

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE NORTHERN AREA 29/04/2004

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 Now (Committee) 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 & COUN-CILLORS	NOTES
---------	------------------------	----------	-----	---------------	----------	---------------------	-------

1	SV	S / 2004 / 480 Mr J Hammond	MRS S TUCKER BYFORD PORTON	REF	IDMI	2-9	UPPER BOURNE, IDMISTON & WINTERBOURNE Cllr Hewitt Cllr Wren
2	SV	S / 2004 / 485 Mr O Marigold	MS W CALLOWAY PARKHOUSE GARAGE PARKHOUSE ROUNDABOUT CHOLDERTON	REF	CHOL	10-13	AS ABOVE

3	S / 2004 / 319 Miss L Flindell	MR C N RHIND-TUTT PLOT 3 OVER STREET STAPLEFORD	APPC	STAP	14-18	TILL VALLEY & WYLYE Cllr Mills Cllr West
4	S / 2004 / 337 Miss L Flindell	MR & MRS WESTERN 19 SALISBURY ROAD BULFORD	APPC	BULF	19-21	BULFORD Cllr Spencer Cllr Woodbridge
5 sv	S / 2004 / 381 Ms S Waaldijk	M HURST & C GREASLEY 1 SOUTH MILL ROAD AMESBURY	APPC	AMES	22-24	AMESBURY WEST Cllr Westmoreland
6	S / 2004 / 517 Miss L Flindell	MR F BOTTING 15 CHURCH ROAD IDMISTON	APPC	IDMI	25-26	UPPER BOURNE, IDMISTON & WINTERBOURNE Cllr Hewitt Cllr Wren
7	S / 2002 / 1650 Mr J Hammond	JS BLOOR (NEWBURY) LTD & PERSIMMON HOMES (SC) LTD BOSCOMBE ROAD (LAND SOUTH OF) AMESBURY	APPC	AMES	27-36	AMESBURY EAST Cllr Brown Cllr Noeken

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/2004/480	03/03/2004 08:52:42	28/04/2004 08:52:42	MRS S TUCKER
IDMI	POR		MICHAEL LYONS ARCHITECTURE
Easting: 418896.5	Northing: 136590.3		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -DEVELOPMENT OF 16 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS COMPRISING 14 NEW BUILDINGS AND CONVERSION OF 2 BUILDINGS WITHIN THE GROUNDS INTO DWELLINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW ACCESS IN BYFORD, PORTON
LOCATION:	BYFORD PORTON SALISBURY SP4 0LF

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation in part.
HDS does not consider it prudent to exercise delegated powers

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises a large area of garden land (0.68 hectares) serving the unlisted dwelling known as Byford. Byford lies at the junction of the C.288 Winterslow Road and an unclassified short length of roadway serving 2 dwellings before reducing in width and surface standard to become a footpath connecting northwards to Bourne Gardens.

The site includes a number of timber outbuildings as well as a single storey permanent building adjoining Winterslow Road in its north western corner.

The site lies within the Porton housing Policy Boundary and Conservation Area. Additionally, the site adjoins the Porton Meadows SSSI which is a component part of the cSAC River Avon network. Additionally, part of the site lies within the 1:100 year flood plain for the River Bourne.

To the north west of the site there is a post war cul de sac of predominantly single storey dwellings whilst to the south west, on the opposite side of the Winterslow Road are located the village shop, post office and residential frontages including Bonaker Close and High Street.

THE PROPOSAL

This application proposes the creation of a new access road, taken from Winterslow road, offset from the High Street junction to serve a development of 16 dwellings in total comprising 14 new build dwellings and the conversion of 2 existing buildings on site. The scheme would provide 2 off road parking spaces per dwelling and a footpath connection northwards, linking into the footpath already serving Bourne Gardens. The development would retain a separate curtilage for Byford and discrete access from the unclassified spur road.

The application proposes the transfer of an area of copse to the local authority. This may offer opportunities to enhance existing recreational routes. The scheme is of sufficient scale to require the provision of affordable housing on site.

The design of the scheme adopts a traditional and vernacular approach to design, mixing brick and flint banding, brick, stone and flint banding, stone plinths, render and timber cladding under tile, slate and thatched roofing.

The application is accompanied by a design statement that sets out the design concept behind the creation of a Winterslow Street frontage, the enclosure of the sites, estate road with linked housing and the formation of an overlooked and useable footpath connection.

PLANNING HISTORY

There is no relevant planning history to this site.

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - No formal observations, however the scheme has been the subject of pre-application submissions and raises no objections in principle to the creation of a new access in this location to serve this number of dwellings. Recent discussions with the Highways Authority confirm that whilst the sitelines, roadwidths and parking standards are not objected to, there are issues of minor detail that will require further details. A further report clarifying the outstanding issues will be made to the Area Committee.

WCC Library/ Museum - Records refer to much Roman pottery being found on the site in the 1930's. Previous discoveries have not so far identified any significant archaeological sites. On this basis it would be appropriate to place a watching brief condition on the application.

English Heritage - This is an application that can be determined by SDC without further representation from EH

Housing & Health Officer - The 3rd bedrooms in the terrace of 4 houses are at the limit or habitable space as defined by the Housing Act 1985. These should be enlarged or removed. The site is on and close to the Environment Agency 1:100 year floodplain.

Wessex Water Authority - The site lies within a sewered area. Connection will need to be agreed. SDC should satisfy itself with the adequacy of soakaways.

Environment Agency - Site lies within the 1:100 year flood plain. The Agency objects to the proposed development due to lack of information given the PPG 25 approach recommending a precautionary approach to avoid flood risk. A flood risk assessment should be provided to address flood risk and mitigation as well as risk of flooding elsewhere and measures to deal with these risks. If this issue can be addressed there should be controls over development within 8 m of the River Wylye (sic) a scheme for surface run off limitation will be necessary, no materials should be stored within the 1:100 year flood plain and floor levels should be set 600 mm above the 1:100 year flood plain. Permitted development rights should also be removed for properties extending into the flood plain.

English Nature. - The scheme lies within a SSSI and forms part of the wider Avon cSAC. The scheme needs to address the impacts upon protected species given the proposals for demolition, conversion and possible tree felling prior to determination. Other issues relate to potential pollution during construction and foul discharge into the river. Further information on foul and surface drainage is therefore required.

Architects Panel - The scheme fits the site, wall thicknesses on plan and by material in elevation will differ, this should be resolved. It is important that details such as rainwater goods are indicated. Sample panels will be necessary and retained on site to confirm the quality of work. Joinery details for openings and junctions will be necessary. The successful

implementation of the scheme will depend upon the architect being retained through the completion of the project,

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes – Expired 08/04/04
Site Notice displayed	Yes – Expired 08/04/04
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes – Expired 29/03/04
Neighbour response including:	Yes – 8 letters of comment and objection raising issues

- Restricted visibility to the west, which requires improvement,
- Reduction in height of existing boundary wall to Byford,
- Inadequate visibility eastwards,
- Footpath should stop at the vehicular access to the site, bollards should be introduced to prevent parking on the verge,
- Welcome the offer of amenity land,
- Should a roundabout be provided?
- Concerns about existing traffic levels and scope to increase with expansion of Porton Down
- There was a chapel on the land in or before 1372. Could the history be verified? Could this influence house naming?
- Sewerage has been problematic. Local service provision is inadequate.
- There is a risk of flooding to 2 properties
- Concern about the safety of bus stop users.
- Parking on site is inadequate
- There are orchids on site that should be protected
- Scheme is sympathetic to the context
- No plan submitted for conversion of the old school building
- There should be no scope to wall the rear boundaries to rear plots.
- The need for street lighting should be addressed.
- Existing site should remain largely undeveloped.
- Existing good quality walls should be preserved.

Parish Council response Yes – Object:

- Traffic
- Flooding
- Loss of important flora
- Historic importance of chapel
- Foul drainage
- Petition of bus stop

MAIN ISSUES

Principle
Design and impact upon Conservation Area
Access and highways
Flood risk
Amenity space and R2
Affordable housing & efficient use of land
Archaeology and protected species
Foul sewerage

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP
G1 General principles for development
G2 General criteria for development
G4 Water environment, flood risk

D2 Infill development
H16 Housing Policy Boundary
H25 Affordable housing
CN8 Development to preserve or enhance Conservation Area
CN9 Demolition in Conservation Areas
CN10 Loss of open space / gaps in Conservation Areas
C18 Impact upon water quality
R2 Open space provision

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Principle

This application lies within the Housing Policy Boundary and Conservation Area. To this end therefore the principle of new housing development in a location close to the village's core services is acceptable, provided that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is preserved.

