

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE
NORTHERN AREA – 04/03/04

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

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

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO OFFICER	LOCATION	REC	PARISH / WARD	PAGE NOS	WARD & COUNCILLORS	NOTES
1	S / 2004 / 13 Mr J Hammond	J M & F E CASTLE MANOR FARM CHOLDERTON	REF	CHOL	2-6	UPPER BOURNE, IDMISTON & WINTERBOURNE Councillor Mr Hewitt Councillor Mr Wren	
2	S / 2004 / 14 Mr J Hammond	MR J M CASTLE & MRS F E CASTLE BARN, MANOR FARM CHOLDERTON	REF	CHOL	7-11	UPPER BOURNE, IDMISTON & WINTERBOURNE Councillor Mr Hewitt Councillor Mr Wren	
3	S / 2003 / 2334 Mr S Llewelyn	CASTLEWAY DEVELOPMENTS LTD. GRATEN COTTAGE HOMANTON SHREWTON	REF	SHRE	12-16	TILL VALLEY & WYLYE Councillor Mr Mills Councillor Mr West	
4	SV S / 2003 / 2668 Mr O Marigold	R A DIAPER & F COOK 2 HOREFIELD COTTAGES HURDCOTT LANE WINTERBOURNE EARLS	REF	WINB	17-18	UPPER BOURNE, IDMISTON & WINTERBOURNE Councillor Mr Hewitt Councillor Mr Wren	

END OF LIST

Schedule Of Planning Applications For Consideration

In The following Order:

Part 1) Applications Recommended For Refusal

Part 2) Applications Recommended for Approval

Part 3) Applications For The Observations of the Area Committee

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

ABBREVIATIONS USED THROUGHOUT THE TEXT

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

Part 1

Applications recommended for Refusal

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

Proposal
Location

1	Case Officer Mr J Hammond	Contact No 01722 434380	1
----------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------

S/2004/13	09/01/2004 15:28:39	05/03/2004 15:28:39	J M & F E CASTLE
CHOL	CHO	II	MICHAEL FOWLER ARCHITECTS
Easting: 422514.684821367	Northings: 142387.870808959		

PROPOSAL:	CHANGE OF USE -PROPOSED CONVERSION OF TWO EXISTING BARNs INTO A SINGLE DWELLING AND COVERED PARKING ALTERATION OF ACCESS
LOCATION:	MANOR FARM CHOLDERTON SALISBURY SP4 0DN

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises the setting of a substantial timber framed barn, currently under a corrugated clad roof structure. The building originally comprised 2 barns, running north – south and east – west. The site also includes a separate small timber clad outbuilding in addition to open grassed areas and the verges between the buildings and A.338.

THE PROPOSAL

To amend the approved scheme by the demolition of a further two bays (four in all) To relocate the glazed screen to the west elevation and alter the internal layout.

The application is accompanied by a short statement confirming that the removal of a further two bays will bring the project within the realms of viability for the applicant.

PLANNING HISTORY

81/439 – c.o.u. of barn to form 4 dwellings, approved
 87/1578 – demolish agricultural building and construction of 2 dwellings, refused
 90/529 – refurbish barn for workshop and convert field barn to dwelling, withdrawn
 95/988 – listed building proposal to replace galvanised roof with fibre cement sheets, approved
 00/700 – conversion of barn to single dwelling and covered parking, approved

00/701 – listed building application to convert barn to dwelling and covered parking, approved
02/1875 – conversion of existing barn into dwelling including removal of two bays, Northern Area Committee minded to approve subject to completion of S.106 agreement, as yet uncompleted.
02/1876 – listed building application for conversion and demolition of two bays.

CONSULTATIONS

This application seeks to vary the design and extent of a residential conversion within a site where the principle of conversion has already been accepted. To this end, issues such as access, parking, water supply, sewerage and possible flood risk have already been taken into account.

The determination of this application rests upon the acceptability of the revised design approach and its respect for the listed building. The key consultees therefore relate to this aspect.

English Heritage - As you know English Heritage objected to the previous scheme on the basis of a lack of justification. This application proposes even more demolition and although a justification has been provided it is very far from being convincing in terms of the criteria set out in PPG 15, by whose standards such applications should be judged.

The justification demonstrably fails to meet PPG 15 criteria on the following grounds:

- In stating that the barn is too large for conversion to a single dwelling the applicants are merely reinforcing the fact that the form of building is inherently unsuitable for residential use and this does not justify residential conversion.
- The valuation & costings submitted in bald terms show a scheme which is viable if the VAT element is omitted which should be the case both because listed building consent has been granted for conversion and as a result of the residential conversion of a non-residential building. The financial case therefore seems to rest upon the purchase price paid for the building than on its inherent unviability.
- Payment of an inflated price for a listed building does not constitute acceptable grounds for partial demolition.

