shops. This reflects longer standing concerns that the town centre Redworth House site is to be developed by the town's existing supermarket operator rather than allowing a new operator into the Amesbury market. Equally, however, the Planning Authority must bear in mind the importance of retaining Salisbury Road / High Street as the retail focus for Amesbury. The largest store within the existing retail frontages are the existing Co-op with about 950 sq m retail floor space. The approved redevelopment of Redworth House allows for an approximately 1,300 sq m store to be built.

Clearly therefore, the opportunity to develop all or part of the retail area proposed by this application could, if not controlled, facilitate a single retail user considerably larger than the largest alternative available within the town centre. As such the range of products available within a considerably larger out of centre store could draw significant trade away from the town centre and damage any linked shopping trip potential within the town centre.

To address these concerns, the authority needs to limit the maximum floor space for any single retail unit, taking into account the desirability of providing sufficient floor space to facilitate a good range of products, without competing directly with the town centre scale shop units. Further, a maximum overall floor space to be developed within the current phase should be identified.

Whilst a neighbourhood centre based upon a range of differing sized retail uses, including take away and / or pub, offices over shop and hotel / guest accommodation could provide a viable and useful mix of uses and attractions to the neighbourhood centre, there is a need to prevent a single large, non retail operation accessing the site (for example large office or hotel use) and developing the bulk of the neighbourhood centre capacity in a manner which provides little local benefit it is necessary to define upper limits to the floor space available to each use type proposed.

The Section 106 Agreement provides the opportunity to define the maximum size of retail unit that could be considered within the reserved matters applications, the level of information required to address vitality / viability if the developer subsequently proposes a larger unit, the proportion of the 4,250 sq m capable of being developed within the current application and the upper limit upon floor space for uses A1, A2, A3, B1 (office), C3 and D1.

The applicant has agreed to limit the maximum gross floor space for any individual unit within the proposed neighbourhood centre to a size that does not impact adversely upon the vitality and viability of the town centre. The maximum floor area should not compete with the range of goods available within the town centre, whilst providing an opportunity to create retail units capable of offering a good range of local shopping services.

The overall floor space capable of being developed within this phase should be limited to prevent an excess of retailing compared to the needs of the existing Bloor / Persimmon housing taken with the current application. A total floor area of 2,100 sq m to serve this development as well as the local setting would allow a range of retail opportunities commensurate with the needs of the scheme, and setting and leave a potential phase two for retail development to address any further housing development.

The opportunity to develop a pub or restaurant would not undermine the neighbourhood retailing facility, or the overall provision of such leisure facilities within East Amesbury given the existing locations and levels of accessibility and as such should not count against the 2,100 sq m retail floor space, subject to the use of a condition preventing reversion under the Use Classes Order back into an A1 retail use.

To prevent single, non-retail uses being promoted at ground floor level a limit of 30% non-A1 retail should be a required upper limit for ground floor uses within the 2,100 sq m neighbourhood centre capable of development within the current proposal.

### **Affordable Housing.**

The development brief provides for 25% affordable housing with a split of 89% rental : 11% shared equity.

PPG 3 and Adopted Local Plan Policy stipulates that this 25% figure should be a minimum provision.

The need for this development to deliver the southern section of the link road, together with a primary school at an early stage within the development has been identified by the Development Brief as representing the key local infrastructure requirements considered essential to the acceptability of the overall project.

The negotiation of the S.106 Legal Agreement needs to balance the competing bids arising from a range of consultees and involved parties. As such, the scope to deliver in excess of 25% affordable housing has to be assessed within a social infrastructure package where other S.106 requirements would have to be re-assessed in terms of scale or timing for delivery.

Within the negotiations for this application, the developer has accepted a shift from 89% rental accommodation to the delivery of 100% rental accommodation. Additionally, the developer has agreed to provide 8 phases of affordable housing, limiting the overall scale of individual blocks of affordable housing to 15 – 25 units per block and to deliver these sites at a constant phasing across the overall development.

Both of these issues are considered to improve the quality and delivery of affordable housing over that established at the development brief stage.

The delivery of 25% rental housing is however reliant upon the Housing Associations having adequate grant. A cascade trigger will be included within the legal agreement to manage this.

Given the particular needs within Amesbury, and the series of infrastructure priorities relevant to this development, a 25% rental only supply of affordable housing represents an acceptable solution to social housing provision. It should be noted however that acceptance of a 25% rental figure in this instance is a site-specific judgement. Where other schemes being brought forward are not required to front end load significant elements of social infrastructure the Local Planning Authority would not consider the 25% level of provision to set a precedent for affordable housing negotiations.

### **Provision of the Community Centre.**

The Development Brief identified a need to provide a community centre facility in addition to recreational areas / changing accommodation. The E.S. proposed a community Building of up to 450 sq m capable of including a small sports hall & other facilities (such as meeting room & kitchen areas)

Following discussions with WCC there is scope for the County Council to manage this facility to provide both a community and youth centre. To meet both the SDC requirements for a community use building as well as the delivery of the County Council's Youth Service would involve:

- A sports hall of not less than 200 sq m of adequate design to provide for badminton use (Roof height and floor construction issues are therefore important)
- An early years / meeting room,
- Two youth rooms & IT area
- Male / female / disabled toilet facilities
- Kitchen
- Cleaning & other storage space
- A management agreement between SDC & WCC relating to the manner in which the delivery of community use will be secured, hours of opening, inter-relationships between dual Community & youth use and the extent to which facilities should be retained as dedicated youth use areas.

Early discussions with WCC have mapped out a management proposal capable of delivering the twin aims of Community and youth use.