This requires an assessment of the merits of the existing appearance and the contribution that the existing open space makes towards the CA character and appearance.

Clearly, the open character of the domestic setting for Byford provides a generally open feel to the village core. However, this open character is offset by the boundary wall along Winterslow Road which reduces the immediate impact of an open, undeveloped site from within the village. The views from the footpath link to Bourne Gardens also reinforces the undeveloped nature of the setting and rural context.

Equally clearly, the proposal for 14 new dwellings will not retain the same open character and therefore will create a differing feel to the setting and streetscape.

In this instance, the planning judgement needs to take into account the relative merits of retaining this private space as an undeveloped area, albeit behind a walled enclosure and balance this against a more developed streetscape where views into and through the site are preserved through the design and arrangement of buildings.

The scheme falls below PPG3 requirements to deliver 30 dph. This design therefore introduces a question over the efficient use of land, particularly where it is well served by local services and alternative modes of transport.

To conclude, the site is acceptable for housing, the number of units requires a balance between efficient use of land and the need to preserve the character of the Conservation Area. To this end, the appropriate density will be informed by the design qualities adopted by the developer.

Design and impact upon Conservation Area

The design for this scheme does look to address the site's context, creating a new street frontage onto Winterslow Road and avoiding the feel of an impermeable cul de sac layout by introducing a pedestrian link through the site connecting into the surrounding footpath network. The internal layout creates a more informal street pattern and serves a small court grouping mixing single and two storey dwellings, retaining the footprint and form of an existing outbuilding to inform the position and scale of plot 10. The development also retains an existing single storey building on site for residential conversion, although to date no details of the design or elevational treatments have been submitted.

The design principles include the creation of a simple pair of semi detached units fronting Winterslow Road together with a curved, thatched semi detached pair of dwellings at the sites entrance. This unit has been designed to address the junction location and serves to "lead the eye" into the development itself. This curved unit would include natural stone plinth, with render above under a thatched roof which included swept dormers.

To the north west of the site entrance the first pair of semis will present a gable to the Winterslow Road, again emphasising the junction of a route rather than simply being an access

point to a small housing development. The location of 2 pairs of semi detached dwellings at the back edge of pavement, using simple frontages and well proportioned brick and flint banding will create a strong streetscene but one that reflects the village scale and context.

The single storey "T" shaped building using one of the existing buildings on site will provide a unit of accommodation and covered parking within a private court area, also enclosed by a terrace of 4 dwellings using eaves breaking dormers.

To the rear of the site, located abutting the HPB are 2 larger detached dwellings. Plot 15 creates a focal point to the estate road and relates to the footpath connection. Plot 7 is set back from the main roadway and uses a stone and flint banded ground floor with render over under a thatched roof.

The boundaries to the road and footpath generally comprise the front elevations to dwellings with narrow grassed planting. The footpath link is bounded by the repaired cob wall forming the domestic cartilage to plot 7 and a 1.2m natural stone wall to plot 15.

The overall concept is therefore the creation of a "natural" extension to the traditional road and streetscene pattern, providing some permeability through the site and allowing it to be a pedestrian through route rather than a closed off cul de sac.

As a concept therefore the development responds positively to it's setting and creates a development that is intrinsically rural and whose use of materials draws upon the higher order of finishes found within Porton and its local setting.

The impact upon the conservation Area however requires a judgement to be made regarding the development's impact upon the character and appearance of the CA including its impact upon the loss of gaps in frontages, boundary walls and loss of open space.

At present the garden holds an open character with existing mature planting creating a green canopy. From the Winterslow Road approach however the high boundary wall and its repair using blockwork rather than reinstating more traditional cob walling blocks direct views over the open space and creates an untidy roadside edge.

From the existing footpath link to Bourne Gardens longer views into the site can be achieved that do allow the public to appreciate the scale and open character of this site.

Clearly, the proposed development will introduce buildings of a height that will transform the currently open site and will alter the public perception of this area from all local viewpoints.

The design of the development does however avoid impacting upon the footpath adjoining the river Bourne. The closest dwelling would be plot 15 where a gap between the dwelling and existing footway of 14m will be retained. The gap between plots 7 – 9 and the boundary varies between 22 – 45 m. These gaps will retain significant open space, not least because of the position of the HPB and floodplain. The character of the development viewed from the River Bourne side will be of a spacious development that retains significant open space and creates a new public access point through the site.

From Winterslow Road, the scheme will replace the untidy boundary walling with 4 new dwellings facing or presenting a gable to Winterslow Road, set behind a grassed verge and footpath link.

These will remove the perception of openness, however they will respond positively to the need for a locally relevant design and scale. Additionally, the access road, retention of an existing mature tree, and use of a single storey building within the sites core will allow for longer views to be taken through the site. Again, the provision of the footpath link will allow for the area and route to be opened up.

Clearly, this application cannot retain the existing open space and character. The judgement must be therefore whether the undeveloped nature of this walled private space is of intrinsic importance or whether a well designed and scaled development is capable of introducing new elements that can equally contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

In this instance the attention to design detail in terms of layout, numbers, elevational treatment and materials together with the creation of a through route for pedestrians is considered to contribute positively to the Conservation Area.

Access and Highways

There has been significant local concern, reiterated by the parish council regarding the site's access onto Winterslow road including proposals for wider traffic calming measures, a roundabout and objections to the sitelines and possible on road parking.

The application was prepared with pre-application discussions with WCC Highways. There has been no objection to the principle of an accesspoint at this position with the removal of the existing boundary wall and the recessed frontages to the dwellings facing Winterslow Road. The scheme provides for 21 covered parking spaces with a further 11 open parking spaces. There are therefore 2 spaces per dwelling. Additionally, plots 7 – 10 inclusive have additional hard surfaced driveway space for additional parking. Additionally, the road width at 5.5 metres will allow for on street parking without creating unacceptable disruption to traffic movement.

Discussions to date with the Highways Authority do not indicate a need for a roundabout. Equally, wider traffic calming measures requested by the parish and public are a separate matter for the Highways Authority to consider outside the realm of this application.

The proposed position for the relocated bus stop is a matter for detailed location discussions with the Highways Authority.

Flood risk.

The Environment Agency has objected to this scheme on the basis that a part of the site lies within the 1:100 year flood plain, however no flood risk assessment has been submitted. Equally, no proposals to mitigate flood risk on site and elsewhere have been proposed.

This objection does not necessarily challenge the principle or scale of development but does mean that there is insufficient information in the form of both an assessment and mitigation proposals to allow the precautionary approach set out in PPG 25 to be adequately addressed. This issue therefore represents a ground for refusal.

Amenity Space and R2.

During pre application discussions the applicant had proposed the transfer of an area of informal woodland north of the site to the parish council. This approach was considered to secure the recreational / amenity use of this site in perpetuity and would link into the parish council's own circular walks strategy. Clearly if the applicant were to transfer such an area of land then the normal commuted sum payment for public outdoor recreational use would need to be adjusted to take account of this provision, however any adjustment would need to reflect the lack of alternative uses to which this land could be put.

The parish council has expressed concerns about the condition under which the land would be transferred as well as the level of any commuted sum payment adjustment. Should the scheme in all other respects be acceptable this is a matter of detail that could be resolved via the Section 106 Agreement. If, as a part of that process the parish council declined to take ownership of the land clearly SDC would no longer pursue its transfer.

Whilst the R2 issue forms a ground for refusal where permission is refused, the resolution of this issue is a matter of detail rather than principle.

Affordable housing & efficient use of land.

The parish council has suggested that the provision of smaller units of accommodation would meet the requirement to deliver affordable housing without the need to introduce a Registered Social Landlord and limit occupation to rental or shared equity only.

A move to provide generally smaller units of accommodation would have the linked effect of increasing the number of units that could be delivered on site and possibly within the footprint of the existing proposed dwellings. Allied to this issue would be the need to increase parking space provision.

In any event, Local Plan policy requires a minimum 25% affordable housing provision on schemes of over 15 units. The district Council would require these to be delivered via an RSL rather than on the open market. The move to smaller units would not remove the requirement to involve an RSL in the delivery of affordable housing.

The current proposal includes 3 x 2 bed dwellings (together with the converted building on Winterslow Road which is unlikely to provide more than 2 bed accommodation.) 6 x 3 bed dwellings, 5 x 4 bed and 1 x 5 bed dwelling. This represents a good mix of housing sizes.

The provision of 16 units on this site represents a sensitive balance between making efficient use of housing land in sustainable locations and respecting the character and need to retain a feeling of space and longer views through the development. In this instance an increase in numbers on site would undermine the attempts to preserve the character of the CA, whilst a reduction in numbers or conversion of smaller semi detached units into single dwellings would undermine the level of efficiency achieved and dilute the mix of house sizes that contributes to this scheme's design benefits.