We understand, although nowhere is it specifically set out in the justification that the need for major repairs, including underpinning has been identified and this has led to the high cost of conversion.

If it is the case that an independent professional advisor has produced a report to that effect then I would be happy to ask one of English Heritage's architects or structural engineers to assess the need for such works. Given the irreversible nature of the proposals we consider as unacceptable reliance on a brief builder's estimate alone to make the case for the unviability of the building. Such an assertion needs to be supported by an independent professional assessment of the extent and costs of the work required which English Heritage could then verify.

We would take issue with the point that the proposed scheme for substantial demolition of a listed building could be "more sympathetic to the aesthetics and structure of the existing building" than the previous scheme which retained more of the building and its spatial qualities through locating a swimming pool (and subsequently a full height family room over two bays) at that end.

English Heritage concludes that it objects on the basis that the case for demolition of any part of this listed building has not been made, that the tests set out in PPG 15 have in no way been made and that there are no grounds for approving this application. Approval of this application would raise serious questions as to whether the barn, in its truncated and converted state would retain sufficient of its architectural and historic qualities to remain a listed building.

SPAB - We appreciate that difficulty may have been experienced in finding a new use for this notable listed agricultural group, however from the material provided we remain to be convinced of the case for partial demolition.

When residential conversion was approved we imagine that this was seen as a reasonable compromise between ensuring future maintenance and adverse impact upon character. If a change to residential use would now not only involve alteration but also a significant degree of demolition we believe that this must lessen the justification for the proposed use to the point where it may not be acceptable in listed building terms.

The report offers figures for conversion costs but does not explain how these figures were achieved, nor how they may be affected if the unrequired bays received basic repair but were left unconverted, perhaps for storage use.

The report suggests that SDC considers there to be no other viable use other than residential conversion. This may be the case but we wonder whether consideration has been given to a mixed domestic and home office / workshop function which might give some use to the threatened bays.

The current proposal is aimed at achieving a more viable development. A compromise between re-use and conversion must have been reached when the original consent was granted. We consider it extremely regrettable if the building's historic interest and character suffered further by the demolition of a significant part. More explanation of the costings for re-use seems necessary, and other re-use options explored before demolition of the bays can be accepted.

Civic Society - We have no alternative but to object to this application for the demolition of two further bays, as being entirely at variance with the principles underlying the statutory protection afforded to listed buildings.

It is hard to believe that a conversion scheme cannot be found that retains the bays in question, for a purpose such as storage, which does not involve major expenditure on them. The building as proposed will contain only a very small proportion of full height space, thus effectively negating the character of the listed barns interior. The importance of such interiors is of course specifically referred to in the local plan's conversion policies. Retention of the two bays referred to in this application, in their full height form would somewhat mitigate the impact of the residential conversion and this should be looked at further before any encouragement is given to these unfortunate proposals.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes – expired 12/02/04
Site Notice displayed	Yes – expired 12/02/04
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes – expired 02/02/04
Neighbour response	No
Parish Council response	Yes – The overwhelming view of the parish is that development is better than deterioration. The building has already suffered considerable damage since the initial grant of consent for residential conversion. The subsequent proposals have further changed the barn like appearance. The parish view is that knocking it down and starting again would be acceptable subject to re-use of existing timbers. This may allow for more of the original barn size to be retained. The parish perceives the development as vital. The barn is continually vandalised and there are risks of injury. Development of the site gives an opportunity to develop more useful recreational facilities on the recreation ground. If approval is granted we recommend an historical survey recommended by PPG16 is carried out to secure details of the building for the future.

MAIN ISSUES

Impact of the loss of another two bays
Design & layout of the conversion
R2

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan CN1, CN3, CN4, CN6, CN7, C22

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Impact of the loss of a further two bays.

The footprint of the existing barn is some 383 sq. m. The Current application, taken with the approved scheme including the removal of two bays will result in the loss of approximately 160 sq. m of listed building.

This approach will significantly alter the character, scale and “feel” of the existing barn. The existing simple east / west element which underpins much of the buildings character will be reduced to a very much more domestic scale. To an extent the dominant elevations will be removed resulting in the narrower, north elevation becoming the dominant façade and mass within the overall structure.

Following the proposed demolition, the east and west elevations would resemble a form and mass of building more akin to a chalet dwelling than a substantial converted barn.

The submissions made to the LPA during the current consultation process indicate a constant objection to the impact that the proposed development will have upon the character and appearance of the building. Furthermore, the lack of detailed and independent assessment to support the proposal fails to meet the tests set out in PPG 15 before a case for demolition can be considered.

Design & layout of the conversion.