The review of the S.106 proposals undertaken by Fordham Research in relation to the Community Centre identified a need for some 385 sq m of Community Use space for the current application. The proposal to deliver a 450 sq m youth / Community building to be constructed and available for use by the commencement of the 220<sup>th</sup> dwelling therefore represents a beneficial outcome in that provision will exceed the normal space requirements and will be delivered to a useable condition within the first half of the development.

### **Provision of Public Open Space and Changing Facilities.**

The application proposes the provision of formal playing fields and a changing facility / pavilion, informal open space, and two equipped play areas.

The formal open space is identified upon the masterplan and will be of sufficient size to accommodate two football pitches & cricket pitch. This description is in reality only indicative of the area of land to be provided. Should the playing field management body prefer to use these pitches for other sports this would be a matter for it and not SDC or the developer to control.

A specification for the changing accommodation has been agreed between SDC's Parks Manager and the Developer and will be controlled via the S.106 Legal Agreement. This will comprise:

- A building of up to 200 sq m
- Four separate changing rooms & officials changing room
- Showers, toilet and storage areas
- Serviced kitchenette
- Suitable flooring & fixed furniture
- An appropriately surfaced car park for 40 vehicles

The Legal Agreement will require the preparation of the pitches in the first planting season following commencement of development. Following preparation, the pitch area will require 12 months maintenance prior to transfer by the developer. The changing accommodation will be constructed and available for transfer by the developer upon the formal pitches being first available for use.

The location of equipped children's play facilities has been considered in light of earlier problems relating to the need for adequate supervision against possible harmful impact upon residential amenity. The current proposals indicate locations within the main playing field and adjoining the community centre. These positions avoid positions surrounded by residential units whilst locating the play areas at points of more general activity allowing for indirect surveillance of the play spaces by users of the other facilities in the area.

Against the SDC play / open space requirements, a 550 dwelling proposal requires 3.44 hectares of space. This application proposes 4.6 hectares of space.

The future of the open space which lies outside the application site also needs to be secured via the legal agreement.

### **Provision of Cemetery, location & noise issues.**

The application proposes a 1-hectare cemetery to the south of the development, closely related to a link road junction. A specification for the cemetery in terms of handed over condition, fencing, planting, parking and internal routes have been agreed with the developer. The proposal will deliver the facility within 36 months of commencement of development or the 240<sup>th</sup> dwelling, whichever is sooner.

Quinetiq has objected to the position of the cemetery given its location under flight paths. This matter has been discussed with the town council.

The opportunity to re-locate the cemetery within the site is limited by the desire to have a direct access either to the A.345 or the link road and the position of water storage / drainage routes. Given the level of use and inability to deliver an off site solution SDC consider that the provision of a 1 hectare facility albeit within a noisier location is preferable to no on site provision.

### **Review of Section 106 Agreement by Fordham Research.**

SDC commissioned Fordham Research (who have previously acted for the Council at Bishopdown Farm and over affordable housing research.) to review the proposed package of issues to be addressed through the Section 106 Legal Agreement.

The report generally concluded that the range of issues covered was reasonable and noted that some elements of the scheme were in effect retro-fitting social infrastructure that was required to serve a wider area of East Amesbury than the application site.

The report advised upon the need for the practical delivery of enhanced social infrastructure required by a possible phase 3 to be considered at the design stage. In essence, could buildings / play areas required by the current application be easily expanded to serve any future phase, or would a series of smaller, fragmented areas result.

Since receiving the Fordham Report, the Legal Agreement has evolved with the Community Building increasing to 450 sq m and payment of commuted maintenance sums in respect of play areas (based upon the recently adopted 20 year multiplier)

#### **Health services.**

The Development Brief and E.S. identified a possible use within the Neighbourhood Centre for health services. The Barcroft Practice has written to SDC to advise that it would not wish to locate an out office within the development but would expect to expand on site. The Practice has requested that the development contributes towards that expansion.

Concurrent with the consideration of this application however, SDC has been involved with the Primary Care Trust over the re-development of that site to facilitate a One Stop Shop. Arising from that proposal it has become clear that there is available space within the PCT building should a practice wish to expand within the town centre or set up a new practice within the centre. Until the available PCT space is used SDC could not bid for funds for to support an individual medical practice.

There is scope for on site provision of a surgery facility within the neighbourhood centre or, by agreement within the community building.

#### **Construction practice.**

Concerns have been raised regarding the hours of construction, noise and dust, vehicle routing and impact upon the quality of local roads. Additionally, as a part of the application's assessment under the Habitat Regulations, the potential for construction practices, leaching across stored materials or spillage could represent a detrimental impact upon the habitats within the River Avon.

The applicant's have submitted a code of construction working practice that addresses the potential impacts upon the River Avon. This code has been considered by SDC's Environmental Health Department, Environment Agency and English Nature and is considered to meet their concerns.

The acceptance of a major construction project brings with it inevitable, noise, dust and vehicle trip impacts upon the neighbouring population, however it is normal for projects of this scale to carry with them conditions relating to noise & dust management, wheel washing facilities, location of construction workers car parks etc. Whilst routing conditions relating to construction vehicles have proved difficult to justify on appeal or enforce when not appealed, informatives can be added to any consent relating to points of access into the construction site and can relate to the detailed assessment of construction storage, compounds and parking addressed as a part of each reserved matters application.

Hours of operation can also be controlled by condition.

#### **Construction methods in relation to the HSE safeguarding zones.**

SDC has undertaken consultations with HSE and Quinetiq over the impact of explosives safeguarding zones upon areas and methods of construction. No objection has been raised by HSE, as licensing authority for the privatised Quinetiq subject to construction being of no more than three storey height and not being of vulnerable construction. The developers have confirmed that the construction standards advised by Quinetiq through the consultation process reflect their normal build practice. The only element on the building heights masterplan proposed to be above three storey in height actually represents a possible tower feature within the neighbourhood centre. No other development is proposed above three-storey height.

