

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE
NORTHERN AREA – 28/07/05

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

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

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO OFFICER	LOCATION	REC	PARISH / WARD	PAGE NOS	WARD & COUN- CILLORS	NOTES
1	S / 2005 / 1046 Miss L Flindell	FAR EAST EUROPE LTD 4 THE ARCADE EARLS COURT ROAD AMESBURY	REF	AMES	2-4	AMESBURY Councillor Brown Councillor Noeken Councillor Peach	
2	S / 2005 / 1078 Miss L Flindell	BRYAN WELSH 1 THE ARCADE AMESBURY	REF	AMES	5-6	AMESBURY Councillor Brown Councillor Noeken Councillor Peach	
3 SV	S / 2005 / 1128 Mr A Madge	MR ANDREW DOBSON 51 AND 53 ANTROBUS ROAD AMESBURY	APPC	AMES	7-11	AMESBURY Councillor Brown Councillor Noeken Councillor Peach	

END OF LIST

Schedule Of Planning Applications For Consideration

In The following Order:

Part 1) Applications Recommended For Refusal

Part 2) Applications Recommended for Approval

Part 3) Applications For The Observations of the Area Committee

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

ABBREVIATIONS USED THROUGHOUT THE TEXT

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

Part 1

Applications recommended for Refusal

Item No. Case Officer Contact No.

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

Proposal
Location

1 Case Officer Contact No 1
Miss L Flindell 01722 434377

S/2005/1046	20/05/2005	15/07/2005	FAR EAST EUROPE LTD
AMES			
Easting: 415632.663037047	Northing: 141403.665727019		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -CHANGE OF USE A1 TO A5 HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY AND ERECTION OF ETERNAL FLUE.
LOCATION:	4 THE ARCADE EARLS COURT ROAD AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7NA

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Noeken has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:
the controversial nature of the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

No 4 The Arcade is located within the Secondary Shopping Area of Amesbury as defined on the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan proposals map.

THE PROPOSAL

This application is for a change of use from A1 (retail) to A5 takeaway (Use Classes Amendment Order 2005)

PLANNING HISTORY

1984/1182 Withdrawn

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - No highway objection
Housing & Health Officer - Supporting noise documentation is noted

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement Yes, expired 30.06.2005
Site Notice displayed Yes, expired 30.06.2005
Departure No

Neighbour notification Yes, expired 21.06.2005
 Third Party responses Yes 9 letters of objection, summarised below;
 Owners, employees and customers of existing establishments in the Arcade use St Melor House Surgery car park, limiting spaces available for staff and patients, despite signs informing people that use of spaces are for St Melor Surgery only (objection to application S/2005/1004).
 Lack of parking (there is only space for one vehicle to park outside each shop in the lay-by provided)
 Existing takeaway encourages litter, and congregations of younger people. Vandalism and antisocial behaviour has occurred and rubbish left in and damage to nearby residences/premises/vehicles and increase in noise levels
 An additional takeaway is not necessary (Amesbury already has many takeaway facilities 10-15) there is already a fish and chip shop, kebab shop and public house in close proximity to site
 Impact on nearby businesses/competition on trade (loss of sales)
 Amesbury needs a better variety of shops not takeaways
 Fast food outlets have already been approved for Solstice Park development
 The proposed takeaway is close to a corner and two junctions (encouraging dangerous parking and hazard especially during school hours and evening). There has been an accident in the last six months and obstruction from parking on both sides of the road daily.
 What are proposed opening times and delivery restrictions? Restrictions on hours of use often ignored and later relaxed
 If permission is granted an additional CCTV camera in Edwards Road will be required.
 Environmental issues – cooking extract fumes, containment of waste products, unpleasant odours from takeaways in close proximity to each other (external flues and filters have proved inefficient in other premises/lack of maintenance), rat infestation, will impact on other businesses (odours discouraging customers)
 Visual impact – external flue/chimney
 Application should be refused on grounds of public order during evenings, night, litter, lack of car parking and air pollution

Town Council response - No objection

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on Secondary Shopping Area, Vitality and Viability of Amesbury
 Residential Amenity
 Highway safety

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan Policies:
 G1 (Sustainable Development)
 G2 (General)
 S2 (Secondary Shopping Area)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The site is within the identified Secondary Shopping Area of Amesbury; therefore policy S2 of the Adopted SDLP will be relevant. The principal role of the secondary shopping area is to ensure that the vitality of these areas continues and where possible is improved to provide attractive shopping environments. It is therefore important to ensure that shopping remains the dominant land use at ground floor level. Local shops are essential to the economic and social life of settlements and collectively ensure that places remain sustainable by providing a range of services, thus reducing the need to travel by car.

