

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

NORTHERN AREA – 14/10/04

Note: This is a précis of the Committee report for use mainly prior to the Committee meeting and does not represent a notice of the decision

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

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO OFFICER	LOCATION	REC	PARISH / WARD	PAGE NOS	WARD & COUN- CILLORS	NOTES
1	<b>SV</b> <b>S / 2004 / 1745</b> Ms S Waaldijk	FOX AND SONS 55 EAST GOMELDON ROAD GOMELDON	REF	IDMI	2-7	UPPER BOURNE, IDMISTON & WINTERBOURNE Councillor Mr Hewitt Councillor Mr Wren	
2	<b>S / 2004 / 1883</b> Miss J Boustead	XIAOYE WEN LINLEY HIGH STREET PORTON	REF	IDMI	8-10	UPPER BOURNE, IDMISTON & WINTERBOURNE Councillor Mr Hewitt Councillor Mr Wren	
3	<b>S / 2004 / 1565</b> Mr S Llewelyn	MR I HUNTER 69 BULFORD ROAD DURRINGTON	APPC	DURR	11-19	DURRINGTON Councillor Mr Baker Councillor Mr Bojdys Councillor Mrs Greville	
4	<b>SV</b> <b>S / 2004 / 1853</b> Mr A Madge	MR ANDREW RHIND-TUTT HILL VIEW BOURNE VIEW ALLINGTON	A106	ALLI	20-24	UPPER BOURNE, IDMISTON & WINTERSBOURNE Councillor Mr Hewitt Councillor Mr Wren	

END OF LIST

# Schedule Of Planning Applications For Consideration

*In The following Order:*

Part 1) Applications Recommended For Refusal

*Part 2) Applications Recommended for Approval*

*Part 3) Applications For The Observations of the Area Committee*

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

## *ABBREVIATIONS USED THROUGHOUT THE TEXT*

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

## Part 1

### Applications recommended for Refusal

Item No.	Case Officer	Contact No.
----------	--------------	-------------

App.Number	Date Received	Expiry Date	Applicant's Name
Ward/Parish	Cons.Area	Listed Agents	Name

### Proposal Location

1	Case Officer Ms S Waaldijk	Contact No 01722 434388	1
---	-------------------------------	----------------------------	---

S/2004/1745	11/08/2004	06/10/2004	FOX AND SONS
IDMI			NIGEL LILLEY
Easting: 418811.8	Northing: 135643.1		

PROPOSAL:	CHANGE OF USE -DEMOLITION OF SHOP, ERECTION OF 2 STOREY DWELLING WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE AND ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS
LOCATION:	55 EAST GOMELDON ROAD GOMELDON SALISBURY SP4 6LT

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Wren has requested a site visit and that this item be determined by Committee (27.9.04) on the following grounds: -

“ .... on the grounds of high local interest, a very prominent position and possible loss of amenity”

## SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site is occupied by a single storey, flat roofed, detached, retail outlet, sited well back from the footway. The building is unoccupied and was last occupied (lawfully), as a retail outlet for groceries and household products.

Land levels rise towards the north of the site and significantly towards the west where there is a steep embankment and bridge.

The locality is residential in character consisting predominantly of detached bungalows. Those on the northern side of East Gomeldon Road are sited further back from the highway than the application shop and do not have dormers. Those on the southern side tend to be chalet bungalows with feature dormers and are situated significantly closer to the highway. There are no alternative shopping or other community facilities within the locality.

To the west of the site, at No 51 is a small detached bungalow (with no accommodation within the roof). Principal windows to the eastern elevation serve a living room and a kitchen. The main outlook for these windows would be onto the rear / western elevation to the application premises.

The site is within Gomeldon Housing Policy Boundary and a Special Landscape Area as delineated on the Proposals Map.

East Gomeldon Road is a quiet rural road. It is not heavily parked or trafficked and most properties have off street parking.

## THE PROPOSAL

This application seeks full planning permission for a change in the use of the site from retail (use class order classification A1), to residential by way of a detached 4-bed house with integral garage.

The building would be sited between 9.1m and 13.2m from the back of the footway.

The applicant has submitted the following information regarding the marketing of the property:

1. Sales particulars detailing site.
2. Letter stating sign was placed to front of site (no dates given).
3. Chartered accountant details from former site owner stating that for the years of 2000 to 2003 the property showed a low turnover and that the property was for sale for many years but there was no offers. No sales details have been submitted for these years.
4. Statement that the site has been advertised in window of Fox and Sons and two websites.
5. Salisbury Journal every third week (no paperwork submitted to support this).

The applicants have submitted supplementary information dated 24<sup>th</sup> September 2004, as follows: -

1. Paperwork and statement that a 'for sale' sign was in situ for over 4 months;
2. Advert from The Journal dated April 1<sup>st</sup> 15<sup>th</sup> & 29<sup>th</sup>, May 20<sup>th</sup> and June 24<sup>th</sup> 2004.

## PLANNING HISTORY

99/0876                      Application for outline planning permission for the replacement      AC  
30/05/00  
of the existing shop with attached 3 bed bungalow to rear &  
attached garage. This permission was subject to conditions,  
including: -

1. The house and shop be linked in the same ownership and shall not at any time hereafter be sold or let separately,
5. The floor area of the dwelling shall not exceed 100 sq m as measured externally, and not including the proposed garage,
3. The buildings shall be single storey.

03/2077      Demolition of shop; erection of detached dwelling with integral  
garage – no A1/retail proposed.  
11/03/04

WD

*Also of Relevance to this application is the history pertaining to No 65:*

04/0103                      Full permission for the erection of a detached dwelling  
grounds

*Refused on*

on flank garden to house at No 65; erection of *of garage*  
*being forward* detached garage to the front of No 65. *of dwellings in*  
*locality.*

04/1943 Erection of chalet bungalow with integral garage. *Still under*  
 (Application for outline planning application with *consideration*  
 only access and siting of building to be determined  
 at this stage).

## CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways:	Concerns regarding access. Recommend refusal.
Wessex Water Authority:	No objection.
Forward planning:	PS3 has not been satisfied.
Environmental Health:	No objection.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Site Notice displayed	Yes
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes
Neighbour response	One letter has been received stating they support the application and a second objecting on the following grounds: -

Two storey house would be out of character  
 Original permission was for single storey  
 Fence for proposed house has been placed on No 51's property.

Idmiston Parish Council:

"Whilst we would, wherever possible, wish to retain retail premises within our Parish, it would seem unrealistic for this to happen in this instance. We are pleased to note that our earlier objections with regard to access, loss of amenity to number 51 and building line have been taken into account with this latest application.

We would request that permitted development rights are removed should you be minded to approve this application and that the development be subject to R2 contributions"

## MAIN POLICY CONTEXT

PS3 loss of community facility; G1 sustainability; H16 permits housing within Gomeldon Housing Policy Boundary; D2 design; C6 Special Landscape Area – high standard of design with siting and scale sympathetic to the landscape; and R2 off site open space / G9 – planning obligations.

## MAIN PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations are the acceptability of the proposal given: -

The community and sustainability policies of the Local Plan;

The extant permission;

Character of the locality and amenity of the street scene;

Amenities of the occupiers of adjoining property;

Contribution towards open land with respect of Policy R2; and

Highway considerations.

### Community and Sustainability

Local Plan policy PS3 states: -

“In view of the many changes that have taken place in consumer trends in retailing and entertainment, it has been difficult for the traditional village facilities, such as the pub, the post office or the corner shop, to maintain their viability. ... However, where such facilities do still exist, they can contribute towards the sustainability of these settlements by offering an alternative to making longer car journeys for basic requirements as well as contributing to the social life of the people living there”

“ ... Local Plan contains policies to prevent the loss of such facilities except where it can be proven that the facility is unviable and unlikely to become viable in the foreseeable future. The applicant ... will be expected to submit a statement of the efforts that have been made to make the business in question viable.”

The applicant has submitted limited documentation. These are insufficient in that they do not show that the premises have been marketed continuously on the ‘open market’ for a minimum of six to nine months. As a minimum this should be with a local estate agents and include an on site ‘for sale’ sign, which states the site is being marketed for retail purposes (and / or an alternative community facility). The applicants have submitted no information regarding the latter. Nor have they justified the sale price.

The Policy Team have advised that the Estate Agent particulars and a residential web site are not sufficient, especially as there is no evidence that the site has been marketed for an alternative community facility. Further, this is the only community facility serving such a large village.

Were the applicant to meet the requirements of policy PS3, policy H16 allows for housing redevelopment within the Gomeldon Housing Policy Boundary. The principle of housing would therefore be acceptable but only if the policy consideration under PS3 is overcome.

### Extant Permission

In respect of the second consideration, the proposal has significant differences with the approved scheme:

	Approved Scheme	Scheme Withdrawn	Scheme under consideration
<u>Use:</u>	A1 to front with attached bungalow to rear to include garage.	Residential with no A1 use.	House with no A1 use.
<u>Height:</u>	Condition 8 stipulated that the building should be single storey.	Considerable accommodation within roof space.	Large two-storey house.
<u>Siting:</u>	5m from the back edge of the highway.	2.85m from back of highway with significant accommodation above	9.1m from back of highway.

### Character of the locality

The proposed building would not have an acceptable setting within the street scene. Whilst the forward most part would be sited inline with the existing shop, it would be two storeys and

thereby have a significantly greater impact upon the streetscene (and when viewed from adjoining residential premises). Given that the adjoining premises are small bungalows, the siting, form and massing would be incongruous and unacceptably out of character with the locality.

The development would be in conflict with conditions attached to the permission approved in 2000, which states that the building should be single storey.

Given that the site is within a Special Landscape Area, these concerns are of particular pertinence.

#### Amenity of adjoining occupiers

With respect to consideration four, windows proposed in the western elevation could be obscure glazed and fixed shut as they are to a bathroom; a condition could therefore be attached to ensure they would not result in overlooking. However, it would not be good practice to restrict windows to the rear as these would be to bedrooms and would look directly into dining and bedroom windows to the small bungalow to the rear (No 53).

No 51 to the northwest would experience some loss of outlook. No 51 is a small bungalow with limited garden amenity due to the steep bank to the west. The proposed two-storey house would result in some dominance and loss of outlook, which would result in a sense of enclosure, but not to a degree that permission would be refused on these grounds.

#### Amenity of any future occupiers

The proposal would have a very small amenity area for such a large dwelling, particularly given that proposed retaining walls results in a depth of only 3.6m with the upper height of the retaining wall being 1.9m in height.

#### Open Space Provision

The applicant has not made provision for a commuted sum towards off-site recreational open space, in accordance with Local Plan Policy R2.

#### Highways

The proposal would not provide acceptable visibility from the west and highways have recommended that the application be refused.

### CONCLUSION

The application would result in the loss of the only community facility within this large village. The applicant has not submitted documentation to satisfy the acceptability of losing this facility in conflict with the potential viability of the settlement. This is of particular concern given the conditions attached to the former permission and the absence of alternative community facilities within the locality.

### RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

(1) Insufficient evidence has been submitted to illustrate that adequate attempt to market the shop as an existing business, for an alternative community facility or for a dwelling with associated business (in accordance with extant permission 99/0876). Consequently it is considered that the applicants have not proven that the current community use is no longer viable. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy PS3

and G1 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan, which seeks to retain facilities that are central to the economic and social life of the village.

(2) The development by reason of its height, size and siting, would result in a prominent overbearing feature within the street scene, out of character with the locality in conflict with policies D2 and C6 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan 2003.