Archaeology and protected species.

Local concerns regarding the historic presence of a chapel on site, together with the possible presence of protected species and important plant forms has been raised by objectors and the parish council.

The County Archaeologist has sought a watching brief but based upon previous works on the site does not require further works to be undertaken prior to the decision being secured. Were the scheme in all other respects acceptable there would be local merit in evaluation the remains of the chapel setting, however given the position adopted by the County Archaeologist, this issue is not considered sufficient to merit a ground for refusal on its own.

The application does propose the demolition of buildings that may accommodate protected species. Without an appropriate assessment of these structures, the acceptability of their demolition cannot be adequately determined. Further information is required from English Nature to determine whether any of the flora within the site merits protection.

Foul sewerage.

The capacity of the local foul system has been identified as being unable to cope with additional demands, however this view is not supported by Wessex Water which has not requested any additional measures to deal with foul sewerage as a part of this proposal.

CONCLUSION

This application does represent a well designed approach to both the layout and treatment of individual buildings. It could provide an attractive mix of house types and sizes within a scheme that could respect its sensitive Conservation Area setting as well as delivering local affordable housing and recreational enhancements within the parish.

Notwithstanding the level of pre application works undertaken the scheme does not provide adequate information to enable a positive recommendation to be made. There is a lack of flood risk assessment as well as survey work for protected species. Additionally, there are no design details for the conversion of the existing single storey Winterslow Roadside building to allow for assessment of its impact upon amenity. Furthermore, the issue of affordable housing and R2, whilst capable of resolution via the legal agreement represent grounds for refusal at this stage.

RECOMMENDATION: **REFUSE** on the basis that the proposed development fails to address the requirements of policy G4 relating to flood risk and C12, protected species, and fails to provide adequate information to address the requirements of policy G2 the general criteria for

development as well as the need to provide recreational and affordable housing facilities and for the following reasons:

(1) In the absence of a full Flood Risk Assessment, setting out the development's relationship to and impacts upon the 1:100 year floodplain for the River Bourne, together with measures to mitigate impacts both on and off site, the proposed development. In the absence of such information it is considered likely that the development would reduce the flood storage capacity within the River Bourne and result in cumulative flood risks elsewhere contrary to policies G4 and C18 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and advice provided in PPG 25 "Development and flood risk"

(2) In the absence of adequate information to the contrary, the Local Planning authority is not convinced that the proposal, resulting as it does in the demolition of existing buildings together with the conversion of others will not have an adverse impact upon the habitat for species protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and is therefore contrary to the provisions of policy C12 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

(3) In the absence of sufficient elevational details the impacts of the residential conversion of the former school room adjoining Winterslow Road into a residential unit the Local Planning Authority are not convinced that the scheme will not have an adverse impact upon the amenity of adjoining properties and the appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of policies G2 and CN8 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

(4) The proposed development is unacceptable in that it fails to make provision for the supply of affordable housing in a manner that is capable of satisfying the requirements of policy H 25 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan. As such, it would place additional demands upon existing affordable housing facilities and would set a precedent that would make it difficult to implement this policy in the future

(5) The proposed development fails to make provision towards recreational open space contrary to the requirements of policy R2 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan. As such, it would place additional demands upon existing recreational facilities and would set a precedent that would make it difficult to implement this policy in the future.

INFORMATIVE:

1. The reasons for refusal numbers 4 and 5 are capable of resolution by way of a Section 106 Agreement if the development were to be considered in all other respects acceptable.

2. This permission has been taken in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

- G1 General principles for development
- G2 General criteria for development
- G4 Water environment, flood risk
- D2 Infill development
- H16 Housing Policy Boundary
- H25 Affordable housing
- CN8 Development to preserve or enhance Conservation Area
- CN9 Demolition in Conservation Areas
- CN10 Loss of open space / gaps in Conservation Areas
- C18 Impact upon water quality
- R2 Open space provision.

NOTES:

S/2004/485	04/03/2004 14:57:00	29/04/2004 14:57:00	MS W CALLOWAY
CHOL			GERALD STEER
Easting: 423192.1	Northing: 143519.4		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -ONE REPLACEMENT DWELLING DEMOLITION OF GARAGE BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF 1 HOUSE AND ALTERATION TO EXISTING ACCESS
LOCATION:	PARKHOUSE GARAGE PARKHOUSE ROUNDABOUT CHOLDERTON SALISBURY SP4 0EG

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site consists of an existing dwelling, a petrol filling station, garage and forecourt, located on the junction between A338 and the western-bound slip road to the A303. The site lies in the open countryside, some distance to the north and on the boundary between Wiltshire and Hampshire. The site consists of previously developed land.

THE PROPOSAL

The application proposes the demolition of the garage, filling station and existing dwelling and associated buildings, and the erection of one replacement dwelling and one new dwelling, together with garages and residential curtilage.

PLANNING HISTORY

Residential Development and alteration to access, Withdrawn on 12th February 2003 (02/1023)

CONSULTATIONS

Highway Authority	Response awaited
Highways Agency	No objection
Environment Agency	Object. No flood risk assessment has been submitted and, in the light of the precautionary principle outlined in PPG25, the proposal may result in harm to life and property.
Environmental Health	Raise concerns regarding contamination of the site (in light of its current use) and would require a full site investigation (including risk assessment) to establish whether site is suitable for proposed development.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No	
Site Notice displayed	Yes	expires 08/04/04
Departure	No (unless approved)	
Neighbour notification	Yes	expires 09/04/04
Neighbour response	Yes	1 letter raising concerns relating to additional reflective noise from the proposed perimeter wall.
Parish Council response	Yes	Commented on first application

submitted in June 2002. Residential use is preferred over industrial, and design reinforces village estate Arts and Crafts properties. Area has recently been flooded and so proposal to raise floor height is welcomed.

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on character and appearance of the countryside and Special Landscape Area

Whether the proposed development is in accordance with the Government's sustainability objectives

Loss of the existing garage and petrol station facility

Impact on flood Risk

Impact on living conditions of adjoining properties

The issue of whether the land is contaminated

Recreational Open Space

POLICY CONTEXT

G1, G2, H22 and H23, H30, C1, C2, C6, G8, R2

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Impact on character and appearance of the countryside and Special Landscape Area

Local and National policies make clear that new dwellings in the open countryside will be resisted. While policy H23 only relates to development on undeveloped land, and there is national policy support for the efficient use of previously developed land, policy H22 only identifies sites adjoining Housing Policy Boundaries (or similar designations) as being acceptable for new dwellings, for sustainability reasons. Taking both policies H22 and H23 together (and their explanatory text), therefore, the Previously Developed status of the land does not over-ride the general policies of restraint in the countryside, and for this reason the proposed new dwelling is unacceptable in principle.

Meanwhile, policy H30 requires that a replacement dwelling must not be significantly larger than the dwelling to be replaced. In this instance, the proposed dwelling at plot 1 would clearly be significantly larger, in terms of footprint, size and bulk, and would be contrary to policy H30.

In design terms, the proposal has clearly been designed to take careful account of the dwellings in the village of Cholderton, as identified by the applicant's Design Statement, and the overall design of the resultant development would be an improvement over the existing buildings on the site.

However, the principle of a new dwelling in the countryside remains unacceptable even with the improvement in design. The proposal would result in the removal of the existing buildings on the site. However, it is also considered that the size and scale of the new dwelling on this prominent site would, when compared with the single storey, and relatively modest garage building, be excessive in size and scale, resulting in additional physical impact on the open countryside.

Sustainability Issues

As the proposal involves a new dwelling in the open countryside, it would clearly conflict with the aim of Government and Council policy to limit new development to within, or adjoining, built up settlements.

The applicants argue that residential dwelling would result in less traffic generation than the existing garage use. But many of the trips to the garage and filling station would be expected to be from local residents (who are possibly visiting the petrol station as part of linked trips), while occupants of the new dwelling would be making all their journeys from an unsustainable location.

It also has to be borne in mind that the loss of the existing facility is likely to result in longer journeys by local residents to obtain fuel and garaging facilities (i.e. to Thruxton). Although the site abuts a bus route, any residents of the new dwelling would be heavily reliant on the private car for access to most services and facilities.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed new dwelling would not be sustainable, and would therefore conflict with policy G1 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.

Loss of the existing Petrol station and garage facilities

The applicants in their statement say that the garage has been marketed for some time, but that the oil companies are not interested in continuing the site, with fuel currently being purchased on an ad-hoc basis from an independent supplier. The applicants say that the garage is run-down and falls far short of Health and safety regulations, however, some viability is accepted in the proposal to re-locate the existing business.