As a part of the reserved matters process, applications within the HSE safeguarding zone will be referred to the HSE for comment. This will allow them to make detailed observations upon the design, orientation and method of construction.

Within the Local Authority regulatory regime, method of construction is normally controlled through the Building Regulations, however Building Regulations do not allow for control over construction to be influenced by the presence of explosives storage within Boscombe Down airfield. (In essence, for Building Regulations purposes the likely impact of explosives storage upon a housing development would be controlled via the HSE licensing and construction of the explosives storage facility.)

Planning controls do not normally cover areas that are more directly controlled via other regulatory regimes, however in this instance the relationship between the Building Control Regime and the HSE licensing regime is either neutral or reactive only. As such it would be appropriate for the planning application to require details of construction methodology to be submitted as a part of each reserved matters application requiring its agreement as a part of that application's determination. This will provide the HSE with a clearer picture of the subsequent proposals and will identify any issues that could subsequently prejudice construction or the integrity of the Boscombe Down explosives license.

### **Design Code.**

The current application, accompanied by an Environmental Statement makes limited commitments to design form and quality. This approach reflects the application's outline status.

However, before considering any reserved matters design details, the Local Planning Authority requires a design framework to be approved. This will establish an overall design concept and context within which to determine individual reserved matters applications. It also offers the scope to require best practice to be followed in terms of scale and form of design, treatments for traffic calming, the creation of particular character areas, the use of design forms that reflect the market town scale of Amesbury and a coherent approach to hard and soft landscaping.

Concurrent with the outline application, the developers have been consulting with the Local Planning authority over the preparation of a comprehensive Design Code. Within this process, the Authority has consulted its Architect's Panel, the Police Architectural Liaison Officer, WCC Highways and the Town Council over the nature and extent of the Design Code. This consultation has included presentations by officer of the Design Code to the Town Council, both as a stand-alone design control tool and as a part of a wider, Town Design Statement concept.

The evolving Design Code offers encouragement that this scheme will create a distinct character and interesting built form and provides an opportunity to counter the impacts that some earlier, more amorphous housing schemes have had upon the overall character of Amesbury.

Whilst it is not essential that the Design Code is completed before the determination of the current application, it is essential that conditions are applied to the scheme that prevent the submission of any reserved matters applications until the Design Code has reached an acceptable form. Furthermore, each subsequent reserved matter application must be accompanied by a Design Statement setting out how the Approved Design Principles have informed the particular submission.

### **Location of proposed play facilities.**

Concerns have been raised regarding the position of proposed play facilities in relation to their level of overlooking / lighting and scope for vandalism or potential safety in relation to traffic.

Whilst this is an outline application, and therefore the detailed design of and context for play areas has not been determined, however working against the illustrative masterplan, officers from the SDC Parks Department have been able to discuss preferred numbers and locations for equipped play areas, in light of the experiences of the Town Council over the past decade.

Rather than identify a series of small play facilities in locations which either lack adequate surveillance, or are too close to dwellings to be successfully used, the current scheme provides two large, equipped play areas, linked to other community facilities to provide natural surveillance and additional reasons to use the area. One equipped area would be linked to the overall playing fields area. The other would be located adjoining the community centre close to the central neighbourhood centre. Both play facilities are capable of being transferred to SDC for equipping & fencing at an early stage within the overall development.

### **Extent & location of traffic calming.**

The development of this site will be subject to traffic calming measures as required by DB 32. The design of these traffic calming measures will adopt the “designed in” approach illustrated by the DETR / DoT Guide, “Places, Streets & Movement, A Companion Guide to DB32.” As such traffic speed control will be designed as an integral part of the developments road layout, rather than appearing as a series of later, “bolt on” additions. Traffic calming measures will occur throughout the development itself, including housing, play areas, neighbourhood centre and school setting.

The Southern Section of the Link Road will not however be provided with similar physical speed control measures, other than the presence of a series of roundabouts. The function of this road is to distribute traffic either past or away from / towards the development itself. As such the opportunities for vehicle access onto the Southern Section of the Link Road or for pedestrians to cross the Southern Section of the Link road are, by design limited and offer good visibility. Where the Link Road approaches a greater frequency of pedestrian / vehicle junctions the speed limits will reduce. Additionally, the number of junctions / roundabouts tends to increase between Underwood Drove and Folly Bottom to combine physical and signed speed control.

### **Lighting.**

The issue of lighting for the site has been raised by the Amesbury Society and Quinetiq. Good design practice should seek to minimise the impact of street lighting upon the night sky. In this case the issue is also relevant to the integrity of night flying uses at Boscombe Down.

During the negotiation process the issue of lighting, including the use of the MoD’s own best practice criteria has been identified and considered by both the applicant and Planning Authority. There is acceptance on the part of the developer that proposals to limit the limit of uplight and the restriction of lit areas needs to be addressed.

In addition to limiting the lighting for the link road to that necessary for safe movement the limit of lighting along byway 20 to those areas contained within the development is agreed. The emerging Design Code will also address the types of street and wall mounted light in order to limit uplight and “orange glow”.

### **Landscaping to the Southern boundary of the development site.**

The Local Plan Inspector identified the need to identify the southern boundary of the development site through structural planting within the current phase as a key issue.

The outline application identifies the extent of housing development and alignment of the link road. This red line can accommodate elements of the required structural landscaping but will not address the need for a comprehensive landscape treatment.

A clause within the S.106 is therefore required to provide for structural landscaping outside the redline area in order to deliver adequate delineation of the site and to achieve the Inspector’s landscape setting requirements.

