

Report

Report subject: Planning Application S/2005/2412

Report to: Planning and Regulatory Panel

Date: 6th February 2006

Author: Oliver Marigold, Senior Planning Officer on behalf of the Head of Development Services

PLANNING APPLICATION S/2005/2412: FULL APPLICATION – ERECTION OF TWO LINK DETACHED TWO STOREY DWELLING HOUSES PROVIDING ANCILLARY STAFF ACCOMMODATION at ST MARYS SCHOOL, DONHEAD ST MARY, SHAFTESBURY

Report Summary:

To consider a full application for the 'erection of two link detached two storey dwelling houses providing ancillary staff accommodation'. The application has been brought before the panel because the Western Area Committee's recommendation is considered to be a material departure from the policies in the Local Plan. The Committee considered the previously circulated report of the Head of Development Services, together with the schedule of late correspondence circulated at the meeting on 19th January 2006 and the Committee made the following recommendation:

RECOMMENDED TO PLANNING AND REGULATORY PANEL

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

"There is a proven functional and financial need for the accommodation proposed, it will support the rural economy as it is a major employer in the parish and accommodation on site will reduce the need to travel in accordance with PPG13."

(2) That the above application be approved subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission. (A07B)

Reason: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004

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



Awarded in:
Housing Services
Waste and Recycling Services



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.

Reason: In the interests of the character and appearance of the countryside and AONB.

3. The occupation of the residential accommodation hereby permitted shall be limited to persons solely or mainly employed at St Mary's School, Shaftesbury, or a dependant of such persons residing with that member of staff.

Reason: the dwellings lie in an area where new dwellings would not normally be permitted in the interests of the character and appearance of the countryside.

4. No development shall take place on site, including site clearance, tree works, demolition, storage of materials or other preparatory work, until all details relevant to the retention and protection of trees, hereafter called the Arboricultural Method Statement, have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing. Thereafter the development shall be undertaken only in accordance with the approved details, unless the Local Planning Authority has given its prior written consent to any variation.

The Arboricultural Method Statement shall show the areas which are designated for the protection of trees, shrubs and hedges, hereafter referred to as Protection Zones. Unless otherwise agreed, the Protection Zones will be fenced, in accordance with the British Standard Guide for Trees in Relation to Construction (BS.5837: 1990) and no access will be permitted for any development operation.

The Arboricultural Method Statement shall also include all other relevant details, such as changes of level, methods of demolition and construction, the materials, design and levels of roads, footpaths, parking areas and of foundations, walls and fences. It shall also include the control of potentially harmful operations, such as burning, the storage, handling and mixing of materials, and the movement of people or machinery across the site, where these are within 10m of any designated Protection Zone.

The Arboricultural Method Statement shall also indicate the specification and timetable of any tree works, which shall be in accordance with the British Standard Recommendations for Tree Works (BS.3998: 1989).

The Arboricultural Method Statement shall include provision for the supervision and inspection of the tree protection measures. The fencing, or other protection which is part of the approved Statement shall not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works, including external works have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials removed from the site, unless the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority has been given in writing

Reason: To comply with the duties indicated in Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, so as to ensure that the amenity value of the most important trees, shrubs and hedges growing within or adjacent to the site is adequately protected during the period of construction.

5. No tree, shrub, or hedge which are shown as being retained on the approved plans shall be cut down, uprooted, wilfully damaged or destroyed, cut back in any way or removed other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the written approval of the Local Planning Authority. All tree works approved shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard Recommendations for Tree Work (BS.3998: 1989).

If any tree shown to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars is removed, uprooted or destroyed, or dies, or becomes severely damaged or diseased within 5 years of the completion of the development, another tree, shrub or hedge shall be planted at the same place, and that tree, shrub, or hedge shall be of such size, specification, and species, and should be planted at such time as may be specified in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

If within a period of five years from the date of planting any replacement tree is removed, uprooted or destroyed, or dies or becomes 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 comply with the duties indicated in Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, so as to safeguard the amenity of the existing trees to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

6. The development, including site clearance, must not commence until a scheme of landscaping and a statement of the methods of its implementation have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing.

The scheme must include details of the proposed planting including a plan, details of species, stock sizes and numbers/densities where appropriate, and include a timetable for its implementation. If any plant dies, becomes diseased or fails to thrive within a period of 5 years from the date of planting, or is removed, uprooted or destroyed, it must be replaced by another plant of the same kind and size and at the same place, unless the Local Planning Authority agrees to a variation beforehand, and in writing.

The statement must include details of all the means by which successful establishment of the scheme will be ensured, including preparation of the planting area, planting methods, watering, weeding, mulching, use of stakes and ties, plant protection and aftercare. It must also include details of the supervision of the planting and liaison with the Local Planning Authority.

The landscaping must be carried out in accordance with the agreed scheme and statement, unless the Local Planning Authority has given its prior written consent to any variation.

Reason: To comply with the duties indicated in Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 so as to ensure that the details of the development of the landscaping are complimentary, and to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development.

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of Classes A to 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. (V15A)

Reason: in the interests of the character and appearance of the countryside

8. No development shall commence until a scheme of energy and water efficiency measures to reduce the energy and water consumption of the dwellings hereby approved shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall subsequently be implemented and brought into operation prior to the first occupation of the dwellings and shall thereafter be retained, unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of the conservation of energy and water resources.

The Western Area Committee considered the following officer's report, as amended to incorporate amendments and letters of representation received as late correspondence (**attached as appendix IV and V**), before making its recommendation. Amendments to the report subsequent to Western Area Committee have been made in bold.

REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor John Cole-Morgan has asked that the application be heard at Western Area Committee

SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site consists of the grounds of St Mary's School, an independent Catholic boarding and day school for girls. The school and its surroundings are located in the countryside (outside of any Housing Policy Boundary) and within the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

THE PROPOSAL

The application proposes the erection of two new four-bedroom dwellings, one of which would replace a temporary single storey portacabin. The proposals would consist of a block of two semi-detached dwellings. The block would have a maximum height of 9.5m (excluding chimneys), with an overall length of 22.6m.

PLANNING HISTORY

The planning history of the site is attached as **appendix I**. From this it can be seen that the school has had a significant number of previous applications, some of which have been for residential accommodation including flats, a headmistress's house and permission (in some cases permanent, in others temporary) for mobile homes. The level of existing accommodation is outlined in the 'planning considerations' section below and in the plan submitted by the applicants included as **appendix II**. Two applications have been made specifically for dwellings recently:

1. Erection of 5 staff dwellings, withdrawn (S/2004/0819)
2. Erection of 2 staff dwellings, Refused on 13th December 2004 (S/2004/2397). This permission was refused for two reasons:
 - (1) *The proposed dwellings would be located in the countryside and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, outside from a housing policy boundary, where new residential dwellings are unacceptable unless there is an adequate functional and financial justification for a rural based enterprise. As inadequate justification has been given, the proposal conflicts with policies H27, H23, C1, C2, C4 and C5 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.*
 - (2) *The proposed dwellings, in that they would be located remote from services, employment opportunities and being unlikely to be well served by public transport, are contrary to the key aims of Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 which seeks to reduce growth in the length and number of motorised journeys. They would represent unsustainable development, contrary to policy G1 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.*

CONSULTATIONS

Highway Authority – no objection

Environmental Health – no objection

REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No	
Site Notice displayed	Yes	expired 29/12/05
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	No	
Third Party responses	No	
Parish Council response	Yes	Fully Support

MAIN ISSUES

1. The principle of development
2. The size, design and appearance of the dwellings
3. Sustainability

4. Recreational open space

POLICY CONTEXT

G1	General Development Criteria
H23	New Dwellings in the open countryside
H27	Rural Workers' dwellings
C1	Development in the countryside
C2	Development in the countryside
C4	Development in the AONB
C5	Development in the AONB

PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The principle of development

The site lies outside of any housing policy boundary and in the countryside where new dwellings are, as a matter of principle, unacceptable in accordance with local (H23) and national (PPS7) policies, in the interests of maintaining the character and appearance of the wider countryside. The site also lies within the AONB, further strengthening the need to exercise restraint.

However, the erection of dwellings may exceptionally be permitted for agricultural workers. Since the publication of PPS7 this exception has been extended to workers who are essential for *rural based enterprises*.

The first test, therefore is whether the school is a rural based enterprise. It is important to note that such applications must be assessed on the same terms as those for agricultural dwellings – ie the need must be essential, it must be for a need for a *full time* worker, it must satisfy a functional and financial test and there should be no other existing accommodation, either on the unit or by other existing accommodation in the area.

PPS7 advises that: “...it is essential that all applications for planning permission for new occupational dwellings in the countryside are scrutinised thoroughly...” It needs to be established, therefore, whether there is an essential need for two, large, permanent dwellings to serve St Mary's School. There should be both a functional and a financial justification.

Whether the school is a 'rural based enterprise'

PPS7 has extended the scope for agricultural dwellings to 'rural based enterprises'. To benefit from this exemption, therefore, it must be shown that the school is a rural based enterprise. PPS7 is relatively recent and no definition of the term is contained within the document.

The phrase could be interpreted two ways – either as relating to any enterprise that has its base in a rural area, or as relating to an enterprise that has to be based in a rural area. The definition is important not just for this case but for the interpretation of the policy generally – the wider definition (ie any enterprise that happens to be rural based) gives much greater scope for dwellings in the countryside.

In seeking clarification, officers sought advice from *Development Control Casebook Forum* in *Planning* magazine – the professional journal for Town Planning. This advises that Planning Inspectors have usually taken the line that the enterprise must have an essential link to the use of the countryside such as equestrian developments or wildlife sanctuaries. Other uses, such as catteries and fishing uses have been shown not to be 'rural based enterprises' (**appendix III**).

On the basis of this advice, it would seem that the definition of 'rural based enterprise' cannot be extended to encompass a school, which has no essential link to the countryside but happens to be based there for historic reasons.

In response to the point made in late correspondence with regard to PPS7, it should be made clear that the response from 'planning magazine' relates to all new dwellings in the countryside for existing enterprises – new enterprises would only justify a mobile home (as with new agricultural enterprises).

Therefore it would seem that the principle of a dwelling does not fall within the scope of PPS7. However, in the event that members consider that special circumstances do apply in the case of this school,

or that a school can be considered as a 'rural based enterprise', therefore the tests in relation to rural based enterprise dwellings have been assessed below.

The justification put forward by the applicants

A list of the current residential accommodation at the school is attached at **appendix II**. In support of the application, the appellants have sought to justify the erection of two dwellings for a number of reasons. It is argued that a need has arisen because of changes in staff (from residential nuns to mainstream teaching staff); changes in educational standard, residential care and supervision, and new legislation.

The structure of the school's management is that there is a Headmistress, a Deputy Headmaster and a Senior Housemistress who form the Senior Management Team (SMT). Below the Senior Housemistress are 6 resident Housemistresses, each of whom normally has the duty of care ('in loco parentis') for the children for which they are responsible (ie within each 'house'). Each housemistress is supported by 2 House Assistants. Only members of the SMT can take over a housemistress's responsibility.

It is argued that when a housemistress is not available to discharge their duties, a member of the SMT has to take over that duty, both for planned absences (training courses, school trips etc) and for unplanned absences (for example a medical emergency).

To this end, the school has implemented a duty system where one member of the SMT is 'on duty' (ie proactively working), one member is 'on call' (ie is available to be called into the school to assist) and one member who is off duty. This would provide a 24 hour, 7 day coverage.

It is further argued that, under the Working Time Regulations a worker may not work more than 48 hours per 7 day period. Legal advice given to the school says that a member of staff who was called in (and required to sleep in a duty room) would be treated as working, while a member of staff 'on call' but at home with their family would not count towards the 48 hours.

The school has recently appointed a Deputy head who has a family but who currently lives in Shaftesbury. While the previous Deputy Head also lived off site, he was appointed at a time when there was no expectation that the occupier of that post had to live on site. Now, the Deputy head forms part of the Senior Management Team.

Further arguments made in support of the application are the current need for SMT staff to cover for staff who are suffering from work-related stress, and the additional burdens placed on SMT members by the Care Standards and Health and Safety requirements. The school has also submitted the first draft of the school development plan, which indicates that staff housing is a priority.

Inspection Report by the Commission for Social Care Inspection

As part of the justification, the applicants have also submitted information from the School's recent inspection by the Commission for Social Care Inspection. This provides an objective assessment of the need for supervision of boarders at the school (and therefore the need for additional dwellings).

In particular four standards criteria are relevant. Standard 9 relates to whether the school is capable of satisfactorily managing crises affecting boarders' welfare, for which the school achieved a 'minor shortfall' against the standard.

Standard 31 relates to whether the staff supervising boarders outside teaching time are sufficient in numbers. For this, the school also achieved a 'minor shortfall'. The report says that '*the duty rota demonstrates than an appropriate number of staff are on duty*' and that '*boarders did not report insufficient levels of supervision at any time of day*'. However, the report also says that the Inspectors were told that there were occasions when gap students were left to supervise boarders while staff supervised supper, and the report comments that gap students should not be left in a position of sole responsibility.

Standard 33 relates to whether staff are present, and accessible to boarders, in each boarding house at night. For this the school achieved 'standard met' with no shortfalls. The findings of the report were that within the houses there is always one member of staff on duty and that the housemistresses are also resident and on duty 6 nights a week.

At the time of inspection, the Senior Housemistress was temporarily resident in one of the boarding houses

(the Deputy Head had not then been appointed). Therefore even without the Deputy Head the school still met standard 33.

Standard 34 relates to supervision of staff with boarding duties (for which the school achieved 'minor shortfall') and the report finds that a formal system of supervision has not been established but is necessary. The school has argued that the Deputy Headmaster needs to live on site (in an additional dwelling) in order to provide that supervision required by standard 34.

Although the report provides some justification for the school's case (in relation to standard 31), the fact that Standard 33 was fully met would appear not to justify an essential need for two dwellings.

Whether there is a full time need

The school has argued that the need for the Deputy head and the Senior Mistress to live on site is primarily because of the duty system that they intend to operate. But the requirement for the SMT member to be 'on call' does not necessarily require that person to be on site, rather than in Shaftesbury or one of the villages. The 'on call' member would normally be contactable by mobile telephone in the event of an emergency, disciplinary problem, medical emergency, pupil missing or general advice and support.

It has to be remembered that the 'on call' member is only required when both the relevant Housemistress (assisted by two Assistant Housemistresses) and the SMT member 'on duty' are unavailable.

It is considered that the number of occasions when both the SMT member and the Senior Housemistress are unavailable, and an emergency arises that requires their attendance immediately, which cannot be fulfilled by one of the other members of staff, or by the person 'on call' travelling the distance from Shaftesbury, are likely to be very few and far between, and is certainly not a 'full time' requirement.

While there *may* be a functional requirement for one member of SMT to be available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for when the other staff and Housemistress are unavailable, and an emergency occurs that cannot be dealt with by someone living in a settlement nearby, it is not considered that there is a full time, 24/7 requirement for three members of staff to live on site.

Existing accommodation

Even if there were a requirement for three staff members to live on site, consideration has to be given to the accommodation already within the school. In total, the school has a total of 14 flats or dwellings within the school grounds.

These consist of:

- 1 x four-bedroom dwelling for the headmistress;
- 1 x two-bedroom bungalow for the caretaker;
- 6 x two-bedroom flats/Duplexes;
- 4 x one-bedroom flats;
- 1 x two bed mobile home with permanent permission; and
- 1 x three-bedroom mobile home with temporary permission, although as the temporary planning permission expired on 30th October 2005 (reference S/2002/1778) this building is now unauthorised. It is on the site of this building that the proposed dwellings would be sited.

The school has argued that none of the existing permanent accommodation is suitable for the Deputy Head (who currently lives in Shaftesbury) or for the Senior Mistress who currently resides in the unauthorised mobile home, because both have large families and because it is 'more likely' that a senior manager will have a spouse and family.

PPS7 (in paragraph 9) makes clear that it is the requirements of the enterprise, rather than the requirements of the owner or occupier, this is relevant in determining the size of accommodation. Therefore, the question of whether the existing forms of accommodation could meet any functional need should be based on the needs

of the school, not the personal family circumstances of the Deputy Head or Senior Mistress.

It is considered that the argument of an SMT member being 'more likely' to have a spouse is not sufficient *essential* justification as to why one of the other forms of two or one bed accommodation could not be used. The fact that the current SMT members have families does not mean that all members of the SMT will necessarily have families, or that it is essential to their position for a family-man (or woman) to be employed.

Even if there was a full time requirement for all three SMT members to live on site, the school already has two dwellings (the caretaker's house and the headmistresses house) that could meet the need for two of the SMT members. The fact that one third of the time the need can be met by the existing accommodation (and that another third could be accommodated by re-organising the existing arrangements) itself means that there is not a 'full time' requirement.

Furthermore, although the requirements of the Working Time regulations are not disputed, the fact that an call' member occupying one of the numerous other flats for the period of their duty would use up some of their 48 hours does not equate to an essential need. It has not been demonstrated that alternatives have been considered, such as having a fourth member of SMT to fulfil the duty system, reducing the need for the SMT's members of family to live on site.

Consideration has been given to the other points raised by the applicants, but it is not considered that the additional burdens placed on staff justify a full-time, on-site presence; nor does the need to cover for staff who are currently absent through illness.

Originally 5 dwellings were proposed although this was subsequently reduced to 2. During the course of the 2004 application for two dwellings, the school's bursar commented that one dwelling would be 'highly desirable' from a pastoral perspective, and that the proposal for a second dwelling resulted from a wish to see family accommodation. It was not argued at that time that there was an *essential* need for two dwellings on the site.

Overall, it is not considered that there is sufficient functional need to justify the erection of two new dwellings in the open countryside.

Financial Test

PPS7 also sets out a financial test. The Guidance states in paragraph 3 that "...*the unit and the [rural based enterprise's] activity concerned have been established for at least three years, have been profitable for at least one of them, are currently financially sound, and have a clear prospect of remaining so...*".

The applicants have submitted financial information which demonstrates that the business is financially sound, has been profitable for at least one of the last three years, and has a reasonable prospect of remaining so.

The principle of development – conclusion

It is considered that a school cannot be considered as a 'rural based enterprise' and therefore to allow two additional dwellings would be clearly contrary to policy. If the school were to be considered a 'rural based enterprise' the case is finely balanced in relation to functional need but, overall, it is concluded that an insufficient functional justification has been put forward to permit the erection of two dwellings in the countryside and AONB. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies H23, H27, C1, C2, C4 and C5.

The size, design and appearance of the dwellings

In addition to considering the principle of two dwellings on the site, consideration also needs to be given to the size, design and appearance of the dwellings. It is accepted that the dwellings would not be prominent from public viewpoints, being located within the school grounds that are largely screened from adjoining countryside.

Nevertheless the site does lie in the countryside and within the AONB where Local and National advice is that development should be strictly controlled and design to the highest standards and the fact that a site is well screened is not a good reason to accepting a lower standard of design – it is an argument that could be repeated too often. In any case, the block would be visible to staff and visitors to the school from the main access 'loop' serving the school..

Furthermore, PPS7 advises that agricultural dwellings (and therefore dwellings for rural based enterprises) *“...should be of a size commensurate with the established functional requirement. Dwellings that are unusually large in relation to the agricultural needs of the unit, or unusually expensive to construct in relation to the income it can sustain in the long-term, should not be permitted. It is the requirements of the enterprise, rather than those of the owner or occupier, that are relevant in determining the size of dwelling that is appropriate to a particular holding”*.

In this case, during the previous application in 2004, the two dwellings consisted of two semi-detached three-bedroom dwellings, with an overall length of some 16 metres (excluding porches), a height of 9.5 metres and a width of 9 metres.

The proposed dwellings, while having a similar height and width, would have a length of some 22.5 metres, and both dwellings would have four bedrooms. In addition, whereas the previous scheme had a hipped roof, the current scheme has full gables, which only add to its mass and bulk and give a significant roof form.

The proposed block would therefore be significantly larger than the dwelling previously proposed. No functional justification (in PPS7 terms) has been given for the significant increase in the size of the proposals. It is understood that the reason for the increase in size is due solely to the personal circumstances of the Deputy Head – ie the size of his family. It is not, therefore, the requirements of the enterprise but the requirements of the individual involved. In accordance with PPS7 this is not sufficient to justify the size of dwellings now proposed.

Furthermore the size of the dwellings is considered to be unacceptable in design terms. It is considered that the development would have a significant size, mass and bulk. The block would appear as a significant mass of built form with an over-dominant roof design, which would have an unacceptable appearance and would fail to maintain the natural beauty of the countryside or the AONB.

Although it is recognised that the vicinity of the proposed dwellings includes relatively large school buildings (including the recently approved swimming pool) different considerations apply to new dwellings, not least because the precedent effect is greater. The applicants have argued that replacing the existing mobile home would be a visual improvement, but this building is now unauthorised and removal could be secured by enforcement action.

Sustainability

The site is not located within or close to a settlement and journeys for leisure, shopping or other day-to-day requirements would be made by private car. Although at least one of the occupants of each dwelling would have to work at the school, there is no guarantee that other family members would be employed at the school, and so employment journeys would also take place by private car. This formed a reason for refusal previously.

However, having considered the matter in light of additional information provided by the school, it is likely that other members of the household occupying the dwellings would be employed at the school (and that female children of the occupiers would attend the school). On balance, it is not considered that sustainability issues would justify refusal.

Trees

This reason for refusal has been overcome by the Agricultural information submitted by the applicants as late correspondence, subject to conditions.

Recreational open space

All new dwellings generate a requirement for recreational open space in accordance with policy R2. The applicants have submitted a recreational contribution s106 and cheque as late correspondence, which overcomes this reason for refusal.

CONCLUSION

The school cannot be considered as a ‘rural based enterprise’ and therefore there is no scope for a dwelling to be considered in the same way as an agricultural dwelling and the exception to the rule of not normally allowing new dwellings in the countryside.

Even if the school is considered as a 'rural based enterprise', in terms of functional justification, the case is finely balanced. On balance, however, it is not considered that there is a sufficient essential justification for 2 additional dwellings on the site. Concerns regarding the size and design of the dwellings also justify refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE

Reasons for Refusal:

(1) The proposed dwellings would be located in the countryside and within the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and outside of a housing policy boundary. In such locations there is a presumption against new residential dwellings as a matter of principle, in the interests of the character and appearance of the wider countryside, unless there is an adequate functional (and financial) justification for a dwelling essential to the needs of a rural based enterprise (policy H27) or affordable housing to meet a demonstrated local need (policy H26). As it is considered that a school does not qualify as a 'rural based enterprise' and in any case inadequate justification has been given for additional residential accommodation on this site given the number of existing dwellings, the proposal conflicts with policies H26, H27, H23, C1, C2, C4 and C5 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.

(2) The proposed dwellings would, by reason of their excessive size, design and scale, appear as a significant mass of built form with an over-dominant roof design. Furthermore, the size of the dwellings has not been demonstrated as being commensurate with the established functional requirement. In these respects the proposed dwellings would harm the character and appearance of the countryside and would fail to maintain the natural beauty of the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In these respects, the proposed dwellings would conflict with policies C1, C2, C4 and C5 of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan

[reason 3 has been overcome by the submission of a unilateral agreement]

Options for consideration:

- a) Accept the officers' recommendation that permission should be refused
- b) Accept the above proposal, that permission should be granted, subject to conditions.