No details have been submitted by the application in relating to the marketing of the business, the Oil companies' response or the accounts of the current businesses (the petrol station, shop or garage). The garage facility is considered to be an employment use and as such policy H22 makes clear that the displacement of employment uses for residential development will only be acceptable where the existing use is no longer viable.

Although Policy E16 provides some scope for accepting such employment losses where there would be improvements to the local environment, it has not been demonstrated that there would be clear environmental benefits to the scheme, and this is not outweighed by the additional harm. Therefore until it is demonstrated that the employment use is not viable, this should also form a reason for refusal. Policy PS3 would not be relevant because the site does not lie within a settlement.

Impact on Flood Risk

The applicants have argued that the existing site, consisting largely of hard materials, suffers from flooding and that the proposed dwellings, which would be raised 600mm above existing levels, would not suffer from similar flooding. They also argue that landscaping and reductions in levels ('depressions') would help to hold water in the event of flooding.

The Environment Agency have objected to the application on the basis that no technical information has been submitted with the proposal, primarily in the form of a flood risk assessment. Despite informal negotiations with officers highlighting the need for this information, it has not been submitted. Indeed the Environment Agency comment that even with a Flood Risk Assessment, there may remain objections to the proposal. The potential impact on flooding from the proposal must form a further reason for refusal.

Contamination of land

Being a petrol station and garage, the site has a history of potential contaminated land. Without addressing the risk of contamination, it would clearly be inappropriate to allow residential accommodation where such contamination may harm the living conditions of potential future occupiers.

The Council's Environmental Health officers have requested that a site investigation is undertaken in some detail to establish whether the site is contaminated and what mitigation methods would be necessary. A condition has been suggested, but it is clear that contamination could make the use of the land for residential purposes in principle unacceptable.

Without sufficiently detailed information to establish whether the site's contamination can be mitigated against, and to what degree, this must also form a reason for refusal.

Impact on living condition of adjoining properties

The replacement of the garage and petrol station with dwellings would, if anything, have a beneficial effect on the living conditions of adjoining properties. Although a concern has been raised regarding the perimeter wall, and the reflection of noise that would result, this is not a concern that has been raised by Environmental Health. Given the advantages to neighbouring properties in terms of the reduction in impact from the garage and filling station, it is not considered that the impact from the additional wall would justify refusal. A condition could require noise attenuation.

Recreational Open Space

A recreational open space contribution would be necessary under policy R2, through a s106 agreement. The lack of such an agreement also forms a reason for refusal.

CONCLUSION

While the proposal would have a number of benefits, in terms of the design of the proposed buildings and the reduction in noise and disturbance from the garage and filling station, the in principle objections to a new dwelling, and an excessively-sized replacement dwelling, the unjustified loss of employment land and the potential harm to flood risk and from the contaminated land, outweigh the benefits of the scheme. As no recreational open space contribution has been submitted, this also forms a reason for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

1. The erection of a new dwelling in the open countryside on land outside a settlement boundary would result in an unsustainable form of development and would harm the character and appearance of the open countryside and Special Landscape Area, contrary to policies G1, C1, C2, C6, H22 and H23
2. The proposed new and replacement dwellings, by reason of their excessive size and scale, would result in additional physical impact on the open countryside and Special Landscape Area, harming its character and appearance, contrary to policies G1, C1, C2, H22, H23 and H30 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.
3. It has not been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that the existing employment use of the land is unviable, and the proposal would therefore result in the loss of employment land in the open countryside, contrary to policies H22 and E16 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.
4. It has not been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that the proposed development would not result in additional risk of flooding, with the potential of harm to life and property. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies G2 and G4 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan and the advice in PPG25.
5. It has not been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that the potential contamination of the site and land can be adequately and reasonably mitigated, and that potential risks to future occupiers of the dwellings can be avoided. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policy G2 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.
6. In that no contribution towards recreational open space has been submitted, the proposed development would be contrary to policy R2 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.

INFORMATIVES: - POLICY

This decision has been in accordance with the following policy/policies of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan: G1, G2, H22 and H23, H30, C1, C2, C6, G8, R2

NOTES:

Part 2

Applications recommended for Approval

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

Proposal
Location

3	Case Officer Miss L Flindell	Contact No 01722 434377	3
----------	---	--	----------

S/2004/319	16/02/2004 08:36:36	12/04/2004 08:36:36	MR C N RHIND-TUTT
STAP			DAMEN ASSOCIATES
Easting: 406707.431676388	Northings: 137586.581846923		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -CONSTRUCTION OF DETACHED DWELLING AND GARAGE WITH FORMATION OF NEW ACCESS AND CONSTRUCTION OF BOUNDARY WALL (REVISED DETAILS).
LOCATION:	PLOT 3 OVER STREET STAPLEFORD SALISBURY SP3 4LP

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site is located within the HPB of Stapleford and a SLA. The land rises at the rear and there is a vehicular access to Brooklet Farmhouse to the north boundary.

Two substantial dwellings have recently been constructed to the south at plots 1 and 2 and the area is characterised by large detached two storey dwellings.

THE PROPOSAL

Planning permission was granted under 1995/633 for the erection of a two storey detached dwelling and detached garage at plot 3. Permission was granted under 2003/22 to reposition this dwelling and garage further back into the site. Work has commenced on site.

This application is to build over the detached garage to provide an additional bedroom and shower room at first floor.

It is also proposed to add a 1.9m high brick wall to the front boundary of the site.

PLANNING HISTORY

5141	O/L - Erect garage & workshop & construct
------	---

	vehicular access	A	28.05.64
5218	O/L - Erect house or bungalow with garage & construction of access	R	22.10.64
5270	O/L - Erect bungalow & construct access	R	22.10.64
5281	Erect workshop & garage & construction of access	A	24.12.64
5592	O/L - Erect bungalow & construct access	R	13.05.65
6048	O/L - Erect house or bungalow & garage	R	11.11.65
6524	Use of workshop & garage for industrial use	R	13.10.66
7355	Application in principle for erection of house following demolition of existing garage	R	14.11.68
72/339	O/L - 3 dwellings & garages with accesses	A	07.12.72
73/315	O/L - 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings & one detached dwelling & garages with accesses	R	02.08.73
78/1394	O/L - Use of site for erection of 3 dwellings with garages & construct new access	AC	21.02.79
80/807	Change of use from garage to craft workshop	AC	13.05.81
86/799	O/L - Demolish industrial building & use of site for erection of 3 houses & garages & provision of new accesses	AC	24.07.86
89/1640	Erection of house & garage & construction of access	AC	14.03.90
89/1641	Erection of house & garage & construction of access (different site from above)	AC	22.11.90
95/633	Erection of dwelling and garage at plot 3.	AC	19.5.97
95/634 Def 2nd	Erection of dwelling and garage	AC	30.4.97
95/635 Def 2nd	Erection of dwelling and garage	AC	1.5.97
99/2115	Construction of dwelling with garage and alterations to access (Revised proposal) at Plot 2	AC	17.5.00
00/87	Construction of detached dwelling and garage with formation of new access (revised details) at Plot 3 Over Street, Stapleford.	Withdrawn	27.10.00
00/1071	Variation to conditions 6 and 9 of application S/95/635 regarding access.	AC	17.07.00
03/0022	Repositioning of dwelling approved under S/95/633	AC	01.04.03
03/2434	Construction of boundary wall to frontage exceeding one metre in height (plot 2)	AC	23.12.03

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways	- No objection subject to conditions
Wessex Water Authority	- No objections subject to informative
Environment Agency	- No comments

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	Yes, expiry date 18.03.04
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes, expiry date 10.03.04
Neighbour response	No
Parish Council response	Object

Parish concerned over the height of the possible wall. The other plots (1&2) have a high wall. This is not in keeping with the rear of the village. A proposal was sent with plots 1&2 for some form of planting to the wall to soften the outlook. Still awaiting the outcome of this. Happy with the look of the houses – concerns over the wall. Parish would appreciate some feedback if possible.

MAIN ISSUES

Scale, design, impact upon residential amenity and the street scene
R2

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP General (G2), H16 (HPB), C6 (SLA), D2 (Infill development)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Scale, design, impact upon residential amenity and the street scene

The garage as approved has a half hipped roof with single up and over door and is detached from the main dwelling. The proposal will attach the garage to the dwelling at first floor with walkway beneath. The ridge height will be 1.4m below the ridge height of the main dwelling. The single garage door will be changed to two single doors with brickwork pier in between. It is also proposed to add a hipped dormer window within the front roof slope. No windows are proposed on the south elevation.

The proposal will increase the built form of the dwelling, however, the resultant dwelling is considered appropriate in scale to the surrounding dwellings.

It is also proposed to add a brickwork wall 1.9m high to the front boundary, to which the Parish Council has objected.

Planning permission was granted under S/03/2434 and S/03/2440 for the addition of brick walling 1.9m high to the front boundary of plots 1 and 2. The Parish Council suggested the use of planting to soften the wall. However, it was not considered reasonable to impose a planting condition as the wall was considered appropriate to the modern dwellings not sited within the Conservation Area of the Village.

Orchard Cottage to the south of the site has been built at right angles and abutting the highway and Cuffdale to the north of the site has brick walling to the front boundary. The walling to plots 1 and 2 has been completed and it is considered that the brick walling as proposed to match in height the walling at plots 1 and 2 will be appropriate within the street scene.

R2

Whilst the proposal will provide an additional bedroom, as there is an extant permission on the site, for a 4 bed dwelling that pre-dates the R2 policy, a contribution cannot be sought

CONCLUSION

The proposals are considered appropriate to the overall appearance of the dwelling and street scene, with no adverse impacts to residential amenity.

RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVE:** for the following reasons

The proposals are appropriate to the overall appearance of the dwelling and street scene with no adverse impacts to residential amenity in accordance with policies G2, H16, D2 and C6 of the Adopted SDLP

And subject 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.

(2) The driveway between the edge of carriageway and the gates shall be properly consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel) in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety

(3) Any entrance gates erected shall be hung to open away from the highway only and shall be set back a minimum distance of 4.5m from the carriageway edge.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety

(4) Provision shall be made within the site for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway details of which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of Highway safety

(5) There shall be no windows at first floor on the south elevation of the extension hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure adequate privacy for the occupants of neighbouring premises.

(6) Before development is commenced, a schedule of materials and finishes, and, where so required by the Local Planning Authority, samples of such materials and finishes, to be used for the external wall[s] and roof[s] of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. (D04A)

Reason: To secure a harmonious form of development.

(7) No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works 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. 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]. (G01A)

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.

(8) The dwelling hereby approved shall not be occupied until the turning space shown on the submitted plan has been properly consolidated and surfaced to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Such turning space shall be kept clear of obstructions at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

(9) Before the dwelling hereby permitted is first occupied the area between the nearside carriageway edge and a line drawn 2.0 metres parallel thereto over the entire site frontage shall be cleared of any obstruction to visibility at and above a height of 1.0 metres above the nearside carriageway level and thereafter maintained free of obstruction at all times.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

(10) The finished floor level[s] of the proposed building[s] shall be in accordance with details to be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before development is commenced. (C03A)

Reason: To ensure the exact finished floor level[s] of the building[s].

And in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan: General (G2), H16(HPB), C6 (SLA), D2 (Infill development)

INFORMATIVE: - Wessex Water

The development is located within a foul sewered area and there are water mains within the vicinity of the proposal.

It is recommended that the developer should agree with Wessex Water, prior to the commencement of any works on site, a connection onto Wessex Water infrastructure.

NOTES:

S/2004/337	17/02/2004 16:02:32	13/04/2004 16:02:32	MR & MRS WESTERN
BULF			
Easting: 416911.1	Northing: 143615.6		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO DWELLING
LOCATION:	19 SALISBURY ROAD BULFORD SALISBURY SP4 9DF

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

No 19 Salisbury Road is a semi-detached dwelling within the HPB of Bulford.

The property is in an elevated position to Salisbury Road with garden extending to the rear.

There is a single storey outbuilding attached to the main dwelling with gated pedestrian access to the rear garden.

THE PROPOSAL

This application is to replace the single storey outbuilding with a two storey side extension to the dwelling.

PLANNING HISTORY

None

CONSULTATIONS

SDC Housing No response received

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	Yes, expiry date 18.03.04
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes, expiry date 11.03.04
Neighbour response	No
Parish Council response	Object

Bulford PC object to this application because it is an over development in that the proposal would extend the existing property so that it would completely fill the site across from boundary to boundary. It would leave no access to the rear garden except through the house.

MAIN ISSUES

Scale and design, impact upon residential amenity and rear access

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP G2 (General), D3 (Design), H16 (HPB)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Scale and design, impact upon residential amenity and rear access.

The proposed extension will project from the sidewall of the property by 2.95m and only the ground floor of the extension will extend for the width of the existing property (5.8m). Following negotiation with the agent, amended plans have been submitted which have altered the design of the proposed extension to maintain the existing ridge height and set back the main front wall of the two storey extension by 1.15m, with lean-to roof over the remainder of the ground floor extension.

It is considered that the revised design of the extension which retains the projecting hipped roof section which is also on the adjoining dwelling and Nos 11 and 9 to the north of the site, will be acceptable to the overall appearance of the dwelling and street scene.

The neighbouring dwelling has a window on the south elevation overlooking the development site, and the proposal will bring a two storey extension to the boundary. However, there will be a 3.1m gap between the main part of the neighbouring dwelling, and the extension and there have been no objections to the proposal from the neighbouring residents. It is considered reasonable to restrict windows being added to the side elevation of the extension.

The parish council have objected to the application on the grounds that the proposal will block free access to the rear garden by building over the gated access between the dwelling and outbuilding.

The two storey extension will be built abutting the north boundary, thereby restricting direct access to the rear garden. The proposal may cause inconvenience to the occupiers through no direct front to rear access, however, the existing gated access way is already enclosed and the proposal seeks a doorway to the front and rear elevations of the extension allowing access through the extension, it is considered unreasonable in this case to recommend refusal on these grounds.

CONCLUSION

The revised design of the proposed extension is considered appropriate to the overall appearance of the dwelling and street scene and whilst the extension will create inconvenience to the occupiers of the property by blocking free passage to the rear garden, the design incorporates access to the rear garden through the proposed extension, and it is considered unreasonable to recommend refusal on these grounds.

Approval is recommended.

RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVE:** for the following reasons

Subject to a condition restricting windows on the north elevation, it is considered that the proposed extension will be appropriate to the overall appearance of the dwelling and street scene and will not have an adverse impact upon residential amenity, or significant adverse impact through loss of external access to the rear garden of the dwelling, in accordance with the Adopted SDLP policies G2, D3 and H16.

And subject to the following conditions

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

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

(2) The materials and finishes of the external walls and roof of the proposed development hereby permitted shall match in colour and texture those of the existing building[s].

Reason: To secure a harmonious form of development.

(3) There shall be no windows on the north elevation of the extension hereby permitted.

Reason: To ensure adequate privacy for the occupants of the neighbouring dwellings.

And in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:
G2 (General), D3 (Design), H16 (HPB)

INFORMATIVE: - PARTY WALL ACT

It is noted that the development hereby approved involves construction on or near a boundary with an adjoining property. The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not authorise any other consent which may be required from the adjoining landowner or any other person, or which may be required under any other enactment or obligation.

NOTES:

S/2004/381	20/02/2004 09:30:56	16/04/2004 09:30:56	M HURST & C GREASLEY
AMES			
Easting: 415751.9	Northings: 140971.4		

PROPOSAL:	CHANGE OF USE -EXISTING HOUSE - CHANGE OF USE FROM B & B TO HOUSE IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION
LOCATION:	1 SOUTH MILL ROAD AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7HR

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor request – due to local interest and, as the Council is supporting the application, it would be inappropriate for the application to be determined at Delegated Business.

SITE AND SURROUNDING AREA

The application site is occupied by a two-storey, 6-bed, semi detached house. It has a large two storey side extension which is sited prominently forward of the main house. The boundary to the north and northwest forms 1.8m high close-boarded fencing and the forecourt has landscaped parking.

The locality is residential in character. To the north is a residential care home and to the south is the other half of the semi-detached pair, which forms a single dwelling house.

South Mill Road is a quiet residential road, it is not heavily parked or trafficked and there are no parking restrictions.

THE PROPOSAL

The application seeks full planning permission for a change in the use from bed and breakfast accommodation to use as a house in multiple occupation. It is intended to be used for up to six single mothers with health care support. The premises have six bedrooms.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

01/2255 Change of use from residential home to bed and breakfast. AC 28.1.02

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

SITE NOTICE: Expired 23.3.04
 Neighbour notification: Expired 16.3.04
 Neighbour responses: A petition has been received from the occupiers of nine adjoining properties (containing a total of seventeen signatures – one of which has also sent a separate letter of objection), and two additional letters, objecting on the following grounds: -
 The house has been used by social services as a property in multiple occupation and not a B&B;
 Noise / disturbance from residents arguing with visitors;
 Disturbances in the past have resulted in police intervention;
 Vehicles are repaired on the forecourt with radios and revving engines causing disturbance;
 A 24 hour full time manager should be on site;
 Daily visits by social services will not protect occupants from disgruntled partners causing disturbance.