The previous scheme (S/02/1875) which proposed the demolition of two bays retained a two bay full height room. This design approach did therefore respect the original scale and internal arrangement within the conversion in order that the intrinsic original character could still be understood within the new dwelling. As such, the approach went some way towards meeting the requirements of policy CN6 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan which states that “*In particular the interior of statutorily listed barns should be kept as open as possible, as this is part of the special character of barns.*”

The current proposal retains a full height entrance hall, however all other areas are divided into two floors of accommodation. This removes any design merit that may have supported the previous proposal which included the demolition of two bays.

Additionally, the scheme introduces a new glazed door and screen into the west elevation. This replicates a glazed opening currently located further to the south along the west elevation. Whereas the previous scheme re-used an existing opening, the current proposal is to create a new opening and to adopt the design of the original opening now proposed to be demolished. Whilst the original design limited openings and balanced their positioning along a 33m elevation, the current proposal results in a clutter of openings, including the creation of a new and substantial feature opening in a manner that fails to respect the character or integrity of the original building.

R2

This application proposes an alternative residential conversion to that previously considered. As such the applicant would need to enter into a legal agreement with the Authority to ensure that payments previously made in respect of R2 can be transferred over to the current scheme were it to be approved.

CONCLUSION

The principle of a residential re-development has been accepted by the grant of previous consents. The issue of some demolition was considered during 2003 and was felt to retain the

overall scale and character, including retention of internal open spaces and as such justified limited demolition in order to preserve the building.

The current scheme is accompanied by a supporting statement, however the assessment of this justification has confirmed that it is lacking adequate financial and structural details or consideration of alternative options to be considered to be adequate justification for the degree of demolition proposed.

The current design does not respect the internal spatial character of the barn and removes its external character that is derived from the mass and general simplicity of the east and west elevations.

The comment by English Heritage that this proposal if approved could result in the listed status being removed is a clear indicator that the application fails to meet the policy requirements to respect the integrity, scale and character of the listed building as required by policies CN1, CN3, CN6 and CN7. Additionally, the scheme fails to respect the more general requirements of the rural buildings policy C22 (iii) in relation to works being carried out without detriment to the external appearance or harm to the setting.

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

(1) The proposed development by virtue of the demolition of a further two bays of the building together with the consequent loss of full height internal accommodation, re-location of the glazed opening on the west elevation and reduction in the generally uninterrupted east and west elevations will detract from the scale, setting and character of the building, contrary to the requirements Policy C22 (iii) of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

(2) In the absence of adequate financial or structural justification, together with a thorough appraisal of the alternative uses and methods of preservation instead of demolition, then the proposed development by virtue of the demolition of a further two bays of the building together with the consequent loss of full height internal accommodation, re-location of the glazed opening on the west elevation and reduction in the generally uninterrupted east and west elevations will detract from the scale, setting and character of the listed building contrary to the requirements of Policies CN1, CN3, CN6 and CN7 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and the requirements of Paragraph 3.19 of PPG15.

(3) The proposed development fails to make provision for the requirement for a commuted sum in respect of the provision of recreational public open space required under policy R2 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

NOTES:

S/2004/14	02/01/2004 15:28:51	27/02/2004 15:28:51	MR J M CASTLE & MRS F E CASTLE
CHOL	CHO	II	MICHAEL FOWLER ARCHITECTS
Easting: 422497.715511799	Northing: 142412.379907787		

PROPOSAL:	LISTED BLDG (WKS) -CONVERSION OF TWO BARNs INTO ONE SINGLE DWELLING AND COVERED PARKING
LOCATION:	BARN MANOR FARM CHOLDERTON SALISBURY SP4 0DN

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises the setting of a substantial timber framed barn, currently under a corrugated clad roof structure. The building originally comprised 2 barns, running north – south and east – west. The site also includes a separate small timber clad outbuilding in addition to open grassed areas and the verges between the buildings and A.338.

THE PROPOSAL

To amend the approved scheme by the demolition of a further two bays (four in all) To relocate the glazed screen to the west elevation and alter the internal layout.

The application is accompanied by a short statement confirming that the removal of a further two bays will bring the project within the realms of viability for the applicant.

PLANNING HISTORY

81/439 – c.o.u. of barn to form 4 dwellings, approved
 87/1578 – demolish agricultural building and construction of 2 dwellings, refused
 90/529 – refurbish barn for workshop and convert field barn to dwelling, withdrawn
 95/988 – listed building proposal to replace galvanised roof with fibre cement sheets, approved
 00/700 – conversion of barn to single dwelling and covered parking, approved
 00/701 – listed building application to convert barn to dwelling and covered parking, approved
 02/1875 – conversion of existing barn into dwelling including removal of two bays, Northern Area Committee minded to approve subject to completion of S.106 agreement, as yet uncompleted.
 02/1876 – listed building application for conversion and demolition of two bays.

CONSULTATIONS

This application seeks to vary the design and extent of a residential conversion within a site where the principle of conversion has already been accepted. To this end, issues such as access, parking,

The determination of this application rests upon the acceptability of the revised design approach and its respect for the listed building. The key consultees therefore relate to this aspect.