### **Public Art.**

The draft Design Code sets out proposals for the provision of a high quality hard and soft landscape treatment. In addition to planting treatments that will alter to reflect the differing urban, suburban or rural contexts, Equally, the hard landscaping and street furniture is designed to address the particular space into which it is located, rather than simply adopt a common form across the site. Furthermore, the draft Design Code proposes the provision of feature elements within important public spaces. This could represent the delivery of public art / sculptures or enhanced seating, gazebos or other feature structures appropriate to formal park of public space locations.

The formal submission of the Design Code (including public art strategy) is a conditional requirement to be discharged prior to the submission of any reserved matters applications. It will also be necessary for a specific condition to address the delivery of public art, its distribution between each phase and timing for provision.

## **Recycling Facilities.**

The Development Brief proposes the provision of recycling facilities within the neighbourhood centre. Since the Development Brief was published, WCC has proposed the delivery of new recycling facilities within London Road, however the scope to retain a site for a more limited recycling facility should be retained. Given that the proposed recycling site will fall within the applicant's land ownership, the provision of an identified site, access, and in a suitable condition to serve as a recycling facility can be resolved via a condition.

## **Provision of Closed Circuit Television Systems.**

The Development Brief requires the scheme to include provision for the extension of the Amesbury CCTV scheme into the site to serve the main community facilities. Because this will, in part, require off site works it should be addressed within the Section 106 Agreements.

## **Habitat protection & enhancement.**

Concerns have been raised regarding the loss of habitat for named species. Additionally, the opportunity to create alternative habitat enhancement has been suggested.

The applicant's have undertaken surveys to identify the presence of protected species. These surveys have been considered by English Nature and no signs of species requiring protection via condition have been identified.

Whilst SDC and the applicant's initial landscape management strategies considered habitat enhancement, the consultation process with Quinetiq identified a need to create a landscape management approach that did not encourage bird activity given potential bird strike. The approach has therefore evolved to create informal areas of grassland that are not designed to encourage bird use.

English Nature has identified the protection afforded to nesting birds, preventing their disturbance. This issue is controlled by the Wildlife and Countryside Act. Should nesting birds be discovered in the site, the responsibility lies with the developer to protect their environment.

## **Publicity for application.**

The application was publicised by a three stage approach comprising a notice in the Amesbury Journal, a series of site notices at publicly accessed points both close to the site boundary as well as in public locations across Amesbury and a neighbour notification letter sent to properties more closely related to the proposed development site. Subsequent representations from properties along Porton Road and Pendragon Way indicated that these residents considered themselves materially affected by the development. This point is accepted. It is normal for people living beyond the neighbour notification area to wish to comment upon a proposal and its impact upon them. This does not however discount the extent of notification already undertaken. Comments made by residents from these areas have been considered within the planning process and are set out in this report above.

In addition, an all day public exhibition with representatives from SDC and WCC present was undertaken, with public notices again being posted through East Amesbury and letters being sent to objectors advertising this event. Again, public views made at or after that exhibition are set out in this report above.

Outside the administration of the planning application, publicity for and discussion of the outline application and Link Road proposals has been generated by public actions, respectively arranging a public meeting and calling for a Town Meeting to allow debate over the planning issues and the manner in which the application was being considered.

Whilst the neighbour letter and site notice set out a standard, 21 day publicity period, SDC will consider all representations made upon this application that are received prior to the Committee Day. Whilst the planning authority does not normally enter into discussions with neighbours and 3<sup>rd</sup> parties prior to the application being determined, given the magnitude of this application both SDC and WCC have corresponded with residents over a range of issues.

The publicity and level of opportunity available for the public to consider the application and make representations has therefore exceeded statutory requirements and reflects the scale of this application and its overall impact upon the whole of Amesbury.

### **Knowledge of the link road proposals within earlier planning approvals.**

A common objection / complaint relating to the proposed completion of the Link Road is that people purchasing properties within Butterfield Down and the Phase 1 development off Underwood Drive were not made aware by the developers that Pendragon Way / Underwood Drive formed parts of an Amesbury Link road.

Appendices 1 & 2 together with the planning history section above confirms that the developers as organisations were party to the delivery of the link road and aware of its planned method of delivery. Whether this level of information was available at a local level is not a factor that can influence the determination of the current outline application.

### **Searches.**

Linked to the previous issue, a common complaint is that the role of Pendragon Way & Underwood Drive was not revealed upon the search.

As the planning history section above notes, the Salisbury District Local Plan, from its draft stage prior to 1994, and the Replacement Local Plan, now adopted have contained references to the road as either a by pass or Link Road, both within the housing chapter relating to the allocation of the Bloor / Persimmon phase 1 and within the Transportation Chapter, policies TR3 (SDSLP), TR22 (draft RSDLP) and TR19 (Adopted RSDLP) The opportunity for the Search to clarify the presence of a by pass / Link Road proposal to the South East of Amesbury was therefore available if the Search considered this level of detail.

Whether or not the search revealed the presence of the by pass or Link Road is a civil matter and not an issue that could be taken as a factor in the determination of the current outline application.

### **CONCLUSION**

Many elements of the proposed scheme have raised no local concerns, indeed the provision of significant social infrastructure as a part of the overall development is generally welcomed a providing much needed facilities for East Amesbury.

The strong local objections relate to the status of the Link Road, a general lack of knowledge of its promotion and delivery by people who bought new dwellings in East Amesbury and the implications of the route upon safety and amenity, notwithstanding the scope to retro-fit some traffic control and pedestrian safety measures into the scheme.

These widely held concerns have been the subject of considerable discussion between District and County and have where considered justified, resulted in a requirement for new works to be undertaken along the Link Road route.

