

Planning & Economic Development Overview & Scrutiny Panel

Minutes

Commencing 4pm,

14 January 2003
The Alamein Suite
City Hall
Salisbury

Present

Councillor P D Edge (Chairman)
Councillor Mrs S M Thorpe (Vice Chairman)
Councillor K A Cardy
Councillor P M Clegg (substitute for Ms S C Mallory)
Councillor J Coundley
Councillor N S Gallop
Councillor Mrs J M Greville
Councillor J B Hooper
Councillor I D McLennan (substitute for I R Tomes)
Councillor W R Moss
Councillor Mrs M A Peach
Councillor Mrs C A Spencer

In Attendance

H Collar (SDC)
J Ferguson (SDC)
A Macdonald (SDC)
D Neudegg (SDC)
J Meeker (SDC)
P Tilley (WCC)

Apologies

Councillor S J Howarth

Public/Observers

74

Public Questions/Statements

126. Mr G Medley, a Salisbury District Council Tax Payer, stated that, despite his concerns about the ongoing delay to the adoption of the replacement Salisbury District Local Plan and the possible requirement to hold a second Public Inquiry, he hoped that, should further modifications be necessary, such an Inquiry would still take place. In addition, Mr Medley stated his concern that officers were recommending no further modifications in instances where significant numbers (sometimes hundreds) of objections to a proposed modification had been lodged.

Minutes

127. The minutes of the meeting of 10 December 2002 were **agreed** as being a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Declarations of Interest

128. Ms Jane Ferguson, Principal Solicitor and Deputy Monitoring Officer, declared a personal interest in all Strategic Housing sites owing to the fact she was related to a headteacher of a school which might benefit from S106 agreements accruing from new housing development.

Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan – Proposed Modifications

129. **A Macdonald**, Forward Planning & Conservation Team Leader, reported on late representations (both written and verbal) and circulated copies of relevant late correspondence received since the publication of the Agenda (see Annex A, attached) and provided Members with a brief overview of the plan process, the tasks accomplished to date and the timetable for adoption should no further modifications or Inquiries be required. In addition, **A Macdonald** informed the Panel that the recommendations of the Planning & Economic Development Overview & Scrutiny Panel would be considered by the Cabinet at its meeting of 5 February 2003 and that the Council's aim was the timely and fair adoption of the Plan.

130. In addition, **A Macdonald**, drew the Panel's attention to page 11, paragraph 8, of the covering report, Agenda Item 5, where two words had been omitted from the text. The paragraph should, correctly, read :-

*'That the recommendations in this covering report **and appendices** are accepted by Members and that no further modifications are required to the Replacement Local Plan.'*

and to page 19 of Appendix 2, Housing, where **5 representations** (and not 2, as stated) in support of modification PM/HSG/12 (relating to Fugglestone Red) had been received.

131. In presenting this Agenda Item (including details of the proposed modifications, accompanying information and Officer recommendations) **A Macdonald** was supported by **J Meeker**, Planning Officer and **J Fergusson**, Principal Solicitor, Salisbury District Council, as well as by **P Tilley**, Environmental Services Unit, Wiltshire County Council.

Appendix 1 – Introduction, General Principles & Design

Modification Ref.	Issue	Panel Recommendation
PM/GPD/3, 4 & 8	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
RR/DES/1,4 & 5	Various	Accept Officer recommendations

Appendix 2 - Housing

Modification Ref.	Issue	Panel Recommendation
PM/HSG/1 -10	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
RR/HSG/1	Housing Allocations at Salisbury	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/HSG/11-19, 22 - 24	Various	Accept Officer recommendations

Panel Members: K A Cardy, J Coundley, P D Edge, N S Gallop, Mrs J M Greville, J B Hooper, S J Howarth, Mrs M M A Peach, Ms S C Mallory, Mrs C A Spencer, Mrs S M Thorpe, I R Tomes