(3) The proposal would result in the loss of amenity to the occupiers of adjoining residential property by reason of dominance, overlooking and visual intrusion and would not provide sufficient amenity space for such a large house, contrary to policy G2 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan 2003.

(4) The proposal would be contrary to policy R2 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan 2003 in that it does not make provision for a contribution towards the provision of public open space.

(5) The proposed access would provide insufficient visibility to oncoming traffic to the detriment of highway safety.

**INFORMATIVES: -**

Refusal reason No 4 above could be overcome if all the relevant parties can agree a Section 106 Agreement, or, if appropriate by a condition, in accordance with the standard requirement of public recreational open space.

This permission has been taken in accordance with the following policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan 2003: D1 D2 G2 G9 PS3 H16 D2 C6 S10 R2 G2 G6 and G9.

---

**NOTES:**



S/2004/1883	01/09/2004	27/10/2004	XIAOYE WEN
IDMI			MR KEVIN PALMER
Easting: 418807.4	Northings: 136607.6		

PROPOSAL:	CHANGE OF USE -CHANGE OF USE FROM RETAIL SHOP (A1) TO CHINESE TAKEAWAY (A3)
LOCATION:	LINLEY HIGH STREET PORTON SALISBURY SP4 0LH

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Hewitt has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:

- the prominent nature of the site
- the interest shown in the application
- the controversial nature of the application

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Linley is a semi detached development in the centre of Porton that has previously been a retail unit with living accommodation above. To the east of the proposed site is a doctors surgery, to the west and directly opposite are a number of dwellings. There is a parking area in front of the development, which can park up to three vehicles. The proposed site is also adjacent to the conservation area.

### THE PROPOSAL

This application is for the change of use from retail shop (A1) to Chinese takeaway (A3).

### PLANNING HISTORY

S/77/0743 Widening of existing vehicular access and provision of customer car parking  
Approved 16/11/77  
S/04/1513 Change of use from retail shop to Chinese takeaway and restaurant  
Refused 25/08/04

### CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - Object for the following reasons:

The likely vehicular attraction to the proposed development presents a road and pedestrian safety hazard in view of the lack of off-street parking facilities and the substandard nature of the High Street, which is restricted in width with no footpaths.

SDC Conservation - No comments

Environment Health - Object for the following reasons:

Lack of information concerning how the kitchen is to be ventilated, where stocks of food and other catering supplies are to be stored, no indication of what provision will be made for storage and disposal of refuse. Noise is also a concern that the proposed development could give rise to considerable noise nuisance to the surrounding residential properties.

### REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement No  
Site Notice displayed (x2) Yes Expires 07/10/04

Neighbour notification	Yes	Expires 08/10/04
Neighbour Response	Yes	

2 letter of support	Highlighting that it will be an excellent facility within the village
17 letters of objection	Highlighting concerns as outlined below.

#### Traffic

There is already a traffic congestion problem within the High Street of Porton due to the amount of on street parking. The proposal would undoubtedly increase this level of congestion due to the minimal level off site parking. There are currently 3 car parking spaces which will most probably be used by those living in the residential flat above and those working in the takeaway leaving nowhere for the public to park. The Doctors have also expressed that their parking is on private land and therefore should not be used by anybody else other than their staff and patients.

#### Pedestrian Safety

With the increase in traffic parking on the High Street and no public footpaths, it will become increasingly more dangerous to pedestrians, especially school children.

#### Noise

Noise is of concern as the site is surrounded by residential properties. The increase in car and pedestrian movement will undoubtedly increase noise levels during opening times. It is also of concern that the increase in noise levels will be during anti social hours leading to the loss of residential amenity.

#### Other

It has been highlighted that there are already a number of existing takeaways in the nearby towns of Salisbury and Amesbury, majority of whom will deliver. Other concerns have been with food storage and waste disposal leading to a possible increase in litter in the High Street including uneaten food, together with the cooking smells and odours which could subsequently lead to the infestation of rats. It is considered that the proposed takeaway will have an additional affect on drainage which has also been highlighted due to the increase in residential properties in the area. Finally, it was concluded by a resident that although the proposal is not within the conservation area, all the points raised above may impact and overflow into the conservation area.

#### Parish Council Object for the following reasons:

The Parish Council wishes to retain all existing commercial premises within its villages. However, concern is expressed about the impact upon the amenity of close neighbouring residential properties. However this objection is subject to a number of conditions set out below which if satisfied may overcome the objection.

Opening Times should be restricted to – 12:00 – 14:00, 17:00 –22:00 (20:30 on Sunday)

Windows and doors to remain shut during opening times

Proper extraction equipment must be installed to be sure that neighbouring properties are unaffected by fumes, odours and noise.

Rear garden not to be used for refuse or food storage

#### Parish Council Conclusion

Either the permission be granted solely for Chinese Takeaway purposes or the permission granted solely for the applicant. A general A3 usage would permit future use of premises as other types of A3 use which we consider to be totally unsuitable for these premises in this location. It was also stated that a takeaway in terms of traffic would be no worse than the previous newsagent use. The newsagents used to open early and close late as does the existing post office. The surgery is already used informally by the post office/shop customers and residents alike.

## MAIN ISSUES

Highways

Impact upon neighbouring dwellings

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

Adopted SDLP G2 (General), TR11 (Transport)

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The proposed site is contained primarily in a residential area. To the west of the proposal site is a bungalow and directly opposite is a two-storey dwelling. The high street continues onto the West, which is residential and has different housing designs majority of which are incorporated within the conservation area. The proposal is not within but adjacent to the conservation area.

### Highways

Policy TR11 of the Adopted Salisbury Local Plan, which states:

The provision of off-street car parking spaces, on the basis of the guidance given at Appendix V to this Local Plan, will be sought in respect of all new development proposals.