Policy S2 states that at least a third of units within any particular street frontage, or frontage of 50 metres either side of the application site, whichever is less, must remain in A1 retail use.

The premises falls within a clearly demarcated shopping front of less than 100 metres (No 1 Earls Court Road to No 15 The Arcade). The frontage contains 5 A1 units out of a total of 10 properties and therefore it meets the criteria of policy S2. For this reason a change of use from A1 to A5 may be acceptable. However, this is provided that there is no adverse impact on the retail function of the area.

Policies S2 and the G2 of the Adopted SDLP also require that there should be no loss of amenity to occupants through increased noise and fumes and no loss of highway safety or increased burden on existing infrastructure as outlined in policy G2.

There have been 9 letters of representation received (summarised above), mainly objecting to the loss of retail facilities within Amesbury, lack of parking and environmental issues. WCC Highways Department however, have no objection to the application. There is layby parking to the street block frontage, and The Arcade is within 200m walking distance of free car parking used by those shopping in Amesbury. It is therefore considered that there is adequate parking close by to the development site. Highway obstruction is dealt with under separate legislation.

It is also considered that noise and odour concerns from extractor fans could be met by condition. The Environmental Health Unit has no objections to the proposal.

However, the application had been submitted concurrently with S/2005/1046 (also for the change of use of A1 to A5 takeaway at No 3 The Arcade), which has been submitted by a different applicant and registered on the same date. This application has since been discovered to be invalid as the red line site area does not correspond to the site address, and under the Planning Act and Regulations the Council cannot continue to process this application. Another valid application (S/2005/1078) has also been submitted at a later date (11 days later) for the change of use of A1 to A2 (residential lettings agency) at No 1 The Arcade.

It is considered that the other application (S/2005/1078) is material to the decision on this application

It has been calculated that if a change of use is granted for one A5 use, then 40% of the secondary shopping area within this particular street block frontage will remain in A1 (retail) use, in accordance with the requirements of policy S2. However, if permission is granted for two non retail uses, then 30% of the units (less than a third) would remain in A1 retail use contrary to policy S2 of the Adopted SDLP.

There are also already two existing A5 uses within 100 metres of the development site

CONCLUSION

It is considered that as less than a third of the uses within the street frontage will remain in A1 retail use if the applications are considered cumulatively, then cumulatively the application will not accord with the provisions of the local plan and the proposed change of use will undermine the retail function of the settlement of Amesbury and therefore will affect the vitality and viability of the settlement, contrary to policies G1 and S2 of the Adopted SDLP.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

The application has been considered cumulatively with S/2005/1078 (No 1 The Arcade – Change of Use to residential Lettings Agency) and would result in reducing the number of A1 retail units on the street block frontage to below a third, which would undermine the retail function of Amesbury in accordance with Policy S2 with subsequent adverse impact to the vitality and viability of the settlement of Amesbury, contrary to the aims of sustainable development as outlined in policy G1 of the Adopted SDLP.

NOTES:

2

Case Officer
Miss L Flindell

Contact No
01722 434377

2

S/2005/1078	31/05/2005	26/07/2005	BRYAN WELSH
AMES			
Easting: 415617.5	Northings: 141406.3		

PROPOSAL:	CHANGE OF USE -CHANGE OF USE FROM SHOP TO RESIDENTIAL LETTINGS AGENCY
LOCATION:	1 THE ARCADE AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7LY

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Noeken has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to: the controversial nature of the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

No 1 The Arcade is located within the Secondary Shopping Area of Amesbury as defined on the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan proposals map.

