

## Southern Area Planning Committee

---

**MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 14 NOVEMBER 2024 AT MARLBOROUGH ROOM, THE RED LION HOTEL, 4 MILFORD STREET, SALISBURY, SP1 2AU.**

**Present:**

Cllr Sven Hocking (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair), Cllr Richard Budden, Cllr Sam Charleston, Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr Nabil Najjar, Cllr Bridget Wayman and Cllr Ricky Rogers

---

61 **Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

- Cllr Charles McGrath
- Cllr Rich Rogers
- Cllr Andy Oliver

It was noted that Cllr Andy Oliver (Chairman) had been delayed by traffic and that Cllr Sven Hocking (Vice-Chairman) would chair the meeting. Cllr Oliver arrived after the Officer presentation and so did not take part in the meeting.

62 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 17 October 2024 were presented.

**Resolved:**

**To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes.**

63 **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

64 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman explained the meeting procedure to the members of the public.

65 **Public Participation**

The Committee noted the rules on public participation.

66 **Planning Appeals and Updates**

The committee received details of the appeal decisions as detailed in the agenda.

67 **Application Number: PL/2024/03723 - Springhill, Old Blandford Rd**

Public Participation

Mr Nick Cusack spoke in objection to the application

Mr Mark Maidment (Applicant) spoke in support of the application

Cllr Annie Riddle spoke in objection, on behalf of Salisbury City Council

A site visit took place prior to the committee meeting.

The Planning Officer, Hayley Clark, introduced a report which recommended that the application for two storey and single storey extensions and associated alterations, be approved.

Key details were stated to include the principle of development, scale, design, impacts on the character and the appearance of the area, residential amenity and highway issues.

A series of photographs and plans of the proposed development and site were shown throughout the presentation.

Members were made aware of the various third-party objections and concerns, including those from adjacent properties. It was advised that representations received in objection were focused on the impact to the neighbouring property Havendale, as well as scale and change in character of the current property. It was also suggested in the representations that the extension would be better placed if it were at the rear of the existing property and not to the front.

In addition, concerns had been raised around whether a larger property on the site would later be turned into a HMO or care home, however as clarified by the Officer, the application for consideration did not include change of use and therefore the Committee was reminded that it could only consider the application as it was presented.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Details were sought on the difference between the current living space to the proposed, of which the Officer estimated the extension to be 2.5 times the size of the current dwelling and that it would be extend beyond the current footprint.

The site was also noted as being close to the boundary of a Special Landscape Area (SLA) but that this had no bearing on the application. It was clarified that SLA was a saved policy from the Salisbury District Local Plan.

Councillor Andy Oliver arrived at the meeting, but as he had not been present for the Officer presentation, he did not take part in the meeting.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views to the committee as detailed above.

The Unitary Division Member, Councillor Brian Dalton read the comments of a neighbour living at Mulberries, who had been unable to attend the meeting. He then spoke in objection to the application, stating that he had called the application in to Committee for consideration in support of the resident's concerns, noting that he had also spoken to the applicant and had considered both sides of the situation.

Cllr Dalton agreed with there being no Highway concerns, however he supported the concerns relating to the proposed significant increase in size and height and the movement of the footprint by approximately 3m.

Cllr Dalton moved the motion of Refusal stating reasons as CP57, impact to neighbouring property and streetscene, the dominant outlook to Havendale, overdevelopment and bulk and height.

This motion was seconded by Cllr George Jeans.

A debate followed where the Committee discussed the height and scale of the proposed development and the suggestion that the extension would be preferable to neighbouring residents if it were situated at the rear of the current property. The large plot size was considered acceptable for the scale of development and the sloping nature of the land to the rear of the property was noted.

Clarity was sought on whether there were any rules which set limits to the size of a proposed extension, where the Officer noted that there had previously been a percentage figure which should not be exceeded, however that method of judgement had ceased some years previously.

To alleviate concerns raised, the Committee noted that if the application was approved, then any future change of use would need to be approved separately and would likely be brought to Committee for consideration.

At the close of debate, the Committee voted on the motion of Refusal, for the reasons as stated above.

It was;

### **Resolved**

**That planning permission be Refused for the following reasons:**

**The proposed development by reason of its scale, siting and design creates a large, incongruous, unsympathetic, prominent and dominating addition to the host dwelling which does not seek to take into account the local context. The proposed extensions add considerable bulk to the**

**existing dwelling, overwhelming the existing built form and also creating an overbearing and dominating impact on the amenity of the occupiers of Havendale to the detriment of their enjoyment of their home. As such the development is considered to be contrary to core policy 57 of the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy which requires development to "create a strong sense of place through drawing on the local context and being complimentary to the locality.**

68 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items

(Duration of meeting: 4.00 - 5.00 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Lisa Alexander of Democratic Services, direct line 01722 434560, e-mail [lisa.alexander@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:lisa.alexander@wiltshire.gov.uk)

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line 01225 713114 or email [communications@wiltshire.gov.uk](mailto:communications@wiltshire.gov.uk)