English Heritage - As you know English Heritage objected to the previous scheme on the basis of a lack of justification. This application proposes even more demolition

and although a justification has been provided it is very far from being convincing in terms of the criteria set out in PPG 15, by whose standards such applications should be judged.

The justification demonstrably fails to meet PPG 15 criteria on the following grounds:

- In stating that the barn is too large for conversion to a single dwelling the applicants are merely reinforcing the fact that the form of building is inherently unsuitable for residential use and this does not justify residential conversion.
- The valuation & costings submitted in bald terms show a scheme which is viable if the VAT element is omitted which should be the case both because listed building consent has been granted for conversion and as a result of the residential conversion of a non-residential building. The financial case therefore seems to rest upon the purchase price paid for the building than on its inherent unviability.
- Payment of an inflated price for a listed building does not constitute acceptable grounds for partial demolition.

We understand, although nowhere is it specifically set out in the justification that the need for major repairs, including underpinning has been identified and this has led to the high cost of conversion.

If it is the case that an independent professional advisor has produced a report to that effect then I would be happy to ask one of English Heritage's architects or structural engineers to assess the need for such works. Given the irreversible nature of the proposals we consider as unacceptable reliance on a brief builder's estimate alone to make the case for the unviability of the building. Such an assertion needs to be supported by an independent professional assessment of the extent and costs of the work required which English Heritage could then verify.

We would take issue with the point that the proposed scheme for substantial demolition of a listed building could be "more sympathetic to the aesthetics and structure of the existing building" than the previous scheme which retained more of the building and its spatial qualities through locating a swimming pool (and subsequently a full height family room over two bays) at that end.

English Heritage concludes that it objects on the basis that the case for demolition of any part of this listed building has not been made, that the tests set out in PPG 15 have in no way been made and that there are no grounds for approving this application. Approval of this application would raise serious questions as to whether the barn, in its truncated and converted state would retain sufficient of its architectural and historic qualities to remain a listed building.

SPAB - We appreciate that difficulty may have been experienced in finding a new use for this notable listed agricultural group, however from the material provided we remain to be convinced of the case for partial demolition.

When residential conversion was approved we imagine that this was seen as a reasonable compromise between ensuring future maintenance and adverse impact upon character. If a change to residential use would now not only involve alteration but also a significant degree of demolition we believe that this must lessen the justification for the proposed use to the point where it may not be acceptable in listed building terms.

The report offers figures for conversion costs but does not explain how these figures were achieved, nor how they may be affected if the unrequired bays received basic repair but were left unconverted, perhaps for storage use.

The report suggests that SDC considers there to be no other viable use other than residential conversion. This may be the case but we wonder whether consideration has been given to a mixed domestic and home office / workshop function which might give some use to the threatened bays.

The current proposal is aimed at achieving a more viable development. A compromise between re-use and conversion must have been reached when the original consent was granted. We consider it extremely regrettable if the building's historic interest and character suffered further by the demolition of a significant part. More explanation of the costings for re-use seems necessary, and other re-use options explored before demolition of the bays can be accepted.

Civic Society - We have no alternative but to object to this application for the demolition of two further bays, as being entirely at variance with the principles underlying the statutory protection afforded to listed buildings.

It is hard to believe that a conversion scheme cannot be found that retains the bays in question, for a purpose such as storage, which does not involve major expenditure on them. The building as proposed will contain only a very small proportion of full height space, thus effectively negating the character of the listed barns interior. The importance of such interiors is of course specifically referred to in the local plan's conversion policies. Retention of the two bays referred to in this application, in their full height form would somewhat mitigate the impact of the residential conversion and this should be looked at further before any encouragement is given to these unfortunate proposals.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes – expired 12/02/04
Site Notice displayed	Yes – expired 12/02/04
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes – expired 02/02/04
Neighbour response	No
Parish Council response	Yes – The overwhelming view of the parish is that development is better than deterioration. The building has already suffered considerable damage since the initial grant of consent for residential conversion. The subsequent proposals have further changed the barn like appearance. The parish view is that knocking it down and starting again would be acceptable subject to re-use of existing timbers. This may allow for more of the original barn size to be retained. The parish perceives the development as vital. The barn is continually vandalised and there are risks of injury. Development of the site gives an opportunity to develop more useful recreational facilities on the recreation ground. If approval is granted we recommend an historical survey recommended by PPG16 is carried out to secure details of the building for the future.

MAIN ISSUES

Impact of the loss of another two bays
Design & layout of the conversion

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan CN1, CN3, CN4, CN6, CN7.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Impact of the loss of a further two bays.

The footprint of the existing barn is some 383 sq. m. The Current application, taken with the approved scheme including the removal of two bays will result in the loss of approximately 160 sq. m of listed building.