The delivery of an eastern route for Amesbury, notwithstanding the evolution of its status, has been a longstanding objective of the County, District and Town Council's. This application represents the culmination of this long term strategy. The route is considered necessary and its design, as well as the delivery of off site highway improvements are supported by the Highways Authority.

Aside from the road issues, this scheme delivers a significant affordable housing provision, addressing in part the District Council's priority to deliver affordable / social housing within the district. The provision of a primary school will address existing problems of education provision within the town. The size of the proposed community facility is in excess of that justified by the current application and therefore represents planning gain.



The emerging Design Code gives an indication that the resultant scheme delivers a high quality and locally relevant development with scope to integrate into the adjoining residential areas and provide social infrastructure benefits beyond the site itself.

The scheme delivers a two phased level of access to public transport with a service subsidised by this scheme being reliant upon further public transport subsidy from other developments within Amesbury.

To conclude, this application represents a well-designed solution to the provision of a major housing development for Amesbury. The lack of brown field sites within the District generally makes green field site development the main solution to housing provision in this area, however the provision of a housing site of this scale will run parallel to the major employment site located to the East of Amesbury. This application addresses the requirements set out in the Adopted Development Brief and accords with Policy H9 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION: Subject to the applicant and other relevant parties entering into Section 106 Legal Agreements relating to:**

- The phased provision of 25% affordable Housing and cascade mechanism;
- The provision of formal play facilities capable of accommodating 2 football pitches and a cricket square;
- The provision of a changing facility / pavilion of not more than 200 square metres to accommodate 4 changing rooms, showers, stores, kitchenette and associated parking, and maintenance sum;
- Informal public open space;
- 2 equipped children's play areas;
- Commuted maintenance sum for formal, informal and playing field open space;
- A 1 hectare cemetery facility, fenced, accessed and with parking spaces in a condition capable of being brought into use.
- A community centre building of 450 metres square to include 200 metres square hall, toilets, storage and youth service provision including management agreement;
- The provision of a serviced space generally located at the neighbourhood centre on the masterplan to accommodate a maximum 2,100 square metres of retail, office and leisure uses, subject to controls over floorspace available within the current development, maximum shopsizes and uses by floor level
- The delivery of an acceptable marketing strategy for the neighbourhood centre
- Landscaping to the southern site boundary outside the application boundary;
- Payment of a contribution to the delivery of public transport services within Amesbury
- Provision of a scheme to deliver up to 2 metre acoustic fencing to the east boundary of Pendragon Way
- Provision of a scheme to deliver an amenity barrier of up to 2 metres serving Beyer Road properties adjoining Link Road junction;
- Provision of a scheme to deliver a 1.2 metre fence and barriers along the Underwood Drive and playing field prior to commencement of development;
- Provision for CCTV connection into the development;
- Payment of capital sum relating to secondary school provision
- Provision of up to 14 class primary school and associated playing field, hard play space and parking area;
- Completion of the Southern Section of the Link Road
- Provision of a footway to east side of Pendragon Way
- Improvements to Byway 20
- Pedestrian crossing to northern end of Underwood Drive;
- Payment of capital contribution towards off site highway works
- Provision of footpath / cycleway link to Beaulieu Road
- Provision of associated pedestrian links into adjoining residential areas as shown on the masterplan
- Contribution towards the maintenance of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems,

Then **APPROVE** subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of the buildings, the means of access thereto and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called 'the reserved matters') shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.(A01A)

Reason This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.(0001)

2. Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition above, relating to the siting, design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected, the means of access to the site and the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority and shall be carried out as approved. (A02A)

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.(0001)

3. Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. (A03A)

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.(0001)

4. The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later. (A04A)

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.(0001)

5. Prior to the submission of the first of the reserved matters applications, the applicant shall submit to, and have approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority a Design Code setting out block layouts, highway treatments hierarchy of public spaces, design forms, landscape strategy, provision of street furniture, lighting and public art, and the developments shall subsequently accord with the approved principles, details and designs set out within the Design Code.

Reason. To ensure that a development of this scale appropriately reflects the traditional scale, design and appearance of its landscape context in the interests of landscape and visual amenity.

6. Prior to the submission of the first reserved matter application you shall submit to and have approved in writing by the Local Planning authority a phasing plan for the overall development approved in principle by this planning permission, and the phasing shall subsequently accord with the approved scheme unless subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: to ensure that a comprehensive approach is taken to the co-ordination of the overall development.

7. Each subsequent reserved matter application shall be accompanied by statements that address:

- I. How the reserved matter application reflects the design qualities established by the Design Code, or if at variance with the Design Code principles, how the application improves upon the Design Code solution;
- II. The methods to be used to deliver the public art concepts as set out within the Design Code strategies for landscaping and public spaces;
- III. The use of water efficient internal, external and garden based design measures including household fittings and external water butts; and
- IV. The construction methodology required to implement the submitted structures.

And the development shall strictly accord with the approved details.

Reason. To ensure that the development is capable of meeting the design, water efficiency and construction standards established as being necessary to protect the built and water environments as well as the integrity of the adjoining Boscombe Down airfield.

8. The details of all lighting proposals, including street lighting, lighting for footpaths, communal parking areas and byway 20, including the intensity of the lighting and design for light column shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development of each phase of development, and the works shall subsequently accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the lighting scheme respects the overall design qualities required from the development and to minimise impact of the lighting scheme upon both the Boscombe Down airfield in the interests of air safety and upon the landscape in the interests of visual amenity.

9. Before development is commenced, a schedule of external facing materials shall be submitted, and, where so required by the Local Planning Authority, sample panels of the external finishes shall be constructed on the site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D05A)

Reason: 0014 To secure a harmonious form of development.

