

## AGENDA ITEM 8

### LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING COMMITTEE WESTERN AREA – 06-01-05

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

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

ITEM NO	APPLICATION NO OFFICER	LOCATION	REC	PARISH / WARD	PAGE NOS	WARD & COUN-CILLORS	NOTES
1	<b>S / 2004 / 2280</b> Miss A Rountree	MR AND MRS R COWLEY WARDOUR CROSSING COTTAGE TISBURY GATE TISBURY	REF	TISB	2-4	TISBURY & FOVANT Councillor Mrs Green Councillor Mr Hooper	
2	<b>S / 2004 / 2528</b> Mr D Prince	MR P WOOLLEY BARFORD HOUSE MOUNT LANE BARFORD ST MARTIN	REF	BASM	5-7	FONTHILL & NADDER Councillor Mrs Willan	
3 <b>SV</b>	<b>S / 2004 / 2616</b> Mr W Simmonds	ROGER EAST 28 LAMPARD TERRACE WILTON	REF	WILT	8-9	WILTON Councillor Mr Edge Councillor Mr Brown-Hovelt	

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*

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

# 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 A Rountree    01722 434312**

S/2004/2280	22/10/2004	17/12/2004	MR AND MRS R COWLEY
TISB			J J SAMPLE
Easting: 393376.662656665	Northing: 128131.493692353		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO SOUTH ELEVATION AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO EAST ELEVATION
LOCATION:	WARDOUR CROSSING COTTAGE TISBURY GATE TISBURY SALISBURY SP3 6RD

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Hooper has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:  
 The interest shown in the application

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Wardour Crossing Cottage is a former railway workers cottage adjacent to the level crossing at Tisbury Gates bounded on the north side by the railway. It is a white rendered cottage with slate roof located within the open countryside of the AONB and has an existing single storey extension to the east elevation and conservatory to the south.

### THE PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a two-storey extension to the south elevation with integral garage and single storey extension to the east elevation.  
 The two-storey extension will protrude 5.4 metres from the existing property 4.13 metres in width with a pitched roof adjoining that of the existing dwelling. It will provide a garage to the ground floor and bedroom to the first.  
 The single storey extension will replace the existing to provide a utility room measuring 2.1 metres by 2.4 metres with a pitched roof rising to a height of 3.2 metres.  
 Both extensions will be constructed from rendered block work with reclaimed slate roof and green anodised aluminium windows.

## PLANNING HISTORY

None

## CONSULTATIONS

Environmental Health Officer - No Observations  
Environment Agency - No Objections  
English Nature - No Observations  
Network Rail - Soakaways would not be acceptable – Wish objections to be sent out with decision – have restrictive covenant on property that requires their approval to any works.

## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No	
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expired 25/11/04
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expired 24/11/04
Third Party responses	No	
Parish Council response	Yes	Support

## MAIN ISSUES

Scale & Design  
Impact on Neighbours

## POLICY CONTEXT

SDLP G2, D3, C4, C5, C24, H31

## PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

### Scale & Design

In policy terms the property is located in open countryside where development is generally only deemed acceptable if the extension is subservient in size to the existing dwelling and does not substantially alter its character.

With regard to the two-storey extension the bulk and massing created both by the size of the extension and the fact that the roof abuts the ridge tiles of the existing dwelling, does not allow it to maintain subservience. In design terms the integral garage creates an urbanisation out of keeping with the character of the existing dwelling and the proposed double casement aluminium windows do not harmonise with the timber windows on the rest of the property. While the principle of covered off road parking is accepted it would be considered more appropriate to construct a traditional detached garage within the curtilage. Therefore it is judged that the extension does little to respect the character of the existing dwelling as the increased bulk and scale will completely alter the appearance of the property. The proposal is deemed to be contrary to policy H31 and C24 as it will neither be subservient to, nor maintain the character of, the existing dwelling. By virtue of its location the property is clearly visible from the wider area as one approaches the level crossing and the proposal and will be an incongruous development in the surrounding area. As such it is judged to have a detrimental impact on the wider AONB and is therefore contrary to policy C4 & C5.

