



Northern Area Committee

Minutes

9th December 2004 4.30pm

The George Hotel

Amesbury

These minutes should be kept for use by District Councillors at the next Council meeting

Present:

Chairman: Councillor M A Hewitt

Vice Chairman: Councillor C Mills

Councillors: M Baker, J Brady, D W Brown, Mrs J Greville, J Noeken, A Peach, J Spencer, I West, F Westmoreland, T Woodbridge and K Wren.

Parish and Other representatives:

Mr G Burt (Bulford), Mrs J Swindlehurst (Amesbury), Mr S Stubbs (Newton Tony)

Apologies:

Councillor H Bojdys

MINUTES NOT REQUIRING COUNCIL APPROVAL

282 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

None

283 COUNCILLOR STATEMENT/QUESTION TIME

Councillor Wren requested that the update on the development of the DSTL facility at Porton Down return to the Northern Area Committee agenda as a regular agenda item for the coming months to ensure that members are kept fully informed of any developments.

Councillor Mills requested advice from the Head of Legal and Property Services regarding the licence for Riggsy's nightclub in Amesbury. At a meeting of the Northern Area Committee on 29th April 2004 it was resolved that Mr Riggs' licence be extended for a period of 6 months after which time it was to be reviewed by the Northern Area Committee. This item was therefore scheduled to be considered at the December Northern Area Committee meeting. However, members had been sent a letter advising them that due to Mr Riggs not having received the letter instructing him of the upcoming review, he was given a further month. Councillor Mills questioned whether this would affect Mr Riggs' ability to operate over the Christmas period. The Head of Legal and Property Services informed members that the minute implied that the licence could continue until the Northern Area Committee undertook the review.

284 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED - That the minutes of the meeting of the 11th November 2004 be **approved** as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

285 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Noeken declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the Councillor's question relating to the Public Entertainment Licence for Riggsy's as he and his wife are frequent visitors to the King's Arms and know Mr Riggs. In addition, Councillor Noeken was a founder member of the Amesbury 2000 Millennium Committee, which erected a Celtic cross for which Mr Riggs was the principal donor. He therefore withdrew during the discussion.

286 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman informed members that he had presented a bottle of wine to the former Legal Services Manager upon her departure from the Council in recognition of all her help and hard work over many years. She had sent a card of thanks to all members of the Committee which was passed around to all members.

287 RELEASE OF R2 FUNDS IN AMESBURY

The Committee considered the previously circulated report of the Development Contributions Officer. The Mayor of Amesbury, Mrs Swindlehurst, stated that this was a project which would be of major benefit to young people in Amesbury and she urged the members to approve the release of the funds.

RESOLVED - that £74,985.00 of the 'R2' contributions be released to assist the funding of the recreation scheme outlined in the report, and that the release of the monies be made following receipt of invoices for the works undertaken.

288 RAISING THE AUTHORISED LIMIT FOR R2

The Northern Area Committee considered the previously circulated report of the Development Contributions Officer.

Councillor Noeken informed the Committee that this was just one of a range of measures to improve the Council's R2 policy many of which had been undertaken already, and many more of which would be developed in 2005. In addition he added that the Planning and Economic Development Scrutiny Panel had just completed its review of the R2 policy and had suggested many of the changes.

RESOLVED- That the report noted and it be recommended to Cabinet that:

(1) The local member/s be consulted where a project costs between £10,000 & £30,000 and if an objection is raised, the project be referred to the area committee for determination.

(2) To increase the delegated spending limit for the release of S106 contributions to £30,000.

289 DURRINGTON SWIMMING POOL MANAGING BODY MINUTES

Councillor Ian West, the Chairman of the Durrington Swimming Pool Managing Body, informed the Committee that the Managing Body were very concerned that the state of Recreation Road was compromising the users of the pool as well as the school. The letters to the Chief Executives of both Wiltshire County Council and Salisbury District Council had been sent. Dr Keith Robinson had sent a holding letter back to Cllr West and the Northern Area Committee would be kept fully informed of all the developments.

Councillor Wren stated that he knew the issue was being discussed at both the County and the District Council. He stated that if Councillor West felt that the issue was being delayed he should contact Councillor Wren who would ensure it was restarted.

Councillor West also stated that there were many initiatives at both Durrington, and Five Rivers, such as free or discounted swimming sessions for mothers and babies, that the community did not know about. Therefore he asked that any members who knew the names of editors of village and parish newsletters pass these details to Sara Draper who would liaise with the marketing manager at Five Rivers and arrange for adverts to be placed in any possible local publications. However, Councillor West did explain that there was no money available for this and it would be on the goodwill of the editors.