This approach will significantly alter the character, scale and “feel” of the existing barn. The existing simple east / west element which underpins much of the buildings character will be reduced to a very much more domestic scale. To an extent the dominant elevations will be removed resulting in the narrower, north elevation becoming the dominant façade and mass within the overall structure.

Following the proposed demolition, the east and west elevations would resemble a form and mass of building more akin to a chalet dwelling than a substantial converted barn.

The submissions made to the LPA during the current consultation process indicate a constant objection to the impact that the proposed development will have upon the character and appearance of the building. Furthermore, the lack of detailed and independent assessment to support the proposal fails to meet the tests set out in PPG 15 before a case for demolition can be considered.

Design & layout of the conversion.

The previous scheme (S/02/1875) which proposed the demolition of two bays retained a two bay full height room. This design approach did therefore respect the original scale and internal arrangement within the conversion in order that the intrinsic original character could still be understood within the new dwelling. As such, the approach went some way towards meeting the requirements of policy CN6 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan which states that *"In particular the interior of statutorily listed barns should be kept as open as possible, as this is part of the special character of barns."*

The current proposal retains a full height entrance hall, however all other areas are divided into two floors of accommodation. This removes any design merit that may have supported the previous proposal which included the demolition of two bays.

Additionally, the scheme introduces a new glazed door and screen into the west elevation. This replicates a glazed opening currently located further to the south along the west elevation. Whereas the previous scheme re-used an existing opening, the current proposal is to create a new opening and to adopt the design of the original opening now proposed to be demolished. Whilst the original design limited openings and balanced their positioning along a 33m elevation, the current proposal results in a clutter of openings, including the creation of a new and substantial feature opening in a manner that fails to respect the character or integrity of the original building.

CONCLUSION

The principle of a residential re-development has been accepted by the grant of previous consents. The issue of some demolition was considered during 2003 and was felt to retain the overall scale and character, including retention of internal open spaces and as such justified limited demolition in order to preserve the building.

The current scheme is accompanied by a supporting statement, however the assessment of this justification has confirmed that it is lacking adequate financial and structural details or consideration of alternative options to be considered to be adequate justification for the degree of demolition proposed.

The current design does not respect the internal spatial character of the barn and removes its external character that is derived from the mass and general simplicity of the east and west elevations.

The comment by English Heritage that this proposal if approved could result in the listed status being removed is a clear indicator that the application fails to meet the policy requirements to respect the integrity, scale and character of the listed building as required by policies CN1, CN3, CN6 and CN7. Additionally, the scheme fails to respect the more general requirements of the rural buildings policy C22 (iii) in relation to works being carried out without detriment to the external appearance or harm to the setting.

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

(1) In the absence of adequate financial or structural justification, together with a thorough appraisal of the alternatives uses and methods of preservation instead of demolition, then the proposed development by virtue of the demolition of a further two bays of the building together with the consequent loss of full height internal accommodation, re-location of the glazed opening on the west elevation and reduction in the generally uninterrupted east and west elevations will

detract from the scale, setting and character of the listed building contrary to the requirements of Policies CN1, CN3, CN6 and CN7 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and the requirements of Paragraph 3.19 of PPG15.

NOTES:

S/2003/2334	09/12/2003 15:23:41	03/02/2004 15:23:41	CASTLEWAY DEVELOPMENTS LTD.
SHRE			GOADSBY & HARDING COMMERCIAL LTD.
Easting: 406893.4	Northings: 143253.9		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -SV3 - DIVISION OF PLOT AND ERECTION OF SINGLE RESIDENTIAL UNIT WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS AND PARKING AND NEW GARAGE TO SERVE EXISTING
LOCATION:	GRATEN COTTAGE HOMANTON SHREWTON SALISBURY SP3 4ER

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

This application is brought before the Planning Committee as it is contrary to the Parish Council's recommendation.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Graten Cottage is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling that is located on Salisbury Road and occupies a prominent corner plot within the Shrewton Housing Policy Boundary. The existing dwelling is finished in flint and brick with a plain clay tiled hipped roof and has a small single storey extension to the side and a conservatory to the rear. The existing property abuts almost directly onto the road, although its entrance is located to the rear of the property. Vehicular access is currently achieved from the western boundary of the site to Salisbury Road and leads to a detached timber clad pitched roof garage and parking space to the front. A low panelled fence that is set back from Salisbury Road behind a grassed verge and conifer planting demarcates the boundary of the site.

THE PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission to sever a parcel of land from the existing dwelling and to erect a new detached 3-bed dwelling with an attached garage and parking to be accessed via the existing access driveway off Salisbury Road. The proposal also includes an extension of the existing driveway and erection of a detached garage to serve the existing dwelling. It is also includes the provision of a visibility splay to the existing access driveway.