There is no objection to the single storey extension to the east elevation, which complements the style of the existing dwelling and remains subservient to it

### Impact on Neighbours

The property is located in a relatively isolated position and there is considered to be no detrimental impact to the residential amenity of nearby dwellings.

## **CONCLUSION**

This proposed two-storey extension would be an inappropriate development to the existing cottage, undermining its existing character and overpowering it in terms of bulk and scale. The proposed extension is judged to be contrary to policy D3, H31, C4, C5 and C24 of the Adopted SDLP as it fails to respect the bulk, scale or character of the existing dwelling.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE** for the following reasons:

The proposed two-storey extension would significantly alter and adversely affect the simple character of the existing building by virtue of its design and increased bulk. The property is located in open countryside and the proposal would be detrimental to the character and visual amenities of the countryside which is on a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to policies D3, H31, C4, C5 and C24 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

INFORMATIVE: - The site is subject to a restrictive covenant which requires Network Rail's agreement to the proposal and the applicant should take into account comments provided by them.

---

## **NOTES:**

2

**Case Officer  
Mr D Prince**

**Contact No  
01722 434416**

2

S/2004/2528	25/11/2004	20/01/2005	MR P WOOLLEY
BASM	BMA	II	JOHN WOOLLEY
Easting: 405636.2		Northing: 131570.7	

PROPOSAL:	TREES WITH TPO -FELL HOLM OAK (SUBJECT TO TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 308
LOCATION:	BARFORD HOUSE MOUNT LANE BARFORD ST MARTIN SALISBURY SP3 4AG

**REASONS FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS**

This application has been called in by the local ward member for reason of the prominent nature of the site, and the controversial nature of the application.

**BACKGROUND:**

TPO 308 was applied to a Holm Oak [Evergreen Oak (*Quercus ilex*)] under section 201 of the Town & Country Planning Act: 1990 and the Town & Country [Trees] Regulations: 1999 on the 19<sup>th</sup> March 2004. A written objection to the order was received and a report highlighting the objections, the Tree Officers comments and recommendations were put before the Western Area committee of the 12<sup>th</sup> August 2004. The order was confirmed, without modification, at that meeting.

The objection to the order, that the tree was a danger to the occupants of the property and members of the public, was made without substantive or reasonable evidence, other than that there was a fugal bracket of a known wood decay species of fungus at the base of the tree. The remainder of the stem and main branch structure could not be effectively assessed due to the heavy Ivy coverage, although it could be seen that on parts of the stems and branches that there were wounds and defects and some minor dead branches within the inner crown of the tree.

A meeting took place, on the 15<sup>th</sup> June 2004, between the applicant, his tree surgeon and the council's tree officer to discuss the way forward. It was agreed that a detailed internal investigation would be carried out in order that a reasoned assessment of the risk posed by the tree could be made. The Ivy covering the tree would also be cut and allowed to die to allow a more detailed investigation of any defects.

A tree work contractor carried out an investigation using a PICUS Tomograph on the 27<sup>th</sup> August 2004, when the Ivy was also cut around the base of the tree. A copy of the results of the PICUS investigation were forwarded, with out any analysis or supporting information to the tree officer on the 14<sup>th</sup> September 2004.

An application to fell the tree, using the PICUS Tomogram as evidence, was registered on the 25<sup>th</sup> November 2004. I conducted a visual inspection of the Holm Oak on the 7<sup>th</sup> December 2004.

**FINDINGS/OBSERVATIONS**

The tree, as previously reported, is situated approximately 1.5 – 1.7 m above road level, adjacent to the front, north-western aspect of Barford House. The tree had been estimated as being about 180 years of age.

On closer inspection it is probable that this is not one tree but two, or a multi stemmed tree whose stems have arisen at ground level and have grown so close together that over time the main stems have partially fused together giving the impression of a single tree [see photo 1].

The two stems on the northern side have not fused or grafted together, as they have on the southern side, and there is no doubt that there is some decay in this area. A metal probe is easily inserted into the crack and penetrates to a depth of more than 15cm. This area equates to the position shown as 1 & 2 on the PICUS Tomogram supplied with the application to fell the tree. The probe is able to penetrate laterally, either side of the length of the crack but to a much lesser degree; no more than 5cm before significant restriction to the advancement of the probe was encountered and less in most places. There is also another area close to the base of the tree on the southern side, where the metal probe was able to penetrate [Photo4], with more difficulty and probably corresponds to the area marked 8 on the Tomogram, although at a lower level. Penetration with the metal probe in other areas was not possible due to the density of the wood.

There is still quite an amount of ivy covering the main stem, starting just below the divide between the two, which continues into the parts of the canopy and covers and restricts effective inspection of these parts of the tree.

The foliage is of a normal size and appearance for a tree of its age and condition, which is generally good and appears to be in a healthy condition. The overall crown density may be described as being slightly sparse in comparison to the norm for this species, although consistent with a tree of this age.

There is a fruiting body of a known butt and heartwood decay fungus [Photo 2 (*Ganoderma applanatum/adspersum*)] approximately 15cm above ground level on the southern side of the tree between two buttresses, which by the annual growth increments has been growing on the tree for at least 10 years.

### **PICUS Tomogram**

Slides to show the tomogram results in colour, will be shown at the meeting.

The results should be treated with caution because on the face of it, the evidence presented by the PICUS tomogram appears significant. This however is misleading for the following reasons:

The PICUS equipment cannot distinguish between decay and cracks or splits [PICUS user Manual]. What is being shown in the tomogram is a colour representation of the assessment of the wood quality based on the length of time a signal takes to get from one position to the other eleven. Each position, or sensor, takes its turn to send signals to the remaining sensors and then a computer program evaluates the results.

While the key [see tomogram 1] shows 49% sound wood (brown colour), 40% as disrupted tissue (blue & purple) the remaining 11% (green) could not be determined by the equipment. The results presented have no supporting analysis.

The distance between points 1 and 2 [shown on the tomogram] is equal to  $1/12^{\text{th}}$  of the stem diameter at this height. This equals 33.3 cm. Taking the tomogram at face value, this would indicate an opening [cavity or crack] of close to 30cm in width where as photograph 1 shows a gap of 1 to 2 cm at most.

Other factors need to be considered when assessing any potential risks a tree may pose, e.g. the nature and qualities of the wood, condition and vitality of the tree, the type of decay fungus, the type of decay and its properties and the trees response to that decay.

Scientific data published in a variety of documents, books, journals etc. since the early 1990's have now establish failure criteria based on the biomechanical properties of the wood in trees. These show that a tree can have up to 70% of its internal radius decayed or disrupted and still remain structurally sound, provided that the outer 30% of the stem is sound wood. This 30/70 ratio is for a tree with a full crown. Therefore if the amount of sound wood is less than 30% it is possible to modify (carry out surgery) to the crown to reduce the stress loading on the stem. This is a practicably and often used solution for those tree species that will tolerate this sort of work.

Tomogram 2 is the same as 1 with an approximate position [red circle] where this 30% limit would be on this tree [the PICUS computer program has the ability to show this when calculating the Tomogram. This was not switched on in the tomogram supplied with the application to fell the tree]. From this it can be seen that nearly 90% of the outer 30% of the stem contains virtually solid wood, with the exception on two areas one of which is unrepresentative.

There is an alternative and equally plausible explanation for the tomogram results. The tree is, or appears to be either, two separate trees or a multi stemmed single tree. The resulting contact between the bark of these separate stems, where it has not fused or grafted together will remain a crack or barrier to the signal transmitted by the PICUS equipment, which would then result in anomalous and misleading results, showing a problem within the tree stem that may or may not exist.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Irrespective of the lack of any analysis to support the tomogram, the results show that there is sufficient sound wood remaining in the outer 30% of the stem radius. Therefore, the tree retains sufficient structural integrity not to be considered dangerous enough to be felled, at this time.

Works to or within the crown should be considered.

**RECOMMENDATIONS:**            **REFUSE** the application to fell the Holm Oak for the following reasons:

Insufficient evidence to support the conclusion that the tree represents a danger has been provided.

Irrespective of the lack of any analysis to support the tomogram, the results show that there is sufficient sound wood remaining in the outer 30% of the stem radius. Therefore, the tree retains sufficient structural integrity not to be considered dangerous enough to be felled, at this time.

Informatives:

That the tree has defects is not in doubt, it would therefore be prudent to carryout works within or to the crown that would reduce, further, any potential future risk, a process the council would endorse.

The applicant may appeal the councils decision by writing, within 28 days, to the Secretary of Sate

---

**NOTES:**



3

**Case Officer**  
**Mr W Simmonds**

**Contact No**  
**01722 434541**

3

S/2004/2616	07/12/2004	01/02/2005	ROGER EAST
WILT			
Easting: 409054	Northing: 130663.4		

PROPOSAL:	FULL APPLICATION -TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION
LOCATION:	28 LAMPARD TERRACE WILTON SALISBURY SP2 0LB

**REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS**

Councillor Edge has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to:  
Inconsistencies of advice at preliminary enquiry stage and subsequent application

**SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS**

28 Lampard Terrace is a two storey mid-terraced dwelling house forming part of a terraced row of sixteen similar properties. The majority of the terraced row fronts onto a pedestrian footpath, the other side of which is a the frontage of a further terrace of nine properties.

The property has an enclosed rear garden.

**THE PROPOSAL**

The proposal is to create a ground floor kitchen extension and first floor flat-roofed extension to create an additional bedroom at the front of the property.

**PLANNING HISTORY**

There have been three applications to create a two storey front extension at the property (including the present application. The first application (S/04/399) was withdrawn by the applicant on 21.04.04, the second (S/04/1928) was refused by SDC on 06.10.04 on the grounds that the proposal is contrary to Policy D3 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

**CONSULTATIONS**

There were no external consultations.

**REPRESENTATIONS**

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	No
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	Yes – expires 30.12.04
Third Party responses	No
Parish Council response	No

**MAIN ISSUES**

Impact on street scene  
Design  
Setting of undesirable precedent

**POLICY CONTEXT**

Adopted SDLP Policies G2 (General Principles for Development) & D3 (Design Policies – extensions)

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

Impact on the street scene – The proposed extension would create a block-like protrusion on the front of the existing building that would be out of character and unsympathetic to the appearance and form of the terraced row.

Design – the proposed extension is not compatible in terms of the scale, design and character of the existing property and would therefore fail to integrate satisfactorily in relation to other properties and the overall landscape framework.

The proposed development, if approved, would create an undesirable precedent which would make it difficult to refuse further similar applications.

## **CONCLUSION**

Although the existing property, and the terraced row of which it forms a part, cannot be described as being of great significance in terms of the merits of its architectural form, the row of dwellings were designed as an entity and form a coherent uniform design. The addition of the proposed extension to the front of the mid-terraced building would appear incongruous and would be unsympathetic and out of character with the existing building, the terraced row and the wider context of the overall landscape framework. The proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the street scene, would set an undesirable precedent for similar front extensions, and for the reasons outlined above is contrary to Policy D3 (Design of Extensions) of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE** for the following reasons:

(1) The proposed development is not compatible in terms of the scale, design and character of the existing building and fails to integrate satisfactorily with the terraced row, contrary to Policy D3 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

Contrary to the following policies of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan:

Policies G2 (General Principles for Development) & D3 (Design Policies – extensions)

---

**NOTES:**