10. No development shall take place until fencing has been erected in a manner to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, around the site of the proposed school playing fields; and no works shall take place within the area inside that fencing without the consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the Romano-British cemeteries identified beneath the site of the proposed playing fields during construction of the school and related buildings and services.

11. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A of Schedule 2 (Part 12) to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), there shall be no construction of any small buildings, works or equipment upon the area of the masterplan contained within the Environmental Statement identified as the school playing field, unless approved upon the submission of a planning application in that behalf.

Reason: To protect the Romano-British cemeteries identified beneath the site of the proposed playing fields during construction of the school and related buildings and services.

12. Before the commencement of development a full report on the archaeological excavation of the proposed school site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason; To ensure that the results of the archaeological excavations are retained as a public record.

13. No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works, to include the phasing of implementation, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted. These details shall include [proposed finished levels or contours; means of enclosure; car parking layouts; other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas; hard surfacing materials; minor artefacts and structures (eg. furniture, play equipment, refuse or other storage units, signs, lighting etc); proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (eg. Drainage, power, communications cables, pipelines etc. indicating lines, manholes, supports etc); retained historic landscape features and proposals for restoration, where relevant).

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to secure a satisfactory standard of design and implementation for the landscaping of the proposed development, in the interests of visual amenity.

14. No development shall take place until details of earthworks have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include the proposed grading and mounding of land areas including the levels and contours to be formed, showing the relationship of proposed mounding to existing vegetation and surrounding landform. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (G04A)

Reason: 0033 To enable the Local Planning Authority to ensure that the proposed earthworks will relate satisfactorily to existing features within the site and its surroundings, in the interests of visual amenity.

15. No works or development shall take place until full details of all proposed tree planting, and the proposed times of planting, have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and all tree planting shall be carried out in accordance with those details and at those times. (G11A)

Reason: 0040 To ensure the satisfactory establishment of the approved scheme for the landscaping of the site.

16. Before any development is commenced on the site, including site works of any description, all the existing trees to be retained shall be protected by a fence, of a type and in a position to be approved by the Local Planning Authority, erected around each tree or group of trees. Within the areas so fenced, the existing ground level shall be neither raised nor lowered and no materials, temporary buildings, plant, machinery or surplus soil shall be placed or stored thereon. If any trenches for services are required within the fenced areas, they shall be excavated and backfilled by hand and any tree roots encountered with a diameter of 2 inches (50mm) or more shall be left unsevered (See British Standard BS 5837:1991, entitled 'Trees in relation to Construction'. (G15A)

Reason: 0042 In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

17. The development shall strictly accord with the approved Code of Construction Management. Additional details will be submitted to, and approved in writing prior to the commencement of each reserved matter application setting out the provision for staff car parking away from adopted roads, together with precise location of stored materials, the provision of noise attenuation measures, dust management and wheel washing facilities where necessary, and the construction process shall subsequently accord with the approved working practices.

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjoining residents.

18. No construction work (excluding the internal fitting out of dwellings), nor the movement of spoil from site shall take place outside the hours of 0700 – 2000, Monday to Thursday, 0700 – 1800 on Friday, 0800 – 1300 on Saturday and at no time on Sundays and Bank holidays.

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjoining residents.

19. Before development commences the applicant shall submit to and have approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme to provide sound insulation measures within each habitable building within the development, and the development shall subsequently accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of occupiers.

20. None of the dwellings shall be commenced until works for the disposal of sewage have been provided on the site to serve the development hereby permitted, in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (L02A)

Reason: 0062 To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage.

21. Before development commences, a scheme for the discharge and attenuation of surface water from the buildings, roads and other hard surfaced areas hereby permitted to include pollution mitigation measures, to accord with Sustainable Urban Drainage system principles shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: 0064 To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of surface water disposal.

22. No development shall commence until a Water Interest Survey has been undertaken in accordance with a brief to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the results have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Any mitigation measures identified within the survey shall be included in the design proposals for subsequent reserved matters applications.

Reason: To protect the water environment of the River Avon.

23.No development shall commence until a scheme for the provision of recycling facilities, including siting, surfacing, means of access and timing of provision has been submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and development shall subsequently accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the development delivers sustainable land use planning.

24.Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes a – C inclusive of Schedule 2 (Part 1) to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), there shall be no extensions to the dwellings nor the erection of any structures within the curtilage unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority upon submission of a planning application in that behalf. (V15A)

Reason: 0108 To enable the Local Planning Authority to ensure that sufficient space is retained around the dwellings in the interests of neighbourliness and amenity.

25.Notwithstanding the provisions within Class A3 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that Order, no A3 use approved as a reserved matter submission shall revert to A2 or A1 use without a planning application being submitted and approved in that behalf. (V02A)

Reason: The opportunity to develop an A3 use (Restaurant, pub, snack bar, café, wine bar or shop for sale of hot food) are considered to add to the local vitality and residential amenity, however their reversion to A1 retail use could detract from the vitality of the town centre, whilst additional A2 uses (over and above the level accepted within the relevant Section 106 Agreement) could detract from the overall vitality of the neighbourhood centre.

26. Prior to the commencement of development you shall submit to, and have approved in writing a scheme to provide temporary bus stops adjoining the Link Road at its boundary with the proposed Neighbourhood Centre as illustrated on the masterplan, such details to include phasing for provision and trigger for the subsequent removal of the temporary facility, and development shall subsequently accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure that the development is served with an accessible bus service

27. The proposed development shall not exceed 550 dwellings.

Reason: To ensure that the impacts of the development relate to the assessment undertaken by the Environmental Statement.

**INFORMATIVE:**

This permission has been taken in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan G1, G2, G3-6, D1, H9, H25, C18, S4, S8, S9, TR11-14, TR19,R1A,R2,R4,R8,R17,PS5,PS10.