PLANNING HISTORY

No previous planning history.

CONSULTATIONS

- WCC Highways: No objection, subject to conditions requiring the provision of a visibility splay, that any gates to the access are set back a minimum of 4.5 metres into the site and the first 4.5 metres of the driveway is properly consolidated and surfaced.
- Wessex Water: No objection. The site lies within a foul sewered area and the developer will need to agree a point of connection. The Council should be satisfied with any arrangement for the satisfactory disposal of surface water from the proposal.
- Environment Agency: Object to the proposal on the grounds that the application site lies partly within the 1 in 100 year indicative flood plain of the River Till and as the submitted Flood Risk Assessment fails to demonstrate that the site is

above the 1 in 100 year flood level the proposed development would reduce the flood water storage capacity of the flood plain, the cumulative effect of which increases the risk of flooding elsewhere.

English Nature: No objection, subject to a condition requiring the submission of a method statement detailing the potential risks and how these will be addressed to ensure that the river system is protected from any pollution.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	Yes - expired 08/01/04
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes - expired 01/01/04
Neighbour response	Yes

One letter of representation has been received in response that raises the following comments/objections to the proposed development:-

- It will not maintain or enhance the setting/character of the locality, particularly with respect to Graten Cottage;
- Inconvenience to other road users and pedestrians from the parking of construction vehicles; and
- If this application, together with that on the opposite side of the road at Homanton Cottage, are approved consideration should be given to the timing of the commencement of development so as to avoid inconvenience to traffic and pedestrians.

Parish Council No objection.

POLICY CONTEXT

The following policies of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) are relevant to the current proposal:-

G2 (General Criteria for Development), G4 (The Water Environment), G5 (Drainage), D2 (Infill Development), H16 (Housing Policy Boundaries), C6 (Special Landscape Area) and C10 (Nature Conservation).

MAIN ISSUES

1. Principle of Development
2. Visual Impact/Character of the Area
3. Residential Amenity
4. Highway Issues
5. Flood Risk
6. Nature Conservation
7. Impact on Trees
8. Policy R2 - Provision of Recreation Facilities

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Principle of Development

The application site comprises part of the existing curtilage of Graten Cottage that lies within the Shrewton Housing Policy Boundary. Policy H16 of the adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) is therefore applicable to this proposal where the principle of infill and small-scale residential development is considered to be acceptable subject to various criteria.

2. Visual Impact/Character of the Area

The application site is located within a section of Shrewton that is characterised by a random pattern of development consisting of detached and semi-detached dwellings of various sizes and styles that are situated in irregular sized plots. The site in question occupies a corner location

and is fairly large in comparison to some of the other surrounding plots and it is therefore considered that the existing site is capable of being severed in the manner proposed to form two plots of a size that will respect the size of other plots that are evident in the surrounding vicinity. It is also considered that the proposed development has been laid out so that a certain sense of spaciousness is retained between the existing and proposed dwellings, such that it would not appear unduly cramped or out of keeping with the surrounding area, and in a manner that avoids an inappropriate tandem or backland form of development. Instead, the proposed dwelling would be sited so that its principal elevation would front the adjacent highway and although it would be set back from the adjacent carriageway within the site given that there is no established building line to this section of Salisbury Road it is considered that it would respect the overall character of the area. In this respect, the proposed development also conforms to Government guidance contained in PPG3 that advocates that Local Planning Authorities should promote the more efficient use of land.

In terms of design, it is considered that the overall scale and massing of the proposed dwelling would be in keeping with other properties in the surrounding area, while the proposed materials (brick and flint panels to the external walls and a clay roof tile) would match those of the adjacent properties of Graten Cottage and Rose Cottage. Consequently, it is considered that the proposed would generally appear sympathetic to the surrounding properties and would integrate satisfactorily into this section of the street scene.

3. Residential Amenity

With regards to residential amenity, the main impact of the proposed development would be in relation to the parent property at Graten Cottage. Although the proposed dwelling would inevitably alter the outlook from the existing property of Graten Cottage and its rear curtilage, given that it would be offset in relation to Graten Cottage together with the separation distance that would be retained between the two properties it is not considered that it would appear so overbearing or lead to a material loss of light so as to warrant refusal of this application. In terms of the issue of privacy, any views from the proposed dwelling overlooking the neighbouring property at Graten Cottage would be restricted to those from a first floor bedroom window. However, given the orientation between the two properties it is considered that these views would be largely restricted towards the less sensitive areas of the neighbouring garden and would be sufficiently oblique towards the main private/usable amenity areas to the rear of Graten Cottage. Furthermore, given the nature of use of a bedroom (not a principal habitable room of a dwelling) it is not considered that this would give rise to a material loss of privacy. The other windows at first floor level to the rear elevation would serve a bathroom and shower room and therefore could reasonably be expected to be obscure glazed, while the screening to the boundary between the two properties, details of which would need to be agreed, could prevent any overlooking from the ground floor windows of the proposed dwelling.