RR/HSG/5	Housing Omission - Alderbury	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/HSG/25, 26 & 28	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/HSG/34	Housing Omission –Duck Lane, Laverstock	<p>Unanimous recommendation to :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. remove the allocation for reasons relating to :- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inappropriate landscape setting • Overdevelopment • Impact on the character of the settlement (including on local schools) • Highways issues and access issues 2. commission an independent traffic survey to investigate the above-mentioned Highway and Access issues; and 3. distribute the shortfall (that removing this allocation will result in) at other smaller sites already identified in and around the city, thereby abiding by Salisbury District Council's and the Government's policy of increasing the housing density of appropriate sites.
PM/HSG/35	Housing Allocation at Mere	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/HSG/36	Housing Omission – Land at Tisbury	<p>Recommend that the form of words used in paragraph 1 of page 50 of Appendix 2 (Housing) be amended to clarify the role of phasing of development and of monitoring and the potential for removing greenfield sites if preferable brownfield sites became available and it be accepted that the issue relates to all sites in phase 2 of the emerging Salisbury District Local Plan.</p>

RR/HSG/6	Housing Policy Boundary – Stapleford	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/HSG/41, 44 & 45	Various	Accept Officer recommendations

Appendix 3 - Employment

Modification Ref.	Issue	Panel Recommendation
PM/EMP/1 – 3, 9 & 10	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
RR/EMP/1 & 2	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/EMP/15,16 & 19	Various	Accept Officer recommendations

Appendix 4 – Conservation, Rural & Natural Environment & the New Forest

Modification Ref.	Issue	Panel Recommendation
RR/CONS/3 & 4	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/RNE/2 & 3	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/RNE/6	Landscape setting of Salisbury and Wilton	With reference to the Panel recommendation at Modification Ref. PM/HSG/34, recommend, unanimously, that this modification (Modification Ref. PM/RNE/6) be deleted.
PM/RNE/8 - 16	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/NFHA/1 & 2	Various	Accept Officer recommendations

Appendix 5 – Transport

Modification Ref.	Issue	Panel Recommendation
PM/TRANS/1 – 3, 5, 9, 13, 14, 20 & 21	Various	Accept Officer recommendations

Panel Members: K A Cardy, J Coundley, P D Edge, N S Gallop, Mrs J M Greville, J B Hooper, S J Howarth, Mrs M M A Peach, Ms S C Mallory, Mrs C A Spencer, Mrs S M Thorpe, I R Tomes

Appendix 6 – Sport, Recreation and Leisure and Public Services

Modification Ref.	Issue	Panel Recommendation
PM/SPR/1,4,10-12 & 17	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
PM/PUB/3 & 4	Various	Accept Officer recommendations
RR/PUB/1	Salisbury Cemetery	<p>Recommend that :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. this site be deleted as an allocation should an alternative, and more suitable site be identified; 2. the City Area (Community) Committee be advised of recommendation 1, above, when considering the report of the Park's Manager relating to Cemetery provision in Salisbury due to be presented to the City Area Committee at its meeting of 28 January 2003. <p>Note: the Chairman of the Local Plan Member's Working Group (who was also at the meeting) requested that the City Area (Community) Committee be advised of the comments of the Working Group, as they relate to this issue.</p>
PM/PUB/8	Amesbury Cemetery	Accept Officer recommendations

132. During the consideration of the above, Members received the following comments from observers:-

APPENDIX 2 - HOUSING

PM/HSG/12 – Fugglestone Red

133. Mr Stedman, for the Wilton Estate, spoke in objection of the proposed modification to delete Fugglestone Red from the housing allocation, stating that, in his opinion, the site was sustainable, logical for urban extension, a more preferable choice for housing than other sites allocated in the Plan and that fitted with Salisbury District Council's own policies relating to the allocation of housing sites.

Panel Members: K A Cardy, J Coundley, P D Edge, N S Gallop, Mrs J M Greville, J B Hooper, S J Howarth, Mrs M M A Peach, Ms S C Mallory, Mrs C A Spencer, Mrs S M Thorpe, I R Tomes

134. In addition, Mr Stedman informed the Panel that it was his opinion that the holding of a second inquiry would be appropriate given that new issues had been raised and possible housing allocation sites identified. Moreover, Mr Stedman requested that, should his request to allocate the Fugglestone Red site for housing in this Plan be rejected, then the site be given serious consideration in the next Plan period.

PM/HSG/34 – Housing Omission, Duck Lane, Laverstock

135. Mrs Grimsdale, resident of Duck Lane and speaking on the behalf of herself and other Laverstock residents, informed the Panel that she objected to the proposed modification to include the site for housing for the reasons put forward by Officers and outlined in their report and also owing to the loss of valuable (to the residents of Laverstock and the hundreds of people using and enjoying the foot path and bridleway that would be lost) public amenity land that the proposed development would result in. In addition, Mrs Grimsdale drew the Panel's attention to the fact that the development of the site would, irretrievably, reduce the landscape value of the area.

136. Mr Carrington, representing Hawthorne Kamm, Planning Consultants, for Linden Homes, informed the Panel that he supported the modification, stating that the concerns of the residents could be overcome and that the means by which they could be overcome would be detailed in the planning brief for the development.

137. Mr Meecham, for Laverstock, Ford, Hampton Park and Old Sarum communities drew that Panel's attention to the 305 objections to the proposed modification that had been received by Salisbury District Council compared to the two representations that had been received in support and requested that the proposed modification be rejected for the following reasons :-

- The effect on traffic levels and public transport;
- Fragmentation of the existing community;
- The effect on existing schools in Laverstock and the effect on the traffic and the children of transporting the overflow to schools out of the area;
- The effects on employment and leisure facilities in the area; and
- The effect of there no-longer being a physical gap between Laverstock and the City.

In conclusion, for the fact that the increase in housing, as was being proposed, would place pressure on the infrastructure and facilities of Laverstock and alter the character of the community without providing any balancing benefits or increases in viability.

PM/HSG/36 – Housing Omission, Land at Tisbury

138. Mr Carter, a resident of Tisbury, informed the Panel that he objected to the proposed modification to include the site for housing and re-iterated a, previously voiced, concern that the minutes recording what had been agreed by the Cabinet at its meeting of 16 July 2002 were incorrect; an apparent 'undertaking' by Salisbury District Council relating to this issue having been minuted as being, merely, an 'option' open to the Council.

139. Ms Henderson, for Tisbury Parish Council informed the panel that the Parish Council objected to the proposed modification and requested that the proposed allocation be deleted from the Plan. Ms Henderson also informed the Panel of the Parish Council's concerns relating to the fact that the comments of the Western Area Committee (as they related to this matter) had not been presented to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting of 16 July 2002, as requested, and that the comments made by the public at a question and answer session at the, aforementioned, Cabinet meeting had not been minuted. In addition, Ms Henderson endorsed the comment made by Mr Carter that the 'undertaking' given by the Leader of the Council at the Cabinet meeting of 16 July had not been minuted correctly.

APPENDIX 5 - TRANSPORTATION

PM/TRANS/20 – Amesbury Link Road

140. Mr Mitchell, a resident of Amesbury, informed the Committee that there was much public opposition and concern over this proposal and that the road was being introduced by stealth. Mr Mitchell also informed the Committee that it was his opinion that the layout of the Agenda Report made it difficult to understand.

APPENDIX 6 – SPORT, RECREATION, LEISURE & PUBLIC SERVICES

RR/PUB/1 – Salisbury Cemetery

141. Mr Stedman, for the Wilton Estate, informed the Panel that he objected to the proposed modification to reject the Inspector's recommendation to delete the cemetery allocation.

142. Mrs Morland, for Wilton Town Council, informed the Panel of her objection to the proposed modification for the reason that the site was difficult to access as it was not well served by pavements or by public transport links and was, therefore, an inappropriate site for a cemetery.

Draft Planning & Economic Development Portfolio Plan 2003/04

143. The Panel considered the Draft Portfolio Plan and **agreed** that it be presented to the Cabinet for consideration without amendment.

Dates of Next Meetings

144. The dates of the next two meetings were **agreed** :-

- Wednesday 22 January 2003
- Tuesday 11 February 2003

The meeting closed at 1935hrs.