**Acronyms.**

cSAC candidate Special Area of Conservation  
SSSI Site of special Scientific Interest

DoT Department of Transport  
HSE Health & Safety Executive  
MoD Ministry of Defence

ATC Amesbury Town Council  
SDC Salisbury District Council  
WCC Wiltshire County Council

SDLP Salisbury District Local Plan

SUDs Sustainable Urban Drainage systems  
E.S. Environmental Statement PPG Planning Policy Guidance

**- ENDS**

S/2002/1651	13/08/2002 10:50:19	08/10/2002 10:50:19	J S BLOOR (NEWBURY) LTD/PERSIMMON HOMES (SOUTH)LTD
AMES			TERENCE O ROURKE
Easting: 416353.764161587	Northing: 140436.089842796		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -PRIMARY SCHOOL AND TEMPORARY ACCESS ROAD
LOCATION:	LAND SOUTH OF BOSCOMBE ROAD AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7XG

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

The application relates to another application upon the same agenda

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Application site lies within an area of rising grassland to the south of Amesbury which is a part of a larger housing development proposal.

### THE PROPOSAL

To construct a 14 class primary school together with hard and soft play areas, car park and temporary access road serving the site.

### PLANNING HISTORY

S/2002/1075 Outline application for the construction of 550 dwellings, associated play areas, affordable housing, community building, neighbourhood centre, cemetery, drainage, school and link road, to be determined.

### CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - No objection subject to the applicant entering into a legal agreement with WCC in respect of the provision of the access road, submission of a school travel plan, storage for 50 bicycles and a 4.5m x 90m visibility splay to the north eastern corner of the site frontage.

WCC Library/ Museum - In the case of the proposed primary school an investigation of this site has already taken place. This recorded a Romano-British cemetery and two Bronze Age burials. However a further two cemeteries were identified which have not been excavated which should remain preserved in situ, as they lie beneath the proposed school playing field. The applicant's archaeological consultants confirm that a proposal for importing of material to create the playing fields was proposed but has not, as yet, been produced. Whilst WCC recommend that this proposal becomes part of a Section 106 obligation. As the site is wholly within the applicant's control a condition can be provided the necessary control to approve the proposals for preserving the Romano-British sites prior to the grant of planning permission. It is therefore recommended that the following conditions are also placed on the application:

No development shall take place until fencing has been erected in a manner to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, around the site of the proposed playing fields; and no works shall take place within the area inside that fencing without the consent of the Local Planning Authority.

This condition is to protect the Romano-British cemeteries identified beneath the site of the proposed playing fields during construction of the school and related buildings and services.

Before December 31<sup>st</sup> 2003 a full report on the archaeological excavation of the proposed school site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

This condition is to ensure that the archaeological excavation of the Romano-British cemetery and Bronze Age burials that took place in May 2002 are fully reported and therefore available to the public.

Wessex Water Authority - No objections as this issue is dealt with in the Wessex Water response to the S/02/1075 application

Environment Agency - Consider that this application should be judged in relation to the overall outline scheme in terms of water demand surface drainage and construction methodology.

Health & Safety Executive - The Explosives Inspectorate, having considered carefully the type and location of the proposed development, has no objection to it proceeding.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement Yes – Expired 19/09/02

Site Notice displayed Yes – Expired 19/09/02

Departure No

Neighbour notification Yes – Expired 06/09/02

Neighbour response Yes – No objections raised to the principle of the school, however objections have been submitted relating to the position of the school in relation to the Qinetiq explosives consultation zone and to the co-ordinates used to identify the location of the school.

Parish Council response Yes – No objections, welcome the plan.

## MAIN ISSUES

Status of proposal

Need

Relationship to Qinetiq

Archaeology

Design & use.

## POLICY CONTEXT

G2 (General Criteria for Development)

G3 – G6 (The Water Environment)

D2 (Infil Development, Design)

C18 (rivers and River Valleys)

R17 (Public rights of Way)

PS5 (New Education facilities)

## PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

### Status of proposal.

This scheme has been submitted as a full application to allow for early consideration of the design, layout and position of the proposed school within the context of the wider outline application, S/2002/1075. Without the approval of the wider, outline application however, this application would represent a proposal for a new school in an isolated position, poorly related to the existing community and to the wider landscape.

Whilst its submission has allowed SDC to consult upon the design, position and detail of this proposal, its final determination has to be linked to the determination of the S/02/1075 outline application.

### Need.

The determination of the 1996 application for phase 1 and the development brief consultation process prior to the current application identified a pressing need to improve education facilities at both primary and secondary level within Amesbury.

This need was clarified during the consultation process relating to the Adopted Development Brief

The masterplan identifies a site of about 1.6 hectares. The location proposed has evolved from discussions with WCC regarding the school's relationship to the neighbourhood centre and accessibility by the proposed bus service. The current application is for a slightly larger area than that identified within the outline application Environmental Statement. The increase in site size relates to the detailed design for the school and does not alter any of the capacity or impact assessments within the Environmental Statement. The additional space provided for a larger area of open space and a generous landscape treatment.

#### **Relationship to Qinetiq.**

The key local concern relating to the school proposal is the proximity of the school to the Boscombe Down explosives consultation zone. The Health & Safety Executive were provided with a full set of the application drawings and have considered the siting, orientation, position of the building within the school site and construction of the school. The HSE has confirmed that it has no objection to the proposed development proceeding. The proposed school will not therefore impact upon any consideration of the Qinetiq explosives licensing regime.

#### **Archaeology.**

The excavation of the school site has revealed finds of importance. The two excavated burial sites include the "Amesbury Archer" and represent a significant early Bronze Age Beaker burial dating from 2,400 – 2,200 BC. The bodies together with artefacts have been excavated, researched and recorded and a full report is required by the County Archaeologist to contribute to the public record.

The investigation identified two further cemeteries that were not excavated and are recommended to remain "in situ" with conditions controlling the manner in which the school playing field is brought into use and subsequently retained.

#### **Design & use.**

The building adopts a contemporary design form and includes a standing seam metal roof with elevations mixing brick, render and cedar panels. The design approach will contrast with the housing styles proposed for the wider development, however this should add good variety in built form and enhance the appearance of the setting.

The building is designed to be constructed in 2 phases with an initial 7 class school together with 160 sq m hall, kitchen and store, followed by a further 7 class block.

The scale of the hall is designed to meet school requirements only and has not been enhanced to meet community use aspirations, however the outline application provides for a separate community building which will meet this requirement.

The degree to which the school facilitates community use therefore will reflect the management ethos of the governing body rather than a planning requirement to meet a legitimate local need.

#### **CONCLUSION**

This is a well designed and landscaped proposal. The delivery of a new primary school for Amesbury will relieve the significant levels of overcrowding and use of temporary classroom units within Amesbury. The scheme is not prejudiced by the relationship to Qinetiq Boscombe Down and does not challenge the licensing controls within that site.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Delegate authority to the Head of Development Services to approve, subject to the completion of the Section 106 Agreements relating to S/2002/1075 and the issue of a Notice of Decision in that behalf, and to the following conditions:

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission. (A07A)



Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. (0004)

2. This development shall be in accordance with the amended drawings ref: 4636/PO1-6, 379 LO2A, 379 PP1a deposited with the Local Planning Authority on 23<sup>rd</sup> June 2003, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (B01A)

Reason: 0007 For the avoidance of doubt.

3. Before development is commenced, a schedule of external facing materials shall be submitted, and, where so required by the Local Planning Authority, sample panels of the external finishes shall be constructed on the site and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D05A)

Reason: 0014 To secure a harmonious form of development.

4. The development shall accord with the approved Code of Construction Management. Additional details will be submitted to, and approved in writing prior to the commencement development, setting out the provision for staff car parking away from adopted roads, together with precise location of stored materials, the provision of noise attenuation measures, dust management and wheel washing facilities where necessary, and the construction process shall subsequently accord with the approved working practices.

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjoining residents.

5. No construction work (excluding the internal fitting out of the school buildings), nor the movement of spoil from site shall take place outside the hours of 0700 – 2000, Monday to Thursday, 0700 – 1800 on Friday, 0800 – 1300 on Saturday and at no time on Sundays and Bank holidays.

Reason: In order to protect the residential amenity of adjoining residents.

6. Before development commences, a scheme for the discharge and attenuation of surface water from the buildings, roads and other hard surfaced areas hereby permitted to include pollution mitigation measures, to accord with Sustainable Urban Drainage system principles shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: 0064 To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of surface water disposal.

7. No development shall take place until fencing has been erected in a manner to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, about the site of the proposed school playing fields; and no works shall take place within the area inside that fencing without the consent of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To protect the Romano-British cemeteries identified beneath the site of the proposed playing fields during construction of the school and related buildings and services.

8. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A of Schedule 2 (Part 12) to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), there shall be no construction of any small buildings, works or equipment upon the area of the masterplan identified as the school playing field, unless approved upon the submission of a planning application in that behalf.

Reason: To protect the Romano-British cemeteries identified beneath the site of the proposed playing fields during construction of the school and related buildings and services.

9. Before the commencement of development a full report on the archaeological excavation of the proposed school site shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that the results of the archaeological excavations are retained as a public record.

10. Details of any floodlighting shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the buildings are occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (G05A)

Reason: 0034 To enable the Local Planning Authority to exercise control over the appearance of the lighting installation and/or the level of illumination in the interests of visual amenity and/or highway safety for the users of the adjoining Roads.

11. No development shall take place until details of the treatment of the boundaries of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such proposals to generally accord with the landscape masterplan 379 LO 2 A. Any tree screening, hedges, walls or fences thus approved shall be planted/erected prior to the occupation of the buildings. (G20A)

Reason: 0042 In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

12. No development shall take place until there has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority a detailed landscaping specifications, to generally accord with the landscape masterplan 379 LO 2 A which shall include indications of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land, and details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development. (G22A)

Reason: 0042 In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

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

Reason: 0042 In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

14. Before development commences, a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the buildings and hard surfaced areas hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority, and shall be carried out as approved. (L07A)

Reason: 0064 To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of surface water disposal.

15. Before development commences you shall submit to and have approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a school travel plan, and the subsequent travel management within the school shall accord with that plan.

Reason: In the interests of delivering sustainable travel patterns

16. Before development commences you shall submit to, and have approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a scheme for the provision of 50 covered cycle parking stands, to include details of the stands and position of the stands within the site, and development should thereafter accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of delivering sustainable travel patterns

17. The visibility splay to the north eastern corner of the site shall be provided with a visibility splay of 4.5 metres x 90 metres.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

18. Before development commences you shall enter into a Legal Agreement with Wiltshire County Council relating to the provision of an access road between Underwood Drive and the new school hereby approved.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

**INFORMATIVE:**

This permission has been taken in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan G2, G3 – G6, D2, C18, R17, PS5.

---

**NOTES:**

## **Part 3**

### **Applications recommended for the Observations of the Area Committee**

Item No.	Case Officer	Contact No.	
App.Number	Date Received	Expiry Date	Applicant's Name
Ward/Parish	Cons.Area	Listed	Agents Name
Proposal			
Location			

---

No Observations