Amesbury Town Council: No objection.
 Environmental Health: No objection.
 Housing: No observations.
 Wiltshire CC Highways: No objection. Adequate parking exists.

MAIN POLICY CONTEXT

G2 - general criteria for development.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Character of the locality and amenity of the street scene; and

Amenities of the occupiers of adjoining and near by property.

Given the residential character of the locality and the elderly persons home to the north, the proposed use of the premises for up to six mothers with babies would be an acceptable alternative residential use. The principle of the use would maintain the residential character of the locality.

The proposed occupants in this instance are a potentially vulnerable group of society. The proposal is small scale and whilst the concerns voiced in correspondence from adjoining occupants is noted, the proposal would comply with the policies of the local plan. However, given these concerns, it may be prudent to attach conditions to any grant of permission. Whilst it would be unreasonable to limit the visiting hours, (or easy to enforce), boundary treatment could be conditioned to 1.8m high close-boarded fences and a condition stating no repairs or maintenance of vehicles to be carried out on the forecourt.

The applicants have submitted correspondence, which explains that the emergency basis upon which former bread and breakfast occupants were placed, is very different to the basis upon which residents will be placed under this proposal.

Environmental Health comment that they have no objection to the proposal. An Environmental Health Officer has visited the premises and is satisfied with the space standards and fire precautions provided for the proposed use. Their records show that there was one complaint from a neighbour regarding noise and disturbance in 2002 but that the matter was resolved.

CONCLUSION

The proposal would meet the policies of the local plan and would be in-keeping with the character of the locality.

RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVE**

FOR the following reasons: The proposal would meet the policies of the local plan and would be in-keeping with the character of the locality.

AND subject 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) Unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority, the rear and flank boundaries shall comprise close-boarded fencing to a minimum height of 1.8m.

REASON: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

(3) The forecourt shall not be used for the repair / maintenance of vehicles or any other mechanical apparatus.

REASON: To protect the amenities of adjoining occupiers.

(4) No part of the front garden shall be used for socialising or as a meeting place.

REASON: To protect the amenities of adjoining residential occupiers.

INFORMATIVES:

This decision has been made in accordance with the following policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan 2003: G2 general criteria for development.

NOTES:

S/2004/517	08/03/2004 08:55:28	03/05/2004 08:55:28	MR F BOTTING
IDMI			J. T. DRISCOLL
Easting: 420059.7	Northings: 137281.7		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -BUILD IN UNDER 1ST FLOOR BEDROOM TO FORM FAMILY ROOM. CONSTRUCT 2 DORMERS TO REPLACE EX-VELUX WINDOWS.
LOCATION:	15 CHURCH ROAD IDMISTON SALISBURY SP4 0AZ

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Contrary to PC's recommendation

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

15 Church Road is a detached property located in an elevated position within the HPB of Idmiston and a Special Landscape Area.

The roofspace has been converted into residential accommodation with rooflights added to the roofslopes and has been extended at the rear with an unusual flat roof first floor extension supported by brickwork columns.

The garden continues to rise at the rear of the plot with open countryside beyond.

THE PROPOSAL

It is proposed to replace the two existing velux rooflights with flat roofed dormer windows and to infill underneath the first floor extension to provide a family room.

PLANNING HISTORY

1983/986 Extension to house AC 09.09.83

1988/1992 Extension to form bedroom AC 29.11.88

1989/862 Erection of garage AC 08.06.85

90/571 Change existing flat roof to pitched roof AC 18.05.90

CONSULTATIONS

None

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	Yes, expiry date 14.04.04
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes, expiry date 01.04.04
Neighbour response	No
Parish Council response	OBJECT

Apart from the site plan being out of date showing a very different property and no garage in front of the building we note that the proposed front dormer will be facing No11 and will directly overlook the property and garden.

We would prefer this dormer to be removed from the application.

MAIN ISSUES

Scale, design, impact upon residential amenity

POLICY CONTEXT

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The property forms a t-shape, and the proposed dormer windows will replace existing velux rooflights to the south facing roofslope of the projecting part of the dwelling to the front elevation and a rooflight on the rear facing roofslope overlooking the rear garden.

The neighbouring dwellings are also bungalows and No 11 to the east of the site has flat roof dormer windows to the front roofslope. The proposed dormer windows will have flat roofs, which although are not of architectural merit, are considered appropriate to the overall appearance of the dwelling and street scene.

The Parish Council have objected to the application on the grounds that the dormer window to the south facing roofslope will overlook the neighbouring dwelling No 11. However, No11 is set further back from No 15 and whilst the dormer window will overlook the driveway and garage of the property, it will not directly look into living space, and in light of it replacing an existing velux rooflight which already overlooks this area, it is not considered that residential amenity will be significantly adversely affected to warrant refusal of the application.

It should also be noted that there have been no objections to the proposal from the neighbouring residents.

It is considered that the proposal to infill beneath the existing first floor extension at the rear to provide a family room will not have any adverse impacts to residential or visual amenity built with matching brickwork and a high level window to the north elevation.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that the proposed ground floor rear infill extension will have no adverse impacts to residential or visual amenity and the dormer windows will be appropriate to the overall appearance of the dwelling and street scene and will not have a significant adverse impact upon residential amenity through overlooking the warrant refusal of the application.

RECOMMENDATION: **APPROVE:** for the following reasons

The proposed ground floor infill extension will have no adverse impacts to visual or residential amenity and the proposed dormer windows are considered appropriate to the overall appearance of the dwelling and street scene and will not have a significant adverse impact upon residential amenity through overlooking.

And subject 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.

(2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external walls of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building

Reason: To ensure that the proposed extension will satisfactorily harmonise with the external appearance of the existing building.

And in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan: G2 (General), H16 (HPB), C6 (SLA), D3 (Extensions)

NOTES:

S/2002/1650	27/08/2002	22/10/2002	JS BLOOR (NEWBURY) LTD & PERSIMMON HOMES (SC) LTD
AMES			TERENCE O'ROURKE PLC
Easting: 416097.634620667	Northing: 139668.639083862		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -SOUTHERN SECTION OF THE AMESBURY LINK ROAD BETWEEN UNDERWOOD DRIVE AND STOCK BOTTOM AND ASSOCIATED MEANS OF DRAINAGE
LOCATION:	BOSCOMBE ROAD (LAND SOUTH OF) AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7LP

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

HDS does not consider it prudent to exercise delegated powers on the basis that this application relates to the outline planning application S/2002/1075, previously determined by the Area Committee.

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site comprises the alignment of the southern section of the Amesbury link road. It follows the route identified within the masterplan that accompanied the outline planning application. The link road will extend from the current termination of Underwood Drive. And form the eastern boundary to the proposed development before connecting into the A.345 at a re-designed and re-aligned junction at Stock Bottom. The setting for the link road adjoins the existing Stockport Road together with the boundary to the Qinetiq Boscombe Down airfield to its eastern edge, and Stockport Road and Stockport Farm employment site to its southern edge. The road crosses Byway 20.

THE PROPOSAL

To construct a 7.3 metre wide road with 3 metre cycleway / footpath to its western edge. To construct 3 roundabouts linking the proposed development into the Amesbury Link Road, together with a new A.345 junction. To construct a sustainable drainage system served by a series of landscaped swales draining surface water close to source. The creation of a crossing for Byway 20 and the construction of a junction (from roundabout2) linking into the existing Stockport Road and the closure of Stockport Road's connection into the A.345.

The application comprises a full planning application as it has been submitted for consideration prior to the final determination of the "parent" application S/2002/1075 which comprised the outline application for the overall development of land South of Boscombe Road for 550 dwellings, southern section of the link road, school, cemetery, playing fields and changing accommodation, community centre, neighbourhood centre, affordable housing and landscaping works.

PLANNING HISTORY

S/02/1075 Outline application for up to 550 dwellings including affordable housing, the southern section of the Amesbury link road and 4 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 and landscape planting, awaiting completion of Section 106 Agreement following Area Committee determination in 2003.

S/02/1651 Primary school and temporary access, approved in principle subject to final determination of the outline application S/02/1075 and completion of associated S.106 Agreement.

CONSULTATIONS

As this application was submitted in full prior to the detailed assessment of the overall development impacts and principles undertaken in relation to the outline application S/02/1075, responses from consultees addressed this application on its “stand alone” merits. As such, responses from Highways Agency, Environment Agency and English Nature raised objections to the full planning application for the southern section of the link road on the basis that it was premature, lacked assessment of the impacts of the road upon the local water environment and cSAC River Avon and lacked a Traffic Impact Assessment.

During the ongoing assessment of the outline application however the initial areas of objection and concerns about the availability of information were addressed. As such, the detailed observations from Highways Agency, Environment Agency and English Nature to the principle of a development that included the Southern Section of the Link Road were addressed by the appraisal of the traffic assessment and its supporting submissions within the outline Environmental Statement together with the assessment of the developments impacts upon the River Avon in terms of water management and sustainable drainage proposals contained within the report to the Northern Area Committee considered in October 2003.

WCC Highways - The drawings submitted with this proposal have been refined during liaison between the applicant’s highways consultant and the WCC consultant such that horizontal and vertical alignments of the link road meet contemporary standards, practices and requirements and is capable of delivering the function for which it is required. Accordingly I raise no objections to the proposal and have no specific conditions to apply given the conditions and triggers that apply to S/02/1075. It should be noted however that the developer will be required to enter into a Section 278 Agreement with the County Council prior to development commencing arising from the carrying out of highway works.

Highways Agency - considered this application in light of the Traffic Assessment submitted in support of the outline application. No comments to make upon this proposal.

WCC Library/ Museum - An archaeological evaluation is required along the line of the proposed road. This is required prior to determination of the application. (Note, this comment was issued prior to extensive evaluation being undertaken as a part of the overall outline application. This wider evaluation resulted in a further watching brief being required for the overall site, as well as the need to produce the results in the form of a public report to be lodged with the County Council.

English Heritage - Initial objection to the submission of a full application for the road in the absence of an evaluation of the archaeological interests along the road’s alignment. As with the WCC Archaeology response, further work relating to the outline application resulted in the EH objection being withdrawn for the overall proposal including the principle of the Southern section of the link road

Housing & Health Officer - No response relating to the road design, however the impacts of the road in terms of noise and light impacts was considered as a part of the outline application and measures included within the conditions applied to that scheme. Additionally, conditions relating to hours of operation for the overall scheme need to be applied specifically to this full application.

Environment Agency - Considered that this application needs to be considered in the context of the wider outline application in relation to the impacts upon the cSAC River Avon and the requirement for an Appropriate Assessment of the outline application to determine the significance of surface water drainage issues and pollution prevention of controlled waters. (Note, following detailed assessment, and the completion of an “Appropriate Assessment” the Environment Agency withdrew their holding objection to the outline application and recommended a series of conditions to address the impacts of the development as a whole.)

English Nature - Until the outline application’s overall impacts are determined this proposal is premature. (Note, as with the Environment Agency comments, this initial response to the full road application preceded the fuller assessment of the impacts of the outline application, which included the principle of the Southern section of the link road. The Agencies final response to the outline application raised no objection, subject to conditions that arose from

both the works behind the Appropriate Assessment and the evaluation of the outline application.)

CPRE - No comments upon the detail of the scheme. There is some member concern about the implications of the link road however following discussions with the case officer the intention to build the link road has been known for some time and is a material part of the overall proposal. No objection.

Trail Rider's Fellowship - Concern that plans indicate the Byway as a bridleway. Would object if the application has the effect of downgrading the Byway, however if this description does not affect the legal status of the Byway there is no objection.

Wiltshire Bridleways Association.- Byway 20 is described on plans as a bridleway. There seems to be greater concern for avoiding mud on the road rather than providing adequate safety for users of the Byway crossing the link road. Object to the closing of Stockport Road requiring riders and carriage drivers coming from Durnford to continue along the link road to reach Byways Amesbury 20 and Amesbury 1 (The old Marlborough Road) Would also object to any highway orders to alter the two routes.

Test Valley BC - No comments upon the detailed design of the road

Health & Safety Executive - No objections

MoD Defence Estates - No objection subject to the road or associated structures not exceeding 135 m AOD. The road link and associated structures should be developed in accordance with Air Navigation Order Articles 63 & 110.

Qinetiq - The spur road linking the 7.3 m link road to Stockport road should be 7.3 m width, not the 5.5 m width proposed. The junction radii should be amended to take account of a large HGV tracking diagram to allow safe turns using this spur. The public car par on the spur should be deleted. No lighting should exceed the 6 – 8 m pole height indicated with downward spread only. The swales should be designed for infiltration only and not retention of water. If the spur road width is not amended, Qinetiq objects to the application as it considers that this will prejudice the degree of accessibility required for the long-term use of this MoD facility in the national interest.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement Yes – Expired 03/10/02

Site Notice displayed Yes – Expired 03/10/02

Departure No

Neighbour notification Yes – Expired 23/09/02

Neighbour response Yes – Letters of objection received from 25 properties relating to:

Issues of principle.

- Not aware of the link road when purchasing property.
- The link road should be separated out from residential properties.
- Concern about the future safety of users of the double roundabout on Boscombe Road.
- Query traffic forecasts in Amesbury given developments at Solstice Park and Stonehenge Visitors Centre.
- Diversion of HGV from town centre will detract from residential amenity.
- Should consider alternative routes including Stockport road, via Qinetiq and east of housing north of Qinetiq main gate.
- Signage will promote use as through route.
- Impact upon amenity of existing residents.
- Link road will split the town.
- Need for weight restriction upon users.
- Increased risks to children.
- ES fails to address sensitivity of certain receptors.
- Need for wider cycle lanes outside the application site.
- Need additional screening along Pendragon Way (east) and Beyer Road junction with roundabout 1.

Issues relating to the road's design.

- Traffic calming and roundabouts should not be necessary on a well designed road.

- Provision of footway to one side of link road is unacceptable.
- Indicated speed limit is too high.
- Speed limit should change east of roundabout 1, not on Underwood Drive.
- Inadequate footpath crossings, including link to Stockport road employment units.
- Concerns about possible creation of new access into Qinetiq from spur connection to Stockport Road.
- Hours of construction require control.
- Inadequate publicity for application.
- Adverse impact upon users of the Byway
- Risk of traffic accidents at Roundabout 1 impacting upon properties in Beyer Road.
- Noise impacts from vehicles slowing down.
- No specific proposals to upgrade link road outside the application site.

Additionally, a petition with 305 signatures was submitted objecting to the diversion of HGV traffic off the A.345 and along the new link road.

Parish Council response Yes – (on initial drawings) Need for clarification over the connection into Stockport Road. Need strict controls over whole length of link road to protect well being & safety of residents, particularly on the length from Folly Bottom to Underwood Drive. A lower speed limit should be imposed along the roads length. This is important where the junction with Byway 20 occurs. Provision should be made for a crawler lane link into the A.345. road signing should be for local destinations only. No objection to revised drawings.

MAIN ISSUES

1. Principle
2. Design and number of junctions
3. Relationship to the Outline application's Environmental Statement
4. Drainage
5. Lighting
6. Design of spur link to Stockport Road
7. Landscaping
8. Signage
9. Design of Stock Bottom junction

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP

- G1 General principles for development,
- G2 General criteria for development,
- G4 Water environment,
- G6 Sustainable Drainage designs,
- D1 Design, extensive development,
- H9 Land South of Boscombe Road allocation to include link road,
- E8 Employment land at Solstice Park,
- C18 Conservation of water quality,
- TR19 A.345 Amesbury Link road,
- R17 Public rights of way.

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

1. Principle.

This proposal has been submitted as a full planning application. The reason for this approach was to place the detailed designs in the public domain at the earliest opportunity, and to remove possible delays in determining the road design once the principle of the completion of the Amesbury link road had been determined as a part of the wider assessment of application S/02/1075.

The outline application for up to 550 dwellings including affordable housing, the southern section of the Amesbury link road and 4 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 and landscape planting was determined by the Northern Area Committee in October 2003. The committee resolved to grant consent subject to the applicant entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement relating to community and off site infrastructure delivery.

The application was referred to GOSW under the Greenfield Directive. GOSW resolved not to call the application in for determination by the ODP. This means that once the S.106 Agreement is completed, SDC is able to issue the outline planning permission, confirming the series of principles for the subsequent development of this site.

A number of public responses submitted in response to this application's consultation process relate to the issues of principle addressed during the determination of the outline application. These include, the need for a link road, alternative routes to the current proposal, trip generation including other developments in the Amesbury area, off site highway improvement requirements, improvements to boundary screening, local destination signage only, and searches.

Given the adoption of both the Local Plan and Development Brief for this site, both of which require the provision of the final section of the Amesbury link road, and the approval, subject to a S. 106 agreement for the outline application, the detailed road designs accord with planning policy and the provisions of the outline application.

2. Design and number of junctions.

The route of the southern section of the link road comprises the eastern boundary to the overall housing development. Apart from the spur link to Stockport Road, Byway 20 and the Stockport Farm employment area therefore there are few reasons to cross the route of the southern section of the link road. This more uninterrupted nature is reflected in the designed speed which is capable of increasing to the east of Roundabout 1 where the route no longer runs through residential areas.