In relation to other neighbouring properties, the proposed dwelling would be sufficiently separated from the dwellings at "Rose Cottage" and "Brook Cottage" that it would not appear overbearing or cause any loss of light. In addition, any views from the proposed dwelling towards Rose Cottage would be sufficiently oblique and distanced, while those towards Brook Cottage would be obscured by the existing conifer hedge to the boundary, that no material loss of privacy would occur.

Despite concerns that have been raised to the proposed development by a nearby resident on the grounds that the proposal would cause inconvenience to other road users and pedestrians from the parking of construction vehicles, this does not constitute a material justification to refuse this application as any obstruction of the public highway is covered under other legislation.

4. Highway Issues

With regards to the highway issues, both the existing and proposed dwellings would be served via the existing vehicular access with a shared driveway leading to on-site parking, garaging and turning facilities for each property. It is considered that the level of on-site parking/garaging provision is adequate in accordance with the Council's current parking guidelines and the latest advice contained in PPG 13. The proposal also includes the provision of a visibility splay across the site with no obstructions over 1.0 metre in height, including the existing boundary fence to the site, to be retained, maintained or planted/erected within this designated area. This is

considered to provide an adequate level of visibility from the vehicular access and although there is a tree located within this proposed area given that it has a reasonably high canopy and small trunk that would not obscure views across the visibility splay its retention is considered acceptable. No highway objection is raised to the proposed development.

5. Flood Risk

The application site lies partly within the 1 in 100 year indicative flood plain of the River Till.

In support of the application, the applicant has submitted a flood risk assessment but argues that given that the Environment Agency do not have flood event information in respect of the area in question and hence no figure for the 1 in 100 year flood level above ordnance datum (AOD) that without such a benchmark to work to it is difficult to determine where minimum floor levels should be established and the extent of flood alleviation measures that may be required. Nevertheless, the submitted report highlights that the site has not flooded in the last twenty years and lies on the outermost margin of the 1 in 100 year fluvial flood plain and that there are a number of other residential dwellings that are also within such a marginal area. As such, the applicant contends that with the introduction of measures such as flood drainage channels and surface water drains and based on the existing ground levels that the proposed dwelling would be at no greater risk from flooding than the existing house at Graten Cottage and other adjacent properties.

The Environment Agency, however, has advised that whilst the information held concerning the limits of the River Till flood plain is indicative of the area which could be affected by a flood event with a 1% annual probability of occurrence it represents the best available current information on the extent of flood risk. PPG25 also confirms that the precautionary principle is particularly relevant to flood risk and Paragraph 13 states, “...*the uncertainty inherent in flood estimation and, by proceeding from the known facts and taking a precautionary approach to uncertainties, enables more open and better-informed decisions to be made*”. Given that the flood risk assessment submitted by the applicant in support of this proposal fails to demonstrate that the site is above the 1 in 100 year flood level, the Environment Agency recommends that the application is refused on the grounds that it would reduce the water storage capacity of the flood plain, the cumulative effect of which increases the risk of flooding elsewhere.

6. Nature Conservation

The site is adjacent to the River Till Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a part of the River Avon candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC). The nature conservation importance of the river system arises from the range and diversity of riparian habitats and associated species. The River Avon candidate Special Area of Conservation (cSAC) qualifying features include one habitat (the watercourse characterised by floating water crowfoot and starwort vegetation and five species (brook and sea lamprey, bullhead, salmon and Desmoulin's whorl snail), all of which are dependent upon the maintenance of high water quality and sympathetic habitat management. English Nature, however, has advised that the development need not cause significant damage to the nature conservation interests of the Site of Special Scientific Interest or candidate Special Area of Conservation provided that the applicant can demonstrate that appropriate measures will be taken to ensure that the river system is protected from any pollution or other disturbance. This can be secured by the imposition of a condition requiring a method statement detailing the potential risks and how these will be addressed.

7. Impact on Trees

There are several trees located within the application site, although most of these are fruit trees and are not considered to constitute a constraint to the proposed development. However, the site does contain other more mature ornamental trees, including a Sycamore and Poplar tree but it is considered that these would not be implicated by the development. There is also a Willow tree located within relatively close proximity to the boundary of the site but within the curtilage of the adjacent dwelling, “Rose Cottage”. Although the proposal includes the erection of a detached garage in close proximity to the boundary in this location, it is nevertheless considered that there is a sufficient separation distance to this tree that it would not be unduly harmed as a result of the proposal. Consequently, there is no objection to the proposed development on arboricultural grounds.

8. Policy R2 - Provision of Recreation Facilities

In accordance with Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan the provision of recreation facilities must be considered for all proposals for new residential development. This proposal would involve the creation of an additional 3-bed dwelling and therefore in accordance with Policy R2 of the Local Plan a recreational contribution of £1,460.00 has been calculated to be required.

If recommended for approval, this is a matter that could be addressed via a unilateral undertaking, however given the recommendation it must be included as a reason for refusal as otherwise it would make it difficult for the Council to implement the policy effectively in the future.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has failed to provide adequate information to demonstrate that the proposed development lies outside or above the 1 in 100 indicative flood plain of the River Till. In the absence of such information, it is considered likely that the proposal would reduce the flood water storage capacity of the flood plain, the cumulative effect of which increases the risk of flooding elsewhere. As such, the proposed development would be contrary to Policy G4 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) and advice contained in PPG25 "Development and Flood Risk".
2. The proposed development fails to make provision towards recreational open space contrary to the requirements of Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003). As such, it would put an additional demand on existing recreational facilities and would set a precedent that would make it difficult for the Council to implement this policy effectively in the future.

Informative Note(s):

1. In respect of Reason for Refusal No2, the applicant is advised that if this application had been acceptable in all other respects, a financial contribution towards recreational open space provision would have been required in accordance with Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003). This would overcome Reason for Refusal No2.

NOTES:

S/2003/2668	22/12/2003 09:07:17	16/02/2004 09:07:17	R A DIAPER & F COOK
WINB			NIGEL LILLEY
Easting: 416990.6	Northing: 133780		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -DETACHED GARAGE AND CAR PARKING TO 2 HORFIELD COTTAGE AND 1 BED FLAT OVER WITH GARAGING TOGETHER WITH ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS
LOCATION:	2 HOREFIELD COTTAGES HURDCOTT LANE WINTERBOURNE EARLS SALISBURY SP4 6HN

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site consists of the curtilage of the existing dwelling of 2 Horfield Cottage. Surrounding dwellings consist primarily of two storey properties.

THE PROPOSAL

The application proposed the erection of a detached garage (to serve the existing dwelling) and a one bed flat and second garage, together with alterations to the access.

PLANNING HISTORY

Alterations and extensions to existing dwelling, Approved with Conditions on 14th February 2004 (S/2003/2667)

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways	recommend refusal; vehicles resulting from the proposed development, reversing and standing within Hurdcott Lane at a point where visibility is restricted, would impede, endanger and inconvenience other road users, to the detriment of highway safety.
Environment Agency	no objection subject to conditions required to prevent property and surrounding properties from flooding.
Wessex Water	development lies within foul sewerage area

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No	
Site Notice displayed	Yes	expires 29/01/04
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	expires 19/01/04
Neighbour response	No	
Parish Council response	Yes	Would like application to be heard at NAC

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on character and appearance of area

Impact on highway safety
Impact on adjoining properties

POLICY CONTEXT

G2, H16, D1, R2

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed building would provide additional residential accommodation within a built-up part of Hurdcott, and would therefore be acceptable in principle. In design terms, the development would maintain the ridge height of the existing adjoining property. Although the window and garage door arrangement is somewhat incongruous and unsymmetrical, it is not considered that its design would warrant refusal.

However, the proposed development would result in an increase in vehicles using an existing access, at a point that the Highway Authority considers dangerous. Given that vehicles using the garages would have to reverse in or out and stand at this point, it is considered that to allow an intensification of the existing access would be harmful to Highway safety, and contrary to policy G2. In short it would make a dangerous situation worse.

Consideration has also been given to the impact on the living conditions of adjoining properties. The additional physical mass of the building would be unlikely to result in over-dominance or loss of light to surrounding dwellings.

With regard to overlooking, rear facing first floor windows would allow views into what appears to be the side garden of Hawthorns. However, most of these windows could, if necessary, be obscure glazed. The only 'habitable-room' rear windows would be those serving the living area. As the first floor windows of the existing property allow similar views, it is not considered that this overlooking would warrant refusal. Similarly, any overlooking of the property opposite would be confined to views currently available to users of the highway, because of the 'open' boundary treatment of this property.

As a new dwelling, an R2 contribution needs to be paid, usually by means of a unilateral undertaking. To secure the provision of an agreement in the event of an appeal, this must also form a reason for refusal.

CONCLUSION

While the proposed development would not significantly harm the character and appearance of the area, or result in harm to adjoining properties' living conditions, it would harm highway safety and does not make a contribution towards recreational open space.

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

- (1) The proposed development would result in vehicles reversing and standing within Hurdcott Lane at a point where visibility is restricted, which would impede, endanger and inconvenience other road users, to the detriment of highway safety. In this respect, the development would be contrary to policy G2 of the Replacement Salisbury District local Plan.
- (2) The proposed development fails to make provision for the additional recreational open space required by future occupiers. In this respect it would be contrary to policy R2 of the Replacement 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			

No Approvals