Councillor West also wanted to send his thanks and congratulations to the staff of the Durrington Swimming Pool who had all taken on the extra duties associated with the takeover of Five Rivers in a most professional and commendable manner.

Councillor Baker explained that he attended in the Managing Body in the capacity as a WCC member not a District Council member and asked that this be noted in the minutes.

RESOLVED – that the minutes be noted.

290 ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE

The Committee considered the previously circulated report of the Principal Planning Officer (Enforcement).

The Officer informed members that it was becoming increasingly attractive for developers to appeal decisions because the increased volume of appeals meant that the Planning Inspectorate was typically taking longer to decide cases and therefore there was an extended period in which developers did not have to comply where enforcement action had been initiated.

Many members were very pleased to see the robust and proactive approach to enforcement that the Enforcement Team were taking.

One member asked what would be done if an applicant refused to comply with letters instructing them to remove a structure or a sign for example and then subsequently applied for planning permission for the said development. The Officer commented that the Enforcement Team would usually take the pragmatic approach of waiting for the outcome, or suspected outcome, of the application before embarking on enforcement proceedings.

Members asked questions about the fees collected and the fines levied in terms of who they are awarded to and how much the Council receives. The Officer informed members that the Council is awarded all the costs but the government receives the fines that developers are charged for breaches of planning conditions. The officer further explained that the Council uses its own lawyers to proceed against developers but that a systematic audit of how much an enforcement case actually costs in terms of officer time as well as financial costs had yet to be done. He did comment that a much more robust system was being developed at present for monitoring this.

Members felt reassured that any conditions that were placed on applications would be strictly adhered to in the future and officers were urged to keep a close eye on known offenders.

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

291 S/2004/2117 - FULL APPLICATION - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HOUSE AND GARAGES AND ERECTION OF TWO NEW DWELLINGS: PARKHOUSE GARAGE PARKHOUSE CORNER ROUNABOUT CHOLDERTON SALISBURY SP4 0EG – FOR MS W CALLOWAY

The Committee considered the previously circulated report of the Head of Development Services.

RESOLVED:

- (1) That the above application be **REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. 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 policy E16 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.

- (2) That the applicant be informed of the following:
1. that this decision has been taken in accordance with the following policies of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan: G1, G2, H22 and H23, H30, C1, C2, C6, G8, R2
 2. that the applicant be informed that in order to overcome this reason for refusal the site will have to be marketed as an employment use for a period of 6-9 months.

292 UPDATE ON SOLSTICE PARK DEVELOPMENTS

The Principal Planning Officer informed members that three developments had been granted planning consent. Two were for B1, B2 and B8 uses and one was for a 149 bed hotel. He informed members that the developers of the hotel had since applied to vary the application on half of the site and this application was currently under consideration as listed below.

The current applications under consideration are 04/777 – Proposed 149 bed hotel, family pub and restaurant (A3) associated parking, landscaping and accessways with detailed drainage proposals. (Brewers Fayre to take on pub use and pizza hut to take on restaurant use) The filling station operator is not yet known.

04/2203 – Proposed development for B1, B2 and B8 uses (Naish Felts and Wallgate) currently awaiting consultation responses.

04/2424 – Proposed new building to accommodate Tintometer (currently located off Southampton road) waiting to be approved awaiting further information re highways access.

Members felt that the level of interest shown in the site by developers was very encouraging. Members were also informed that Amesbury Town Council had seen the above proposals and had no objections to them.

Some members were concerned that the agreed sequence for developing the site was not being adhered to and that some developments were being marketed out of sequence. However, other members commented that it did not matter if sites were being marketed out of sequence as this did not amount to planning permission and no development could be undertaken without this permission.

293 EXEMPT INFORMATION

RESOLVED - that the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of agenda item 15 on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined within Part 1 of Schedule 12A inserted into the Local Government Act, 1972, by the Local Government (Access to Information) Act 1985, and more particularly specified below:-

Agenda Item 15

Press and public to be excluded on the grounds specified in Paragraphs 1 of the Act, namely that:

“Any terms proposed or to be proposed by or to the authority in the course of negotiations for a contract for the acquisition or disposal of property or the supply of goods or services.”.

Summary of ‘exempt’ matters

Agenda Item 15

Development of the CO-OP At Redworth House

Meeting closed at 1845

Members of the public present 1