THE PROPOSAL

This application is for a change of use from A1 (retail) to A2 Residential Lettings Agency (Use Classes Amendment Order 2005)

PLANNING HISTORY

None

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - No highway objection

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	Yes, expired 30.06.2005
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes, expired 23.06.2005
Third Party responses	None

Town Council response No objection

MAIN ISSUES

Impact on Secondary Shopping Area, Vitality and Viability of Amesbury
Highway safety

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan Policies:
G1 (Sustainable Development)
G2 (General)
S2 (Secondary Shopping Area)

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The site is within the identified Secondary Shopping Area of Amesbury; therefore policy S2 of the Adopted SDLP will be relevant. The principal role of the secondary shopping area is to ensure that the vitality of these areas continues and where possible is improved to provide attractive shopping environments. It is therefore important to ensure that shopping remains the dominant land use at ground floor level. Local shops are essential to the economic and social life of settlements and collectively ensure that places remain sustainable by providing a range of services, thus reducing the need to travel by car.

Policy S2 states that at least a third of units within any particular street frontage, or frontage of 50 metres either side of the application site, whichever is less, must remain in A1 retail use.

The premises falls within a clearly demarcated shopping front of less than 100 metres (No 1 Earls Court Road to No 15 The Arcade). The frontage contains 5 A1 units out of a total of 10 properties and therefore it meets the criteria of policy S2. For this reason a change of use from A1 to A5 may be acceptable. However, this is provided that there is no adverse impact on the retail function of the area.

Policies S2 and the G2 of the Adopted SDLP also require that there should be no loss of amenity to occupants through loss of highway safety or increased burden on existing infrastructure as outlined in policy G2.

WCC Highways Department however, have no objection to the application. There is layby parking to the street block frontage, and The Arcade is within 200m walking distance of free car parking used by those shopping in Amesbury. It is therefore considered that there is adequate parking close by to the development site. Highway obstruction is dealt with under separate legislation.

Another application (S/2005/1046) has also been submitted 11 days earlier for the change of use of A1 to A5 (takeaway) at No 4 The Arcade. It is considered that application S/2005/1046 is material to the decision on this application.

It has been calculated that if a change of use is granted for one A5 use, then 40% of the secondary shopping area within this particular street block frontage will remain in A1 (retail) use, in accordance with the requirements of policy S2. However, if permission is granted for two non retail uses, then 30% of the units (less than a third) would remain in A1 retail use contrary to policy S2 of the Adopted SDLP.

There are also a number of A2 estate agencies/residential lettings agencies in Amesbury, including a vacant A2 site formerly occupied by Lemon, Line & Felton on Amesbury High Street.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that as less than a third of the uses within the street frontage will remain in A1 retail use if the applications are considered cumulatively, then cumulatively the application will not accord with the provisions of the local plan and the proposed change of use will undermine the retail function of the settlement of Amesbury and therefore will affect the vitality and viability of the settlement, contrary to policies G1 and S2 of the Adopted SDLP.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE for the following reasons:

The application has been considered cumulatively with S/2005/1046 (No 4 The Arcade – Change of Use to takeaway) and would result in reducing the number of A1 retail units on the street block frontage to below a third, which would undermine the retail function of Amesbury in accordance with Policy S2 with subsequent adverse impact to the vitality and viability of the settlement of Amesbury, contrary to the aims of sustainable development as outlined in policy G1 of the Adopted SDLP.

NOTES:

Part 2

Applications recommended for Approval

Item No. Case Officer Contact No.

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

Proposal
 Location

3	Case Officer Mr A Madge	Contact No 01722 434541	3
----------	--	--	----------

S/2005/1128	09/06/2005	04/08/2005	MR ANDREW DOBSON
AMES			
Easting: 415874.4	Northings: 141480.3		

PROPOSAL:	O/L APPLICATION -OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 3 NUMBER DETACHED DWELLINGS AT REAR OF 51-53 ANTROBUS ROAD, AMESBURY
LOCATION:	51 AND 53 ANTROBUS ROAD AMESBURY SALISBURY SP4 7ND

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Peach has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to: the controversial nature of the application

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site is a piece of land that forms part of the rear garden to no 51 and 53 Antrobus road, Amesbury. The area is surrounded to the South, East and West by other residential properties, whilst to the north lies Stonehenge School. The site is shown to be accessed by land lying between 51 and 53 Antrobus road.

THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is in outline form only to gain permission for the erection of three new detached dwellings and car parking spaces on land to the rear of 51 and 53 Antrobus Road.

PLANNING HISTORY

02/2462 Four dwellings with alteration to access between 51 and 53 Antrobus road Withdrawn 18/2/03
 03/0378 Backland development for 3 houses & parking & formation of access between 51 and 53 Antrobus road Refused 3/4/04

Refusal was on the grounds of adverse effect on surface water drainage, the fact that it had not been adequately demonstrated how access onto Antrobus Road could be adequately formed, that it was an overbearing development close to the boundaries of the site and that the proposal did not meet policy R2 in that there was no provision for open space.

The subsequent appeal was dismissed and the reasons for refusal on the grounds of inadequate information on the highways access, and on the non-provision of policy R2 upheld. The reasons of the effect on surface water drainage and the overbearing nature of the development were not upheld.

CONSULTATIONS

WCC Highways - Following the submission of the earlier similar application on this site and subsequent discussions with the Applicant including the submission of various additional drawings, I am reasonably satisfied that an acceptable access arrangement can be achieved at this site to serve the development proposed.

I would not therefore wish to raise a highway objection in principle to the development proposed subject to details which should include the submission of full details, including levels, calculations etc of the proposed access/parking layout. This may well involve some of the 'blue' land.

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 generated by the proposal. This can be agreed at the detailed design stage.

The developer has not disclosed how they propose to dispose of surface water. 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 (e.g. soakaways). Surface water should not be discharged to the foul sewer. Your Council should be satisfied with any suitable arrangement for the disposal of surface water.

With respect to water supply supply, there are water mains within the vicinity of the proposal. Again connection can be agreed at the design stage.

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	Yes Expired 14/7/05
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes Expired 1/7/05
Third Party responses	Yes 2 responses;-

Objection – as effect on neighbouring properties would be severe it would remove the majority of light from the sun after midday and restrict light to the whole rear aspect of the garden including loss of view. Garden will be overlooked and privacy invaded. Considered land is not suitable to sustain development without having a large impact on surrounding dwellings and school. Also condition of the two properties that have put forward the application is not up to standard, which leaves doubt on the ability of the persons concerned to undertake such a project. Also if application is approved property value would depreciate greatly and would lobby the council for large discount on charges and will take matter to local MP Robert Key.

The construction of dwellings in the rear gardens of 51 and 53 Antrobus Road would appear to have little impact upon the school. However I am concerned at the effect of building work, and increased vehicle flow arising from the extra housing. The access road is the main vehicle route onto the school site and most pupils' walk or cycle into school via the road. Additionally a number of parents and children use the road as a short cut to walk to Amesbury Junior and Infant Schools on the other side of our campus.

Parking restrictions should be imposed on the road in order to prevent obstruction to buses and emergency vehicles. Occupiers of new houses may park in the access road, which would be unsafe.

Access road is on quite a gradient and should not be allowed to become slippery through building works.

During construction it will be important for large vehicles to avoid using the access road when pupils are using it the most important times being between 8am and 9am and 2.30pm and 3.30pm.

As building site will be located immediately next to a school security must be of a sufficiently high standard to prevent curious children gaining access onto the site.

Parish Council response Yes Amesbury town council objects to this application on the grounds of access onto a busy road

MAIN ISSUES

Difference between this and the previous application

Effect on surrounding properties

Effect on highways

Drainage considerations

Policy R2

POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted Salisbury district local plan (SDLP)- Policies G1, H16, R2, PPG3 -Housing

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Difference between this and the previous application

The applications are similar in most respects in that the dwellings are a similar size and to be accessed from the same point. The main difference is that further details have been provided by the applicant of the access way into the site and there has been the appeal decision on the previous application where the planning inspector did not uphold the local authorities decision to refuse the application on the grounds of being overbearing or drainage concerns.

Effect on surrounding properties

The previous application was refused on the grounds that the siting of the dwellings in close proximity to the application sites boundaries with neighbouring residential properties would represent an overbearing form of development. The planning inspector in the subsequent appeal disagreed with this judgement as he considered that the orientation and distances of the proposed dwellings relative to surrounding residential developments would be such as not to result in the proposal being an overbearing form of development relative to existing dwellings and their rear gardens. He was therefore satisfied that the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residential developments would not be adversely affected.

In view of the inspectors decision which is clearly a material consideration and the fact that officers previously raised no objections to this element of the scheme there is little scope for refusing any application on these grounds as in outline form it is difficult to argue in planning terms that there would be sufficient detrimental effect on neighbouring properties amenity to warrant refusal of the planning application.

Effect on highways

The previous planning application was rejected on the grounds that it had not been demonstrated how the proposed access onto Antrobus Road would be formed. This aspect of the application has been addressed by the applicant and additional detailing has now been provided by the applicant with regard to this. This detailing has been considered by Wiltshire County Councils highways department and is now considered satisfactory such that this element of the scheme can be approved. The applicant has shown with the submission of levels drawings that an adequate access way can be made into the new development and that as such this is now acceptable. This needs to be included with the 'red' line rather than the 'blue' line.

The town council have objected to the scheme on the basis that Antrobus road is very busy for much of the day and the additional traffic created by the new development accessing this road would have a detriment to highway safety. Clearly being so close to Stonehenge school Antrobus Road is busy for much of the day and particularly so at the beginning and end of the school day. However the application is only for three new dwellings, which by themselves are unlikely to create such a large additional amount of traffic that there would be a significant threat to vehicular or pedestrian safety. By its nature any cars turning out of the access road are likely to be moving slowly and providing adequate sight lines are provided it is not considered there would be a significant threat to safety from this access.

Drainage considerations

The inspector confirmed that the adequacy of the drainage of the site was something that could be dealt with by way of a planning condition requiring adequate details of drainage to be submitted before development commences. This remains the case and therefore it is not considered that this is in itself sufficient reason for refusal. During the course of the appeal officers agreed with the inspector that this could be dealt with by condition.

Policy R2

The previous application was refused under the terms of policy R2 which if the application was to be refused again could form a further reason for refusal however if the application is to be approved this matter could be dealt with by condition.

CONCLUSION

Although the previous application for a very similar development was refused, the subsequent appeal and submission of new drawings showing how an accessway into the site can be achieved mean that this development is now considered acceptable and that the previous concerns have been overcome such that the application is now recommended for approval.

RECOMMENDATION: subject to the receipt of satisfactory plans amending the red line: - APPROVE: for the following reasons

It is considered that this proposal is an acceptable form of development, which would not have an adverse effect on either neighbouring properties or highway safety and would comply with policies TR11, G1, G2, H16 and R2 of the adopted local plan.

And subject to the following conditions

(1) Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of the building, and the landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the reserved matters) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority in writing before any development is commenced.

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3 (1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order, 1995.

(2) Plans and particulars of the reserved matters referred to in condition 1 above, relating to the siting, design and external appearance of any buildings to be erected and the landscaping of the site, shall be submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority and shall be carried out as approved.

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure Order, 1995.

(3) Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (general Development Procedure Order, 1995.

(4) The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: This permission is in outline only and is granted under the provisions of section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 3(1) of the Town and Country Planning (general Development Procedure Order, 1995.

(5) Notwithstanding the provisions of classes A,B,C,D,E,F,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 dwellings nor the erection of any structures within the cartilage 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.

(6) No development shall take place until details of provision for recreational open space in accordance with Policy R2 of the adopted 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

(7) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until vehicular access to the site from Antrobus road has been constructed in accordance with details to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority such details should show Levels, gradients, access and parking. As soon as such access is available for use, the existing vehicular accesses to no 51 and 53 Antrobus road shall be permanently stopped up. Any sight lines forming part of the approved details for the new access shall be kept permanently free of any structure, erection or other obstruction to visibility exceeding one metre in height above the carriageway level of Antrobus Road.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety.

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

Policy TR11 Provision of off street car parking,
G1, General development
G2, Other General policies
H16 Housing Policy Boundaries
R2 Recreational Open Space

NOTES: