

# 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>

LIST OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS TO BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE FOLLOWING  
COMMITTEE  
WESTERN AREA – 8/12/05

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

Item Page	Application No Parish/Ward	Officer Recommendation Ward Councillors
<b>1</b>	S/2005/1672	TISBURY
	Mr O Marigold	REFUSAL
	SHELLEY CROUCH LITTLE CLONEEN HINDON LANE TISBURY SALISBURY	TISBURY & FOVANT Councillor Mrs Green Councillor Mr Hooper
<b>2</b>	S/2005/2128	SEDGEHILL & SEMLEY
	Miss A Rountree	REFUSAL
	DIOCESE OF SALISBURY SEMLEY C E V A FIRST SCHOOL SEMLEY SHAFTESBURY SP7 9AU	KNOYLE Councillor Mr Couper
<b>3</b>	S/2005/2127	SEDGEHILL & SEMLEY
	Miss A Rountree	REFUSAL
	DIOCESE OF SALISBURY SEMLEY C E V A FIRST SCHOOL SEMLEY SHAFTESBURY SP7 9AU	KNOYLE Councillor Mr Couper
<b>4</b>	S/2005/2305	DINTON
	Miss A Rountree	REFUSAL
	MR AND MRS R J HUGHES THE WARREN HINDON ROAD DINTON SALISBURY	FONTHILL & NADDER Councillor Mrs Willan
<b>5</b>	S/2005/2381	WEST TISBURY
	Mr W Simmonds	REFUSAL
	J AND R GREGG COOLS COTTAGE EAST KNOYLE SALISBURY	TISBURY & FOVANT Councillor Mrs Green Councillor Mr Hooper

**AGENDA ITEMS:**

**THE MONITORING & ENFORCEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL OCCUPANCY CONDITION**

**LAND AT LONG HOUSE, TEFFONT**

**S/2004/1485 – THE OLD GARDEN HOUSE, HIGH STREET, TISBURY**

# Part 1

## Applications recommended for Refusal

1

Application Number:	S/2005/1672		
Applicant/ Agent:	THE SWEDISH HOUSE COMPANY		
Location:	LITTLE CLONEEN HINDON LANE TISBURY SALISBURY SP3 6PU		
Proposal:	NEW SINGLE 3 BEDROOM DWELLING AND DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE		
Parish/ Ward	TISBURY		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	18 August 2005	Expiry Date	13 October 2005
Case Officer:	Mr O Marigold	Contact Number:	01722 434293

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Hooper has asked that the application be heard at WAC  
 Contrary to the view of a statutory consultee (Highway Authority)

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site consists on an area of land to the side of an existing dwelling at Cloneen and adjacent to another dwelling at Little Cloneen. The site has the appearance of an area of unkempt countryside with a number of vehicles etc stored on it.

### THE PROPOSAL

The application proposes the erection of a one-and-a-half storey dwelling, utilising an existing access.

### PLANNING HISTORY

Outline permission was granted on 13<sup>th</sup> September 1968 for the erection of two dwellings and a vehicular access (reference M&T4713/3097)

Reserved Matters permission was granted on 25<sup>th</sup> January 1972 for the erection of a bungalow and garage (reference 72/WV/23/23)

It has been accepted by the Council, in a letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> November 1986, that permission remains valid because a start was made on the erection of the dwelling by constructing the access.

### CONSULTATIONS

Highway Authority – recommend refusal on the grounds that the proposed development would lead to increased use of an existing access with sub-standard visibility in both directions along the C25 Hindon Road to the detriment of highway safety at this location

Wessex Water – site lies within a foul sewerred area

### REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	expired 22/09/05
Site Notice displayed	expires 22/09/05

Departure  
Neighbour notification expires 12/09/05  
Third Party responses none  
Parish Council response support, commenting that it would be a good position and in keeping with other properties and that materials would be in keeping with the environs (although a question mark is raised about access)

## **MAIN ISSUES**

The principle of development and relationship to housing/land allocation  
Impact on highway safety  
Impact on living conditions of nearby properties  
Recreational Open Space

## **POLICY CONTEXT**

H16, H14, E14A, G2

## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### ***The principle of development and relationship to housing/land allocation***

The Council's Forward Planning section have raised a policy objection on the grounds that the site lies within the housing and employment allocation at Weaveland Road (policies H14 and E14A) and that granting permission for this dwelling could prejudice the allocation. The proposed site is on the area of land that the Local Plan Inspector allocated for employment use and therefore it is premature at this stage to allow housing on any part of the site.

