

<p style="text-align: center;">NORTHERN AREA COMMITTEE – 14/10/04 SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE</p>

Planslist
Item No.

1. S/2004/1745 - DEMOLITION OF SHOP, ERECTION OF 2 STOREY DWELLING WITH INTEGRAL GARAGE AND ALTERATIONS TO ACCESS AT 55 EAST GOMELDON ROAD, GOMELDON

1. In addition to the replies to consultation noted in the committee report, the following late submissions have been received:

One letter objecting on the following grounds:

- Dwelling would be out of character with bungalows in this rural area
 - Dwelling would be dominant
 - Having lived in the village for 40 years this would be dominant from No 3 Ladysmith.
 - The site may be an eyesore at the moment but this development is not right for it.
2. A copy letter has been received from the applicants, addressed to Wiltshire County Council Highways department, dated 28th September 2004, including a plan showing an alternative layout.

Agent Letter - See Appendix 1

2. S/2004/1883 - CHANGE OF USE FROM RETAIL SHOP (A1) TO CHINESE TAKEAWAY (A3) AT LINLEY, HIGH STREET, PORTON

Neighbour Letter - "As long as I have lived here – nearly 8 years now – the newsagents always closed at 6.00pm during the week and on Saturdays, and before lunch on Sundays. Mr and Mrs Freeman, who live beside the property have stated that they can never recollect the newsagent being open after 6.00pm - and they have lived there for many more than 8 years"

"The doctor, Dr Stanger, has explicitly forbidden the Chinese applicant from using this forecourt or allowing customers to do so."

"In their conditions they suggest that the Chinese Takeaway should open between 5.00pm and 10.00pm and "that this would avoid most rush hour times." This is an inaccurate and illogical statement, and I trust you will discount it."

Neighbour Letter - "The constraints that the Parish Council are outlining would limit the retail use of the property to such an extent that it would not be financially viable for any concern that would be of advantage to the residents of this village. We have an established village stores but it only trades during normal working hours, there is insufficient trade to support a similar outlet so it does limit the scope of use. The village is short of local facilities which are commonplace in normal modern life, cooked food outlets are used frequently by many of the residents but the nearest is in Amesbury."

**NORTHERN AREA COMMITTEE – 14/10/04
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

4. S/2004/1853 - AMENDMENT TO APPLICATION S/02/0003 TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL BEDROOM ENLARGED KITCHEN AND UTILITY ROOM AT HILL VIEW, BOURNE VIEW, ALLINGTON

HDS Note

Additional tabled conditions regarding planning application no S/04/1853

16) There shall be no access to the field to the north and west of the site other than via the gate to the south west of the proposed chalet bungalow, as shown on the submitted plan KD 15. Access to the field via the gate to the north of the bungalow unit shall be permanently blocked up and the gate removed and shall remain so in perpetuity. Details of the nature and form of the blocking up shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority within one month of the date of this decision. The works shall be carried out within three months of the date of their approval.

Reason: In the interests of residential amenity

Neighbour Letter - I wish to object to this application on the grounds that, when planning permission was changed from one three-bedroom bungalow to two chalet bungalows, it was given on the understanding that the smaller house was 2 bedroom and the larger one to be a 4-bedroom property. The first house has 4 bedrooms and Mr Rhind-Tutt is now, again, trying to enlarge his second property, this time by almost a third. Bourne View is a narrow cul-de-sac, with heavy vehicular traffic for its size. Mr Rhind-Tutt has put on the application space for 5 cars. The whole plan is far too large for the area and has the potential, if he is given permission to enlarge the proposed property, to create a lot more traffic. When he bought the land, he knew that permission had only been granted for one bungalow. He has managed to enlarge this to two but now wishes to build a property that is not only much larger than the surrounding properties but will dominate the area. I trust the Planning Department will stick to the original permission and not allow this latest attempt to enlarge this proposed property.

Appendices (1)