Appendix V explains car-parking guidelines, which are classified according to the Town and Country Planning (Use Class) Order 1987. Highways have also highlighted that a maximum of 9 car park spaces would be required for the take-away and the residential flat in the first floor. Only 3 spaces are available at present, which are situated in front of the building. At the previous Northern Committee it was decided that an agreement should be made with either the doctors surgery or the existing shop for the use of their car park. This has not been brought forward as part of this proposal.

### Impact upon neighbouring dwellings

Noise associated with vehicle movement, car doors slamming and general noise generated by the coming and goings of customers could give rise to a considerable noise nuisance to the surrounding residential properties, especially at antisocial hours.

There is also no indication of how the kitchen is to be ventilated. In view of the close proximity of surrounding residential properties, this will have to be designed with great care to ensure that nuisance is not caused either by cooking odours or noise from the associated plant. It was suggested at the early stages of this application that details referring to this matter were addressed but have not been submitted.

## **Conclusion**

It is considered that the proposal would be detrimental to the character of the locality due to the increase in traffic and on-road parking. There will also be a detrimental impact on neighbouring dwellings in terms of noise.

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

(1) Insufficient information has been supplied with the application for the Local Planning Authority to be satisfied that the proposal will not have an adverse effect upon residential amenity by reason of noise and disturbance and is therefore contrary to Policy G2 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan. Also the likely vehicular attraction to the proposed development presents a road and pedestrian safety hazard in view of the lack of off-street parking facilities and the substandard nature of the High Street, which is restricted in width with no footways.

---

## **NOTES:**



## RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

No previous planning history.

## CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways: No objection, subject to the provision of a second parking space is provided for each of the proposed dwellings.

Wessex Water: No objection. The site lies within a foul sewered area and the developer will need to agree a point of connection. The developer has proposed to dispose of surface water to soakaways and the Council should be satisfied with any arrangement for the satisfactory disposal of surface water from the proposal. A point of connection onto the water supply system should be agreed.

Environment Agency: No observations to make.

Environmental Health: No objection.

Forward Planning: A bank is a central economic function within a community, but given that the property has not been in use for this purpose for over a year and that the limited services that it offered could be met in the Post Office, in this situation a balanced judgement must be made in respect of the application of Policy PS3 to this proposal to safeguard what could be considered a defunct use which would be unlikely to be re-established.

On the matter of marketing for alternative uses this would be a valuable exercise, but if the view is reached that the bank use is not central to the settlement then the wording of Policy PS3 does not necessitate such a marketing exercise to be undertaken.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	Yes - expired 26/08/04
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes – expired 13/08/04
Third Party response	Yes

Two letters of representation have been received in response to the proposed development that have raised the following concerns/objections to the proposed development:

The proposed dwellings at two-storey height will invade the privacy of the neighbouring properties and result in a loss of light to the garden areas;

The two-storey height of the proposed dwellings would be out of keeping with the surrounding properties that are single storey;

The site is located on a busy road and an area of high traffic movements generated by the adjacent Post Office and Co-Op store that already create traffic and on-street parking problems.

The proposed development would exacerbate these existing traffic problems;

The site has always provided an amenity area and it should be kept as such for the benefit of the villagers;

The site is too small to accommodate the development that is proposed;

A fence has already been erected to the boundary of the plot that blocks light to the greenhouse of No73 Bulford Road and in bad weather could be blown down risking damage to the greenhouse.

Parish Council Object on the following grounds:

The proposed development conflicts with the character of the area as the majority of the surrounding properties are single storey;

Loss of retail unit;

Inadequate off road parking; and

The proposal includes gravel beds to the front of the dwellings with open plan frontages.

## POLICY CONTEXT

The following policies of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) are relevant to the current proposal:-  
G1, G2, D2, H16, PS3, TR11 and R2.

## MAIN ISSUES

1. Principle of Development
2. Impact on Street Scene
3. Impact on Neighbouring Amenities
4. Highway Issues
5. Policy R2 - Provision of Recreation Facilities

## PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

### 1. Principle of Development

#### (a) *Loss of Community Facility*

This proposal raises a difficult policy issue.

Policy PS3 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003), which considers development proposals affecting community facilities, is the key consideration in determining whether the loss of the bank and the erection of residential dwellings, in this instance, are acceptable. This policy states that,

*“The change of use of premises within settlements that are currently used, or have been used for retailing, as a public house or to provide a community facility **central to the economic and/or social life of the settlement**, will only be permitted where the applicant can prove that the current or previous use is no longer viable”.*

The supporting paragraphs to this policy acknowledge the difficulties for the traditional village facilities, such as the public house, post office or general store to maintain their viability but identifies the important role that such facilities, where they still exist, have towards the sustainability of these settlements by offering an alternative to making longer car journeys for basic goods/services as well as contributing to the social life of those living in such settlements. However, the supporting paragraphs to this policy also identify that the Local Planning Authority does not wish to enforce the retention of such facilities where they are unviable and unlikely to become viable in the foreseeable future.

The intent of Policy PS3 is therefore obviously to restrict the loss of community facilities, such as the public house or post office, which are central to the economic and/or social life of the particular settlement in which they are located and which are viable. An assessment is therefore needed as to whether the community facility in question is central to the economic and/or social wellbeing and sustainability of the area and, if it is, it must then be demonstrated that the facility is no longer viable and is unlikely to become viable in the future. Consequently, the key issues with regards to this proposal are firstly, whether the bank performed a central role in the economic and/or social life of the settlement of Durrington, and secondly, if Members consider that the bank did perform this central role when open, and would still do so if reopened, whether it is viable.

#### *Is the bank central to the economic/social life of the settlement?*

Clearly it would be difficult to put forward a case that the bank performed a central role in the social life of Durrington and therefore the key question is whether it has a central role to the economic life of the settlement. In response to this question, it is considered that the former bank could not be construed as being central to the economic life of the settlement even though it was the last bank within the settlement. In reaching this conclusion, consideration has been given to the fact that although the closure of this bank has inevitably resulted in the loss of the services that it provided to the community, it has now been closed for a number of months and during this period the settlement of Durrington has not been devoid of banking facilities given the

range of banking services that are available through the Post Office. In this respect, the Durrington Post Office that lies immediately adjacent to the application site provides access to a number of current and basic deposit accounts of the high street banks (see table below) and provides a good range of banking facilities including the ability to deposit and cash cheques, to deposit and withdraw money and to pay bills.

<b>CURRENT ACCOUNTS</b>	<b>BASIC DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS</b>
Alliance and Leicester Barclays Cahoot Co-Operative First Direct Lloyds TSB	Abbey National Alliance and Leicester Barclays Co-Operative Halifax Bank of Scotland HSBC Lloyds TSB National Australia Group – Yorkshire Bank, Clydesdale Bank and Northern Bank Nationwide Building Society Royal Bank of Scotland – Nat West and Ulster Bank

Table 1: Existing high street bank accounts that can be accessed via the Post Office

Furthermore, the Post Office also provides a cash machine that can be accessed with the use of any debit card for the withdrawal of money, while there is also a cash machine available at the petrol filling station at the junction of Larkhill Road and Bulford Road. Given that access is available to this range of high street bank accounts, whereas the former bank only provided services for the customers of that one specific banking company, it is considered that the role of the bank and the relatively limited services that it provided can be largely met via the Post Office and therefore it is not considered that the loss of this facility would jeopardise the vitality and viability of the settlement.

In some respects, an argument could be put forward that the bank is central to the economic life of the settlement as it could provide commercial banking services to business enterprises that might otherwise choose not to locate within Durrington or to move away from the settlement in the absence of such a facility. However, it must be borne in mind that these services would only be available to those commercial customers of that particular banking company, the number of which is likely to be fairly limited. On balance, therefore, it is not considered that this point alone is sufficient to justify that the bank is central to the economic life of the settlement. Furthermore, it could be argued that the provision of banking facilities via the Post Office makes this facility more viable and increases its role to the economic life of the settlement.

On the basis of this assessment that the former bank is not central to the economic and/or social life of the settlement of Durrington, it is considered that the proposed development does not contravene the provisions and objectives of Policy PS3 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) and as such there is no policy requirement for the applicant to demonstrate that the bank is no longer viable and that such a facility is unlikely to become viable in the foreseeable future.

#### *Is the bank viable?*

Whilst it has been assessed that the bank is not central to the economic and/or social life of Durrington in planning and policy terms, if Members reach a contrary conclusion on this issue, it will be necessary to consider whether the bank is viable or whether such a facility is likely to become viable in the future.

No evidence has been submitted in support of this application to demonstrate that the former bank was no longer viable prior to its closure or that such a facility on this site could become viable in the future. However, despite the absence of such information, it must be recognised that the centralisation of banking services to the larger settlements and the closure of the smaller, parochial branches has become more commonplace as banks seek to streamline their operational practices in line with advancing technology, such as internet and telephone banking, for economic reasons. In light of these current trends and given the restricted size of the application premises, it must be acknowledged that it is highly unlikely that a bank would become re-established in this location, albeit that no marketing exercise has been undertaken to

prove that there is no interest from other banks in acquiring these premises. Given these circumstances, it is questionable whether it is actually reasonable to require the submission of a viability report in support of the proposal in any event

*(b) Principle of Residential Dwelling on the Site*

The application site lies within the Durrington Housing Policy Boundary and therefore Policy H16 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) is applicable to this proposal where the principle of infill residential development is considered to be acceptable subject to compliance with various criteria.

2. Impact on Street Scene

Bulford Road is of a mixed character consisting of predominantly residential properties interspersed with commercial premises. The residential properties are of varying types, styles and designs including detached, semi-detached and terraced two-storey houses and detached single storey bungalows. The section of the street scene of Bulford Road in which the application site is located clearly reflects this mixed character of residential and commercial premises of varying scales. At present the site is currently occupied by a small single storey building that to some extent is out of keeping in this street scene by virtue of its small scale, the Post Office store that is located immediately adjacent to the southern side of the site is a fairly substantial building of two-storey height beyond which is the single storey Co-Op store, while Nos71 and 73 Bulford Road to the north and west are both single storey bungalows. Beyond these immediately neighbouring properties, this section of the street scene clearly reflects the mix of single storey and two-storey properties that is characteristic of Bulford Road.

Although it is acknowledged that the proposal seeks outline planning permission with all matters reserved other than means of access, the application has been supported with full elevations and floor plans of the proposed dwellings and a site layout plan that provide a clear indication of the scale, design and layout of the proposed development that the applicant may aspire to achieve on this site. It is therefore considered appropriate that some weight is afforded to these submitted details in assessing this proposal. In this respect, it is considered that the application site could reasonably accommodate two dwellings of the footprint size that has been indicated on the submitted plans, whilst also achieving a suitable level of parking and amenity provision. In terms of the resultant plot sizes, it is considered that while the proposed dwellings would be set in smaller plots than some of the other dwellings fronting onto Bulford Road, some of which occupy substantial plots, it is considered that the proposed development would be in keeping with the plot sizes of other properties that contribute to the established character of the wider surrounding area. Furthermore, it is also considered that the proposed development would conform to the Government guidance contained in PPG3 that advocates that Local Planning Authorities should promote the more efficient use of urban land, whilst providing two smaller and affordable dwellings.

With regards to scale and design, it is evident that the proposed dwellings at two-storey height would inevitably be of a greater overall scale, mass and height than the existing building that occupies the site. Nevertheless, it is considered that the proposed dwellings would not be dissimilar to the scale and massing of other two-storey dwellings in the surrounding vicinity and given the variety and mix of property types and styles that are already evident in Bulford Road it is considered that the proposed dwellings would result in a built form that would sit relatively comfortably in this street scene.

3. Impact on Neighbouring Amenities

With regards to residential amenity, it is again considered appropriate to give some weight to the submitted details in assessing the potential impact of the proposed development upon the amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring properties. In relation to Nos71 and 73 Bulford Road and on the basis of the scale, design and siting of the proposed dwellings as indicated on the submitted plans, it is considered that they would be sufficiently distanced so as not to give rise to a material loss of light/overshadowing. It is also considered that given the separation distance involved, the proposed dwellings would not appear overbearing in relation to No71 Bulford Road. The proposed dwellings, however, would be located in much closer proximity to No73 Bulford Road and would inevitably alter the relationship that currently exists between this



property and the application site. Nevertheless, the proposed dwellings would still be separated from this property by at least 10 metres at their closest point, whilst the orientation of No73 that is angled away from the application site slightly would mean that the natural outlook from the windows in its front elevation towards the proposed dwellings would be somewhat oblique. Given these circumstances, it is considered that the proposed dwellings would not appear unduly dominant.

In relation to the residential property that is located to the rear of the Post Office, given that it is located to the south of the application site it is not considered that the proposed dwellings would result in a material loss of light to the windows that are located in the side facing elevation of this neighbouring property, while a sufficient separation distance would be retained so that it would continue to benefit from an acceptable level of ambient daylight. Furthermore, while the proposed development would be likely to alter the outlook from a ground floor kitchen window in the side elevation of the adjacent dwelling to the rear of the Post Office, it is considered that the resultant relationship that would exist between the two properties is commonplace between residential properties and would not warrant refusal of this proposal.

With regards to the issue of overlooking, it is also considered that the submitted plans, albeit for illustrative purposes only, demonstrate that the proposed dwellings could be accommodated within this site without leading to a material loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. While it is acknowledged that the first floor windows in the rear elevation of the proposed dwellings would allow views towards the neighbouring properties and/or their surrounding amenity areas, it is indicated that they would serve bathrooms and bedrooms (albeit only indicatively at this stage) and given the nature of use of such rooms (not principal habitable rooms) it is not considered that any material loss of privacy would occur. Furthermore, in relation to No71 Bulford Road, any views from the proposed dwellings would also be across a distance of about 30 metres on the basis of the siting as indicated on the submitted plans. In addition, the first floor layout of the proposed dwellings has also been amended so that the bathroom and secondary bedroom are located at the rear, as opposed to the main bedroom, in order to minimise any potential overlooking. The side elevations of the proposed dwellings are also shown to have a blank façade so that no overlooking would occur.

Given the above circumstances, while it is acknowledged that the scale, design and siting of the proposed dwellings could potentially vary from the illustrative details that have been submitted in support of this application at the reserved matters stage, it is considered that the submitted details demonstrate that two dwellings can be accommodated within this site without causing any material harm to the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, the issue of residential amenity will be considered in relation to the detailed proposals at the reserved matters stage.

#### 4. Highway Issues

With regards to the highway considerations, the principle issue for consideration relates to the proposed means of access as detailed approval of this matter is sought by this proposal. In respect of this issue, WCC Highways have recommended that adequate provision be made for two on-site parking spaces per dwelling due to the lack of safe on-street parking in the vicinity of the application site where the carriageway is relatively narrow, a bus stop is located on the opposite side of the road and a zebra crossing is located nearby. Although the submitted plans only indicate the provision of one parking space per dwelling given that the matter of siting has been reserved for later consideration and it is considered that two parking spaces per dwelling could be reasonably accommodated within this site this does not constitute a grounds for refusal of this current outline proposal. Nevertheless, given that this application seeks detailed approval of the means of access it is important to ensure that adequate vehicular access is provided from the highway to serve such a level of on-site parking provision. Consequently, following negotiations with the applicant's agent the submitted plans have been amended to increase the proposed extension of the existing dropped kerb crossing to 4.25 metres instead of 3.0 metres as originally proposed. As a result, it is considered that an acceptable means of access can be provided and there is no highway objection to the proposal.

#### 5. Policy R2 - Provision of Recreation Facilities

In accordance with Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan the provision of recreation facilities must be considered for all proposals for new residential development. This proposal would involve the creation of an additional 2 x 2-bed residential units and therefore a contribution for recreational facilities would be required pursuant to the above policy. This can be secured via a condition of the approval of outline planning permission.

#### 6. Conclusion

Whilst the loss of the former bank use is regrettable given that access is available to a good range of high street banks accounts and services via the adjacent Post Office, it is considered that the role of the bank and the relatively limited services that it provided are largely being met by the Post Office and therefore it is not considered that the bank use is central to the economic life of the settlement of Durrington. As such, it is considered that the loss of the bank, in this instance, does not contravene the provisions and objectives of Policy PS3 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District local Plan (June 2003) and that there is no policy requirement for the applicant to demonstrate that the bank is no longer viable and is unlikely to become viable in the foreseeable future. In officers' opinion, therefore, a refusal of planning permission on the basis of the loss of a community facility would be difficult to substantiate.

Notwithstanding the issues concerning the loss of a community facility, it is considered that on the basis of the submitted plans, albeit that these are for illustrative purposes only in respect of the design and siting of the proposed dwellings, it is considered that the proposed development could reasonably be accommodated within this site without causing any material harm to the street scene of Bulford Road or the amenities of the occupants of the neighbouring residential properties. It is also considered that an adequate means of access to serve the proposed development has been demonstrated, while the requirement for a contribution towards the provision of off-site recreational facilities can be secured via a condition.

#### **RECOMMENDATION                      APPROVE**

#### **REASONS FOR APPROVAL**

It is considered that the bank use is not central to the economic and/or social life of the settlement of Durrington and as such there is no policy requirement for the applicant to demonstrate that the bank use is no longer viable and is unlikely to become viable in the foreseeable future. Consequently, the proposal accords with the provisions and objectives of Policy PS3 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003).

Notwithstanding this issue, it is considered that the site is of a sufficient overall size to accommodate the proposed development and to provide an acceptable level of on-site parking and amenity provision and that the dwellings can be designed in such a manner that they would integrate satisfactorily into the street scene of Bulford Road. In respect of other issues, it is also considered that the proposed development of this site with the erection of two dwellings can be achieved without adversely affecting the amenities of the neighbouring properties, an adequate means of access has been demonstrated, while the requirement for a contribution towards the provision of off-site recreational facilities can be secured via a condition. As such, it is considered that the proposed development complies with Policies G1, G2, D2, H16, PS3, TR11 and R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003).

#### **And subject to the following conditions:**

(1) No development shall take place until approval of the details of the siting, design, external appearance of the building and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called "the reserved matters") have been obtained in writing from the Local Planning Authority and the development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - This condition is required to be imposed by the provisions of Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995.

(2) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission and the development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 5 years from the

date of this permission or before the expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved whichever is the later.

Reason - This condition is required to be imposed by the provisions of Article 4 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995 and Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

(3) Upon approval of the landscaping details (including provision for landscape planting, the retention and protection of existing trees and other site features, walls, fencing and other means of enclosure and any changes in levels) pursuant to Condition 1:

the approved scheme shall be fully implemented with new planting carried out in the planting season October to March inclusive following occupation of the building(s) or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner, or in accordance with a timetable to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority;

all planting shall be carried out in accordance with British Standards, including regard for plant storage and ground conditions at the time of planting;

the scheme shall be properly maintained for a period of 5 years and any plants (including those retained as part of the scheme) which die, are removed or become damaged or diseased within this period shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and the same species, unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation; and

d) the whole scheme shall be subsequently retained.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity, to ensure that the approved landscaping scheme is carried out at the proper times and to ensure the establishment and maintenance of all trees and plants.

(4) The dwellings, hereby approved, shall be occupied until the access as indicated on the approved plan has been constructed and it shall thereafter be retained.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety.

(5) Prior to the commencement of development, details/a plan indicating the positions, design, materials and type of boundary treatment to be erected have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The erection of the approved boundary treatment shall be completed before the dwelling is first occupied. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details, maintained for a period of five years and thereafter retained.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity and privacy for the occupants of the neighbouring properties.

(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or any subsequent re-enactment thereof, no further development permitted by Classes A, B and E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, shall be carried out without express planning permission first being obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason – To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of the amenity of the neighbouring properties and due to the restricted size of the plots.

(7) No development shall take place until details of provision for recreational open space in accordance with Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - In order to comply with the requirements of Policy R2 of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003).

**And in accordance with the following policies of the Adopted Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan (June 2003):**

G1	General Principles of Sustainable Development
G2	General Criteria for Development
D2	Infill Development
H16	Housing Policy Boundary
PS3	Community Facilities
TR11	Provision of Off-Street Parking
R2	Provision of Recreational Facilities

**Informative Notes:**

1. This permission has been taken in accordance with the following policies of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan: G1, G2, D2, H16, PS3, TR11 and R2.

---

**NOTES:**

S/2004/1853	25/08/2004	20/10/2004	MR ANDREW RHIND-TUTT
ALLI			C B DRAUGHTING
Easting: 420307.657728851	Northing: 138941.855028808		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -AMENDMENT TO APPLICATION S/02/0003 TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL BEDROOM ENLARGED KITCHEN AND UTILITY ROOM
LOCATION:	HILL VIEW BOURNE VIEW ALLINGTON SALISBURY SP4 0AA

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Hewitt has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to the controversial nature of previous applications at this site.

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site is located in an elevated position to the north of Boscombe, accessed from Bourne View. The site proposed for development lies within the HPB. It forms part of a larger field, which rises towards the west. At present a basement area has been built on site associated with a previous application S/00/03.

### THE PROPOSAL

This application proposes the construction and enlargement of the previously approved dwelling by means of a further extension to the eastern elevation to include a garage, utility, and kitchen extension to the ground floor and an additional bedroom to the first floor. This will create a five-bedroom property. Including ground floor and basement.

### PLANNING HISTORY

Long planning history: Most recently-  
00/0003 Demolition of existing buildings and construction of two houses and ancillary works. Approved.  
00/2146 Variation to application S/0003 (amended access) Refused  
01/0631 Amended access Approved  
04/0749 Erection of a six-bedroom house (previous permission S/2000/03 refers) Refused (outside the housing policy boundary).

### CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - No Highway objection is raised.

Wessex Water Authority- The development is located within a foul sewered area. It will be necessary for the developer to agree a point of connection onto the system for the satisfactory disposal of foul flows. The developer has proposed to dispose of surface water to 'existing'. As there are no existing public/separate surface water sewers in the vicinity of the site, it is advised that the developer investigate alternative methods for the satisfactory disposal of surface water from the site. Your council should be satisfied with any suitable arrangement for the disposal of surface water.

Environment Agency - The environment agency does not wish to provide any comment regarding the above planning application.

### REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement No  
 Site Notice displayed Yes – Expired 1/10/04  
 Departure No  
 Neighbour notification Yes – Expires 14/10/04  
 Third Party responses Yes 2 letters of objection stating that the proposal will constitute a large development built in a small area of permissible development land, also the size and style would have an adverse effect on the quality of the surrounding landscape. Also wishes to point out that the site has no right of access for vehicles or pedestrians over the private lane to the east and the access would be to the south.  
 The original application was for a building already totally out of keeping with this area, which is predominantly bungalows and three bedroomed council houses. A property of five or six bedrooms could not be expected to blend in and to seek an amendment that will almost double its size is making a mockery of planning regulations. The building proposed cannot be termed a normal family sized dwelling and it is felt that if the building is allowed it could become a guest house, retirement home or similar type of commercial property. The junction of Bourne View with the A338 already constitutes a hazard and additional traffic from any commercial development would create a very dangerous situation.  
 Parish Council response Yes- Object, The site plans are incorrect. The drive and parking to the new application is outside the housing policy boundary. The development is not in keeping with the local area. It is overdevelopment of the plot. Part of the development area is a Greenfield site.

## **MAIN ISSUES**

Scale of development.  
 Impact upon adjoining dwellings.  
 Access.  
 Impact upon setting.

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

Adopted SDLP, G2, D2, H22, H23, R2

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

Scale of Development.

The scheme has been redesigned since the previous planning refusal on the site. The proposed two-storey side extension has now been positioned to the east of the site within the housing policy boundary. The proposed extension has a lower ridgeline than that previously granted permission and the extension is set back from the rear of the house so reducing the overall bulk of the property. Given that this extension will be seen as subservient to that originally granted. It is considered that the overall scale and bulk of this new proposal is acceptable.

Impact upon neighbouring properties.

With regard to the living conditions of adjoining properties, the proposed dwelling would be accessed from the existing driveway. Although an application was submitted to serve this dwelling from another driveway to the east, this was refused and dismissed on appeal because of highway safety and the impact on adjoining properties living conditions. As the dwelling will now be accessed from the south this is likely to cause less disturbance to neighbouring properties. It is however considered appropriate to condition the installation of a fence along the western boundary with neighbouring properties to protect from the glare of vehicle headlights using the access at night and to provide a form of sound barrier to protect the amenities of neighbours.

It is considered that the amenities of the neighbouring recently constructed bungalow at Hillview are unlikely to be effected by the construction of this new extension because there are no windows to the side of the recently constructed dwelling and only one first floor window to this proposal which will face the gable end of the recently constructed dwelling.

Access

Wiltshire County Council has raised no objections to the use of the southern access point to this site for the development. As stated above it is considered unlikely that there would be a significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers from this access.

#### Impact upon setting

The setting includes a wide variety of design themes including short terraces of local authority built housing, individually designed bungalows and chalet bungalows in the more elevated locations and 2 storey units towards the A338 junction. There are no vernacular dwellings within this grouping. The design themes use a simple cottage character for the 2-bed unit and fairly standard chalet solution incorporating return gable. Neither unit will be out of keeping with the scale or design of their setting.

Given the sites elevated position and the amount of land outside the HPB which forms the major part of the same field it will be important to limit the residential garden area to the immediate setting of the dwelling preventing the domestication of a prominent and predominantly rural area.

#### CONCLUSION

The design and layout now adopted enables this dwelling to be constructed without resulting in over development of the site. The design minimises the visual impact of this dwelling particularly in relation to adjoining dwellings. Subject to some improvements to the access, the limited impact that this extension will have is not considered significant.

**RECOMMENDATION:** SUBJECT TO ALL RELEVANT PARTIES ENTERING INTO A SECTION 106 AGREEMENT RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AS SET OUT IN POLICY R2: Then

**APPROVE:** for the following reasons

The proposal is considered to be an acceptable form of development that does not adversely impact upon the amenities of neighbouring properties and accords with policy G2, D2 and H22 of the adopted local plan.

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) 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.

(3) The garage shown on the approved drawing number KD06C shall not be converted into a habitable room without the permission in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To secure the retention of adequate off-street car parking provision

(4) Prior to the dwelling hereby approved being first occupied, the applicant or his successor in title shall peg out, and have agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority the boundaries to the domestic curtilage.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity

(5) Prior to the dwelling hereby approved being first occupied, the applicant, or his successor in title shall submit to and have approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority a landscape management plan for that land which falls within the red line but outside the domestic curtilage approved by condition 3 above and the agreed management plan shall be implemented thereafter unless otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

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

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.

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

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

(8) 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: In the interests of the amenity and the environment of the development.

(9) The building shall not be occupied until the proposed means of vehicular access from the edge of the public highway to the front of the proposed new property has been constructed, surfaced and drained with a tarmac finish in accordance with a scheme which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

(10) Prior to first occupation of the dwelling hereby approved a fence shall be erected along the boundary of the site and access thereto with no's 11 – 14 Bourne View in accordance with details which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the amenity of neighbouring properties

(11) Any gate[s] provided to close the proposed access shall be set a minimum distance of 4.5 metres from the carriageway edge and shall be made to open inwards only. (I09A)

Reason: To ensure that a satisfactory form of access is provided in the interests of highway safety.

(12) Development shall not begin until drainage works have been carried out in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. (L03A)

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



(13) A scheme for the disposal of surface water so as to prevent its discharge onto the highway shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented prior to either of the dwellings hereby approved being first occupied.

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

(14) Before the development hereby permitted commences on the site, a soil survey of the site shall be undertaken and the results provided to the Local Planning Authority. The survey shall be taken at such points and to such depth as the Local Planning Authority may stipulate. A scheme for decontamination of the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing and the scheme as approved shall be fully implemented and completed before any [residential] unit hereby permitted is first occupied (T04A)

Reason: In the interests of health and safety for occupants of, or visitors to, the proposed development.

(15) Notwithstanding the provisions of Class[es] A-H of Schedule 2 (Part 1) to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995, (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), there shall be no extensions to the dwelling(s) nor the erection of any structures within the curtilage unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority upon submission of a planning application in that behalf.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of amenity.

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

Policy  
G2 (General Criteria for Development)  
D2 (Infill Development)  
H22 (Application of Housing Policy Boundaries)  
H23 (Undeveloped land outside HPB)  
R2 (Recreational Open space provision)

INFORMATIVE: - The council asks that the applicant and/ or his successor in title enter into negotiations with the neighbouring property at Green Gables with regards to the access to this site and the future upkeep of the shared driveway.

---

**NOTES:**