They also argue that the site is within phase 2 of the local plan (2006 – 2011) as it is a Greenfield site. The need for this Greenfield allocation will be reviewed in the new year, and there is a possibility that the site will not be required to meet the District's overall housing figures. If this is the case, the site will be de-allocated in the local plan and the Housing Policy Boundary will be moved, leaving this part of the site in the open countryside.

Forward Planning also comment that if the allocation is needed to meet the District's housing requirements, then a development brief will be prepared for the whole site, including the employment element. They comment that the site owner should be in dialogue with the future developer so that the future developer may know their aspirations.

However, notwithstanding the comments of Forward Planning Officers, although the site does lie within the allocation, the Housing Policy Boundary also follows the line of the allocation. Whilst moving the boundary may be proposed as part of a future Local Plan Inquiry, the fact remains that at present it does lie within the HPB.

Furthermore, there is a valid fallback position in that permission remains extant for a dwelling to be erected to the east of the site now proposed. A comparison therefore needs to be made between dwelling that could be built and the dwelling proposed now. Both would lie within the allocation, but the extant dwelling only lies partly in the allocated area whereas the dwelling now proposed would lie wholly within the allocated site.

The applicants have submitted details of the extent of land that CG Fry, the potential developers of the allocated site, have a legal option over. It is argued that CG Fry have no legal interest over the land now proposed for the dwelling. CG Fry did originally propose developing land including the application site, but the owner (the applicant's mother) did not agree to this and a subsequent proposal excluded the current application site.

However, none of these potential options have been considered formally by the Council and do not change the fact that the proposed dwelling would lie within the allocation site. Any agreement between the owner and the developer is outside the scope or control of the Local Planning Authority and could subsequently change without reference to the Planning Authority.

There is no guarantee that the layout and design now proposed by CG Fry will be acceptable to the Authority, particularly as a Development Brief for the site is currently in preparation (expected before March). Nor is there any guarantee that the dwelling now proposed would fit in with the design concept of the larger site.

The information submitted does not, therefore, provide sufficient justification to override the Forward Planning department's concerns regarding piecemeal development of this site. To grant permission for the proposed dwelling would effectively prevent consideration of a larger area for employment/housing. It would constrain the Council's Development Brief for the site as a whole.

The extant dwelling would have a lesser impact on the allocated site and therefore is to be preferred over the current proposals in that respect. Finally, in terms of design and the 'fall back' position, the extant bungalow is single storey while the current proposal is one-and-a-half storey. It is not considered that the proposed design is sufficiently superior to overcome the concerns expressed above.

### ***Impact on highway safety***

The Highway Authority have raised an objection to an increase in the use of the access proposed to serve the dwelling. However, the fall back position remains relevant to highway safety, because the extent scheme also proposed using this access – indeed a condition required specifically that the access be used.

However, if permission were being granted, a s106 would be necessary to prevent both extant and proposed dwellings being erected, resulting in an even greater level of traffic using the access.

### ***Impact on living conditions of nearby properties***

The proposed dwelling would be sited and designed so that first floor habitable windows would allow views into the private amenity space enjoyed by the existing dwelling at Cloneen. However, the new dwelling would be a sufficient distance away for the privacy of this property to be maintained. The proposal would therefore be acceptable in terms of its impact on the living conditions or nearby properties.

### **Impact on character and appearance of the area**

Notwithstanding the 'in principle' objection to the development, consideration has to be given to the impact of the proposal of the appearance of the area. The surrounding area has a wide mix and range of dwellings, including bungalows nearby. In this light, the proposed design is considered to have an acceptable appearance.

### **Recreational Open Space**

In that no provision has been made for recreational open space (through a s106) permission should also be refused on these grounds.

### **CONCLUSION**

The development of a dwelling on the site as proposed now would prejudice future strategic development of the site through a development brief – essentially it would limit the options for the wider development of the site as a whole. The lack of Recreational Open Space agreement must also form a reason for refusal for the Council to defend its position at appeal in this regard.

### **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE**

#### **REASONS FOR REFUSAL:**

(1) The position of the dwelling as submitted would lie within a site currently allocated in the Local plan under policies H14 and E14A for a comprehensive residential and employment scheme. The development hereby proposed would be a piecemeal form of development that would prejudice the overall planning and development of the allocated site. The proposed

dwelling, as submitted, would therefore conflict with policies H14 and E14A of the Replacement Salisbury District Local Plan.

(2) The proposed development, in that it does not make provision for recreational open space, would conflict with policy R2 of the Replacement Salisbury District local Plan  
INFORMATIVE: - R2 FOR REFUSAL It should be noted that the reason given above relating to Policy R2 of the adopted Local Plan could be overcome if all the relevant parties can agree with a Section 106 Agreement, or, if appropriate by a condition, in accordance with the standard requirement of public recreational open space.

Application Number:	S/2005/2128		
Applicant/ Agent:	A JESTYN COKE CAHRTERED SURVEYORS		
Location:	SEMLEY C E V A FIRST SCHOOL SEMLEY SHAFTESBURY SP7 9AU		
Proposal:	ERECT TIMBER FRAMED CLASSROOM EXTENSION		
Parish/ Ward	SEDGEHILL & SEMLEY		
Conservation Area:	SEMLEY	LB Grade:	II
Date Valid:	25 October 2005	Expiry Date	20 December 2005
Case Officer:	Miss A Rountree	Contact Number:	01722 434312

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Couper has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to the prominent nature of the site.

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Semley Primary School is located within the Conservation Area of Semley and the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The school is a Grade II listed stone building dating from 1866 which has had various extensions in the past

The school grounds are well screened extending to the rear wrapping around the southern boundary of St Leonard's Church to the north east of the school, which is screened by mature trees and hedging to the north boundary of the school.

### THE PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a classroom extension protruding from the north elevation of the newly built hall extension attached by a flat roofed link. The proposed extension will measure 10 metres by 6.5 metres with a pitched roof rising to 5.3 metres and will be constructed from a timber frame rendered to closely match the colour of the stone used for the existing building.

Amended plans were received during the course of the application to change the roof from Plasticol coated steel profiled sheeting to plain tiles with steeper roof pitch.

### PLANNING HISTORY

95/0667	Extension of craft, design and technology area at Semley First School	AC
21.06.95		
95/0947	LB consent, erection of extension at Semley First School	AC
28.07.95		
97/0997	Extension - alterations to access and to boiler room at Semley First School	AC
15.08.97		
97/1054LB	Extension and boiler room alteration	AC
20.08.97		
99/0611	Temporary permission for mobile classroom and new access door to school at Semley First School	
99/658LB	Provide a new door opening to main school	AC
05.07.99		
02/1170	Rear extension	AC
06.08.02		
02/1171/LB	Pitched roof extension to in-fill between existing building and store and insertion of window in	

	existing building	AC
06.08.02		
03/2119	Proposed new school hall	AC
03/03/04		
03/2148	Proposed school hall	AC
03.03.04		
04/1129	Renewal of full planning permission for mobile classroom (ref S/1999/0611)	AC
13.07.04		
04/1203	Extension to classroom 2 adjacent to new hall.	AC
13.07.04		

## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes	Expired 24/11/05
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expired 24/11/05
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expired 15/11/05
Third Party responses	Yes	Salisbury Civic Society express concern about the design approach taken
Parish Council response	No	

## MAIN ISSUES

Impact on Listed Building

## POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP Policies CN3

## PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

### Impact on Listed Building

The proposal would be a retrograde step in terms of design following the previously granted school hall extension which relates well to the design and detailing of the original building. The Salisbury Civic Society have "serious concerns about the approach the designers have taken" believing that the design and appearance is more akin to that of a temporary mobile classroom although the amendment to the roof materials was received after their comments. The proposal lacks the detailing shown in both the original building and newly constructed hall extension which features coped verging and stone quoins. In addition neither the fenestration nor the design of the windows respect that of the original building and the flat roofed link further makes the extension appear temporary and substandard. Although the proposed extension is to the rear of the site and will not be visible from the road it will be visible from church yard and as such is considered to have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area and the setting of both the listed school and church.

## CONCLUSION

The proposed extension is judged to be contrary to policies CN3 by virtue of the substandard design of the proposed extension, which will in turn have a detrimental impact to the school building itself, the adjacent listed church and the surrounding Conservation Area.

## RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL

### REASONS FOR REFUSAL:

(1) The proposed extension would be detrimental to the character of the original building by reason of the materials, inappropriate fenestration design and lack of architectural detailing and would be harmful to the character and setting of the building which is Grade II Listed. It is therefore judged to be contrary to policy CN3 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.



Application Number:	S/2005/2127		
Applicant/ Agent:	A JESTYN COKE CHARTERED SURVEYORS		
Location:	SEMLEY C E V A FIRST SCHOOL SEMLEY SHAFTESBURY SP7 9AU		
Proposal:	ERECT TIMBER CLASSROOM EXTENSION		
Parish/ Ward	SEDGEHILL & SEMLEY		
Conservation Area:	SEMLEY	LB Grade:	II
Date Valid:	25 October 2005	Expiry Date	20 December 2005
Case Officer:	Miss A Rountree	Contact Number:	01722 434312

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Couper has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to the prominent nature of the site.

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

Semley Primary School is located within the Conservation Area of Semley and the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The school is a Grade II listed stone building dating from 1866 which has had various extensions in the past

The school grounds are well screened extending to the rear wrapping around the southern boundary of St Leonard's Church to the north east of the school, which is screened by mature trees and hedging to the north boundary of the school.

### THE PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for a classroom extension protruding from the north elevation of the newly built hall extension attached by a flat roofed link. The proposed extension will measure 10 metres by 6.5 metres with a pitched roof rising to 5.3 metres and will be constructed from a timber frame rendered to closely match the colour of the stone used for the existing building.

Amended plans were received during the course of the application to change the roof from Plasticol coated steel profiled sheeting to plain tiles with steeper roof pitch.

### PLANNING HISTORY

95/0667	Extension of craft, design and technology area at Semley First School	AC
21.06.95		
95/0947	LB consent, erection of extension at Semley First School	AC
28.07.95		
97/0997	Extension - alterations to access and to boiler room at Semley First School	AC
15.08.97		
97/1054LB	Extension and boiler room alteration	AC
20.08.97		
99/0611	Temporary permission for mobile classroom and new access door to school at Semley First School	
99/658LB	Provide a new door opening to main school	AC
05.07.99		
02/1170	Rear extension	AC
06.08.02		
02/1171/LB	Pitched roof extension to in-fill between existing building and store and insertion of window in	

	existing building	AC
06.08.02		
03/2119	Proposed new school hall	AC
03/03/04		
03/2148	Proposed school hall	AC
03.03.04		
04/1129	Renewal of full planning permission for mobile classroom (ref S/1999/0611)	AC
13.07.04		
04/1203	Extension to classroom 2 adjacent to new hall.	AC
13.07.04		

## REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	Yes	Expired 24/11/05
Site Notice displayed	Yes	Expired 24/11/05
Departure	No	
Neighbour notification	Yes	Expired 15/11/05
Third Party responses	Yes	Salisbury Civic Society express concern about the design approach taken
Parish Council response	No	

## MAIN ISSUES

Scale & Design  
Impact on Tree  
Impact on Neighbour

## POLICY CONTEXT

Adopted SDLP Policies G2, C4, C5, D3, CN5, CN8, CN11, PS5

## PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

### Scale & Design

While the principle of extension to the school is accepted by policy PS5 the proposal would be a retrograde step in terms of design following the previously granted school hall extension which relates well to the design and detailing of the original building. The Salisbury Civic Society have "serious concerns about the approach the designers have taken" believing that the design and appearance is more akin to that of a temporary mobile classroom although the amendment to the roof materials was received after their comments. The proposal lacks the detailing shown in both the original building and newly constructed hall extension which features coped verging and stone quoins. In addition neither the fenestration nor the design of the windows respect that of the original building and the flat roofed link further makes the extension appear temporary and substandard. Although the proposed extension is to the rear of the site and will not be visible from the road it will be visible from church yard and as such is considered to have a detrimental impact on the Conservation Area and the setting of both the school and church.

### Impact on Tree

There is a large mature tree close to the proposed site of the extension, which is protected by right of its position within the Conservation Area. The application fails to indicate that there is a tree on the site and also fails to follow the current British standard in providing the Local Planning Authority with information about it. The arboricultural officer considers that the proposed extension is within the required root protection zone and this in conjunction with the need for services such as soakaways would cause significant damage to the tree root system which would cause significant damage to the tree root system. As such refusal is recommended due to the likelihood of loss or damage to this tree. The arboricultural officer will be reporting further on investigations concerning the effect the proposal will have on the tree within late correspondence.

**Impact on Neighbour**

The proposed extension will be located very close to the boundary with the church but some distance from any residential buildings so the impact on residential amenity is considered to be minimal.

**CONCLUSION**

The proposed extension is judged to be contrary to policies C4, C5, CN5, CN8 & CN11 by virtue of the substandard design of the proposed extension, which will in turn have a detrimental impact to the school building itself, the adjacent church and the surrounding Conservation Area and AONB. In addition the proposal is contrary to policies G1, G2 and CN11 due to the failure to retain or protect an important tree on the site which has a positive impact on the natural environment of the district and the leafy character of the Conservation Area.

**RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL**

Reasons for Refusal:

(1) The proposed extension is unsympathetic to the existing building by reason of its design and character, the fenestration design and lack of architectural detailing. It would therefore be harmful to the character of the Grade II Listed building itself and the surrounding Conservation Area and AONB. It is therefore judged to be contrary to policy C4, C5, CN5, CN8, CN9 and CN11 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

(2) The proposal fails to safeguard and important tree on the site which is protected by virtue of being located within a Conservation Area. As such the application fails to respect an existing beneficial landscape and conserve the natural environment of the district and is therefore contrary to policy G1, G2 & CN11 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.



## **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Scale & Design**

The principle of development is accepted by the site's inclusion within the Housing Policy Boundary of Dinton and a chalet bungalow is appropriate the site being situated between The Warren a bungalow, and Woodland View a chalet bungalow. However, it represents a cramped form of development leaving very little amenity space surrounding either the new property or The Warren with the proposed dwelling very close to the boundary on both sides. This is out of keeping with the character this area of Dinton, which is characterised by properties well spaced from each other. The proposed materials are appropriate although no details have been provided regarding the rear of the carport, which from the plans appears to be constructed from glazed blocks. Regardless of this, the design of the carport which dominates the side of the property is inappropriate and its deletion would largely overcome the cramped development. Otherwise the design successfully echoes that of Woodland View although attention to the roof detail is lacking with a mix of pitched, hipped and half hipped roofs.

### **Impact on Neighbour**

Woodland View has only one ground floor window on the side elevation and the proposed dwelling will have one ground floor window facing this and a rooflight, which as it serves a bathroom could be conditioned as obscure glazed. There is a single storey window proposed on the west elevation but as there is a double garage between this and The Warren this is not considered detrimental. In addition given the orientation the additional overshadowing to both Woodland View and The Warren is considered minimal.

### **Impact on Protected Species**

English Nature have suggested that there may be Badgers present on the site and have requested a protected species survey in order to ascertain the effect of such a development on their habitats. PPG 9 States that "the presence of a protected species is a material consideration when a local planning authority is considering a development proposal which, if carried out would be likely to result in harm to the species or its habitat" and therefore the absence of such a survey is a reason for refusal. As such the proposal is contrary to policy C12 of the Adopted SDLP.

### **R2 Contribution**

The scheme relates to the creation of new residential development and in order to comply with the requirements of policy R2 of the local plan, applicants are required to enter into a unilateral undertaking and provide a commuted financial payment. Applicants are now required to sign agreements during the course of the application. They have indicated that they are happy to sign the agreement. However, payment is only requested if the council is minded to approve the scheme. It will be necessary to include a reason for refusal relating to policy R2 in the event of an appeal against a decision to refuse the scheme.

## **CONCLUSION**

Although the principle of a new dwelling in this location is accepted by policy H16 and it is considered to have minimal impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties it would represent a cramped form of development of a substandard design dominated by a large integral carport. In addition the submission of a protected species survey and contribution towards R2 funds is required. The proposal is therefore judged to be contrary to policies D2, C4, C5, C12 and R2.

## **RECOMMENDATION: REFUSAL**

Reasons for Refusal:

(1) The proposed dwelling as submitted would represent a cramped form of development of a substandard design out of keeping with the locality which is characterised by properties well spaced from one another and would provide insufficient amenity space for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling. It is therefore contrary to policy D2, G2, C4 and C5 of the Adopted SDLP.

(2) Insufficient information has been supplied to demonstrate that the proposal will not harm protected species, contrary to policy C12 of the Adopted Salisbury District Local Plan and advice contained within PPG 9.

(3) The proposed residential development is considered by the Local Planning Authority to be contrary to Policy R2 of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan because appropriate provision towards public recreational open space has not been made.

INFORMATIVE: - R2 FOR REFUSAL

It should be noted that the reason given above relating to Policy R2 of the adopted Local Plan could be overcome if all the relevant parties can agree with a Section 106 Agreement, or, if appropriate by a condition, in accordance with the standard requirement of public recreational open space.

Application Number:	S/2005/2381		
Applicant/ Agent:	S ROGERSON		
Location:	COOLS COTTAGE EAST KNOYLE SALISBURY SP3 6DB		
Proposal:	INSTALLATION OF ROOF - MOUNTED SOLAR COLLECTORS TO SOUTH ELEVATION.		
Parish/ Ward	WEST TISBURY		
Conservation Area:		LB Grade:	
Date Valid:	22 November 2005	Expiry Date	17 January 2006
Case Officer:	Mr W Simmonds	Contact Number:	01722 434541

### REASON FOR REPORT TO MEMBERS

Councillor Hooper has requested that this item be determined by Committee due to: the issues involved in the application

### SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The application site is a detached dwelling situated in the countryside (AONB)

### THE PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes the addition of two banks of two roof-mounted solar water heating collector units to the roof of the south (road facing) elevation.

### PLANNING HISTORY

S/05/1684 – Installation of two roof mounted solar panels to south elevation. WD 18.10.05  
S/01/656 – Provision of hydrotherapy pool and enclosure. AC 25.05.01

### CONSULTATIONS

None

### REPRESENTATIONS

Advertisement	No
Site Notice displayed	Yes
Departure	No
Neighbour notification	No neighbours
Third Party responses	Site notice expires 22.12.05
Parish Council response (S/05/1684)	Not yet received – Previously supported the application

### MAIN ISSUES

Impact on surrounding AONB  
Impact on neighbour amenity  
Design and materials

### POLICY CONTEXT

Policies G2 (General Criteria for Development), D3 (Design) & C5 (Landscape Conservation)

### PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The property has three existing (smaller) roof mounted solar collectors for domestic water heating.

The acceptability of the proposed development in respect of Sustainable Development and the prudent use of natural resources, in accordance with Government guidance contained within PPS 1, 7 & 22 is not in doubt, however the application should also be considered with other relevant considerations of compatibility with the existing building and the impact of the proposal on the landscape of the surrounding AONB.

Notwithstanding the positive benefits of solar water heating systems in terms of Sustainable Development, it is considered that on balance the visual impact of the proposed roof mounted solar collectors, taken together with the existing solar collectors on the same roof plane, would give a cluttered appearance that was out of sympathy with the landscape of the surrounding AONB.

It is not considered the proposed development would unduly disturb, interfere or conflict with adjoining dwellings or uses to the detriment of existing occupiers.

## **CONCLUSION**

Notwithstanding the positive benefits of solar water heating systems in terms of Sustainable Development, it is considered that on balance the proposed solar collection apparatus, when added to the existing solar collection apparatus attached to the same roof plane, would give the roof a cluttered appearance that was out of sympathy with the landscape of the surrounding Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, contrary to Policy C5 (Landscape Conservation) of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Subject to no new issues being raised before 22/12/05 **REFUSE** for the following reason:

The proposed solar collection apparatus, when considered in conjunction with the existing solar collection apparatus attached to the same roof plane, would result in a cluttered appearance to the roof of the property. As such, the proposed development would be detrimental to the overall appearance of this dwelling and would be out of sympathy with the landscape of the surrounding Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, contrary to Policies D3 (Design) and C5 (Landscape Conservation) of the adopted Salisbury District Local Plan.

## **INFORMATIVE**

Notwithstanding the above reason for refusal, the Local Planning Authority is keen to encourage sustainable energy resources such as those proposed and the applicant is therefore encouraged to contact the Local Planning Authority for further discussions for the alternative siting of the proposed solar collection apparatus.



**Part 2**  
**Applications recommended for Approval**

No Approvals