The provision of a 3 metre wide cycle / footway to the west side of the southern section of the link road likewise reflects the lack of destinations located to the east of the road and the limited reasons to use the eastern road edge.

The inclusion of 2 junctions between the Underwood Drive junction and A.345 Stock Bottom junction provide some traffic calming and deterrent to use as a through route, but more importantly, provide residents of the development with a greater range of opportunities to access both the development and wider road network, reducing potential bottlenecks as key junctions.

3. Relationship to the Outline application's Environmental Statement.

The Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment)(England and Wales) Regulations 1999 establishes the principles and processes whereby the need for development proposals to be accompanied by Environmental Statements can be established.

This application does not comprise a Schedule 1 development where an EIA is automatically required. As an infrastructure project in excess of 1 hectare it does however fall within the scale of project covered by Schedule 2 where an EIA may be required by the Local Planning Authority.

Before determining this application therefore the Planning authority needs to consider whether this full planning application for the southern section of the Amesbury link road requires an EIA in its own right.

Were this proposal to be a stand alone project, the relationship of the development to the River Avon cSAC & SSSI would suggest that an EIA could be requested given the sensitivity of the application sites' context.

As has been clarified in Section 1 above, this application has been brought forwards as a full application to facilitate early assessment of the design detail and to allow for an early decision to

be achieved. The impacts of the link road's completion are assessed within the Environmental Statement that accompanied the outline proposal S/02/1075. The necessary information to allow for the environmental impacts of the detailed road proposal is therefore in the public domain and has been assessed by the Local Planning Authority, in conjunction with its consultees.

The re-submission of the traffic, noise air quality and water management assessments already made in support of the outline application would not therefore add to the quality of decision making in determining either the outline application or the full detailed designs for the link road. Furthermore, given that the link road has no status as a proposal within the County Council's roads capital programme, its development will not take place until the developer has consent for the wider residential development that will fund this element of the infrastructure works required via the S.106 Agreements.

To this end therefore officers consider that the road will not be developed in advance of the grant of outline consent for S/02/1075. That application has facilitated the Planning Authorities assessment of the link road's environmental impacts. There is therefore no benefit to the quality of the decision making process that would be achieved by re-submitting elements of the wider EIA in support of this full planning application.

4. Drainage.

The outline application, and the Appropriate Assessment considered the use of a sustainable Drainage approach to the treatment and disposal of surface water. This application proposes a series of swales located alongside the road to allow for immediate local discharge and infiltration. As such, the development accords with best practice for surface drainage and meets the general aspirations of the Environment Agency in this respect. Qinetiq has raised concerns that the drainage solution will result in standing water thereby attracting birds and causing risks from bird strike. The percolation tests carried out by the applicants as a part of their EIA indicate good drainage capabilities and the lack of standing water. Further details relating to the design of the swales will be required by condition. Additionally, the landscaping proposals will also address the need to avoid bird friendly environments, again to address Qinetiq concerns.

5. Lighting.

The design of the road lighting system is important in 2 respects, it will impact upon the adjoining airfield and will impact upon the wider landscape impact in terms of potential uplight.

Qinetiq accept the height of lighting columns, however further details are required to ensure that the type of lighting and management of light spread and downlight addresses both objectives identified above. Conditions relating to the outline consent address this point. These conditional requirements need to be equally applied to the road proposals.

6. Design of spur link to Stockport Road.

The application indicates a 5.5 m wide road connecting the link road to Stockport Road at roundabout 2. The design of this connecting element has raised an objection from Qinetiq on the basis that it should also be of 7.3 m width to better facilitate the long term access and management of the Boscombe down site which is now managed by Qinetiq under a 25-year management arrangement with the MoD.

This requirement by the adjoining landowner has not been accepted by the applicant who has designed the junction to WCC Highway requirements as a facility capable of accommodating HGV traffic.

WCC Highways equally do not support the request to increase the width to the proposed connecting Road. Minor amendments to the road's radius can however be resolved via the detailed drawings to be submitted to the Highways Authority as a part of their S.278 Agreement as the adopting and managing Authority for the link road.

Policy E 8 of the Adopted SDLP includes provision for a connection through the employment park site into Boscombe down. The Highways Authority considers this to be a preferred future

point of access for any re-development of Boscombe Down airfield, allowing HGV and other traffic to access the airfield using the employment park estate roads.

Should Qinetiq wish to promote an alternative access arrangement then as a part of their proposals they could promote the necessary off site highway works as a part of their application.

Given that the road proposals meet with the requirements of the statutory consultee and the design needs of the road network, and the opportunity for Qinetiq to propose their own enhancement measures if they wish to develop access arrangements via the southern section of the link road, this objection by Qinetiq does not represent a ground for refusal.

7. Landscaping.

The outline proposal requires a comprehensive landscape design and management proposal, and the requirement submitted by Qinetiq for landscaping proposals to adopt a non “bird friendly” approach, there is a need for this scheme to include a requirement for landscape design and maintenance proposals for those areas of soft landscaping that form part of this full application.

These details will also address the planted treatment for the drainage swales.

8. Signage.

Within the outline application, consultations with both the County Council and highways Agency confirmed that the link road would be signed for local traffic only and not be signed as a part of a wider connecting network. Again, those requirements need to be replicated within the conditional controls relating to this scheme.

9. Design of Stock Bottom junction.

The Wiltshire Bridleways Association has objected to the design for this junction on the basis that it requires horse / carriage users approaching from Durnford to use the link road for a significant distance before being able to safely access the closed off Stockport Road.

The applicant has acknowledged this issue and will amend the design and location of crossings to facilitate more immediate access onto Stockport Road. This issue should be controlled by condition.

CONCLUSION

Following the determination of the outline planning application S/02/1075, this full proposal for the link road will in effect represent a reserved matters submission.

The principles established by the determination of the outline application confirm the principle of the link roads' completion, general alignment and number of junctions.

The Highways Authority has required a sum of money via the S.106 Agreement relating to the outline application to address off site highway requirements resulting from the completion of the link road.

The detailed design of the link road has been amended to address initial concerns from the Highways Authority and is now considered to be acceptable for the purpose proposed.

The issue of speed restrictions is for the Highways Authority to resolve rather than for the District Council to condition.

Signage and lighting are issues for liaison between the District and County Council's. The controls established through the outline approval need to be repeated for this application.

Notwithstanding the Trail Riders concerns, the reference to a bridleway on the submitted plans does not confer any changed legal status upon the Byway 20.

RECOMMENDATION: Subject to the satisfactory completion of the Section 106 Agreement in relation to S/2002/1075, and the subsequent issue of that notice of decision then

APPROVE subject 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) The development hereby approved shall accord with the levels indicated on the approved plans unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure the Local Planning authority retains control over the development.

(3) Before development commences further details of crossing measures to facilitate access by horse and carriage drivers to Stockport Road, when approaching from and across the A.345 shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall thereafter accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the highway safety of all modes of use for the southern section of the Amesbury Link Road and associated Byways and Bridleways.

(4) The details of all lighting proposals, including street lighting, lighting for footpaths and byway 20, including the intensity of the lighting, controls over uplighting and design for light columns shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement 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.

(5) 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 landscape planting proposals to include species, heights and densities, measures to protect new planting, the landscaping and planting proposals for all open surface drainage solutions together with the landscaping within the central island for the roundabouts included within the approved development.

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.

(6) 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.

(7) 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.

(8) Before development commences, full details of any fencing or screening required to serve the roadway or associated landscaping or surface water drainage measures shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the development shall thereafter accord with the approved scheme.

Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the setting.

(9) The developer shall afford access at all reasonable times to any archaeologist nominated by the Local Planning Authority, and shall allow him to observe the excavations and record items of interest and finds. (X02A)

Reason: 0121 To ensure that the archaeology of the site is adequately recorded.

(10) The development shall accord with a Code of Construction Management to be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Additional details will be submitted to, and approved in writing prior to the commencement of 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.

(11) 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 residents also served by the link road.

(12) Before development commences, a scheme for the discharge and attenuation of surface water from the 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.

(13) 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.

Reason: In the interests of protecting the water environment serving the cSAC River Avon and other water resource users.

(14) 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

INFORMATIVE:

This permission has been taken in accordance with the following policy/policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

- G1 General principles for development,
- G2 General criteria for development,
- G4 Water environment,
- G6 Sustainable Drainage designs,
- D1 Design, extensive development,
- H9 Land South of Boscombe Road allocation to include link road,
- E8 Employment land at Solstice Park,
- C18 Conservation of water quality,
- TR19 A.345 Amesbury Link road,
- R17 Public rights of way.

NOTES: