

Southern Area Planning Committee

MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 31 MARCH 2022 AT SALISBURY ARTS CENTRE.

Present:

Cllr Richard Britton (Chairman), Cllr Sven Hocking (Vice-Chairman), Cllr Trevor Carbin, Cllr Brian Dalton, Cllr George Jeans, Cllr Charles McGrath, Cllr Ian McLennan, Cllr Nabil Najjar and Cllr Rich Rogers

63 **Apologies**

Apologies were received from:

- Cllr Nick Errington

64 **Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 February 2022 were presented.

Resolved:

To approve as a correct record and sign the minutes.

65 **Declarations of Interest**

Declarations of interest were received from:

Cllr Rich Rogers, who declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 7a, PL/2021/08473, 1 Bourne View, Allington, SP4 0AA as he knew the owner of the site. Cllr Rogers declared that knowing the applicant did not prejudice his view and that he would keep an open mind while he debated and voted on the item.

For transparency, Cllr Nabil Najjar declared an interest in agenda items 7b and 7c, due to him being the portfolio holder for Arts, Heritage and Tourism. This was a non-pecuniary interest and therefore Cllr Najjar declared he would keep an open mind while he debated and voted on the items.

66 **Chairman's Announcements**

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

67 **Public Participation**

The committee noted the rules on public participation.

68 **Planning Appeals and Updates**

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

69 **Planning Applications**

The Committee considered the following planning applications.

70 **APPLICATION NUMBER: PL/2021/08473 - 1 Bourne View, Allington, SP4 0AA**

Public Participation

Peter Banks spoke in objection to the application.

Jonathan Ross spoke in support of the application.

Richard Hughes (Development Management Team Leader, South) presented a report which recommended that planning permission be approved with conditions for the erection of a single 2-storey 3 bed dwelling (outline with some matters reserved).

Key details were stated to include the principle of development, character of the area, residential amenity, highways issues, trees and ecology.

The officer ran through the slides as published in agenda supplement 1, which included maps showing the site, proposed site plans, indicative elevations and floorplans, and pictures of the proposed site. The officer explained that the road to the site was owned by Wiltshire Council but was not an adopted road. The road to the site was narrow. There was a parking area next to the site which local residents used. The proposal included 2 parking spaces.

Members of the committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. In response the officer explained where within the site the dwelling was located, which was towards the access and car parking area, with the end elevation parallel to the A338. The officer stated that he believed the neighbouring parking area was owned by Wiltshire Council. In response to further questions, it was stated that the dwelling was not large, but average for a modern house and that its proposed location was about a metre away from the bank along the A338.

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

The unitary division member, Cllr Rich Rogers, spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Rogers stated that there was a lack of clarity regarding the

shared access, the access road in the close was very narrow, there was already a lack of parking in the area which would be exacerbated by the development. He explained that Wiltshire Council had previously contacted residents regarding double parking in the narrow access road, a problem he felt that had arisen due to the lack of available parking. Cllr Rogers highlighted visual impact as an issue as the proposed dwelling would be prominent when viewed from the A338, which would alter the existing rural character of the area. He also stated that the proposed dwelling was too big for the site and that any future residents would be exposed to noise and pollution from the A338.

Cllr Rogers proposed a motion that the application be refused, against officer recommendation, for the same reasons the 2008 application had been refused. Including that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the site which would exacerbate existing parking and highway issues in the area, and have an adverse impact on residential amenity, and the general amenity of the rural area. This motion was seconded by Cllr Carbin.

During debate Members of the Committee expressed a variety of views, including that the location of the site meant that residents on the estate had to use cars as there was little public transport available and depriving people of parking spaces would not stop them using cars; parking was already an issue in the road; that the location of the dwelling on the plot could be improved if the dwelling was moved to be in line with existing houses, this would also mean an extra parking space could be added to the plans; that the Committee could not predetermine any future applications; and that whilst the parking included with the application met requirements, more cars would clearly add to an existing issue.

At the conclusion of the debate it was;

Resolved:

That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

REASONS: (1)

- 1. On the basis of the indicative layout provided, the proposal has failed to satisfactorily demonstrate that the site can accommodate a 3 bedroomed dwelling with adequate on-site parking. As a result, the proposed development would constitute an overdevelopment of the site which would exacerbate existing parking and highway issues in the area and be unsympathetic to the general amenity and character of the rural area and detrimental to residential amenity, contrary to the provisions of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (2015) policies CP57 (Ensuring High Quality Design and Place Shaping); the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021); and the National Design Guide 2021.**

APPLICATION NUMBER: 20/10860/FUL & 21/00267/LBC - The White Hart Hotel, St John's Street, Salisbury, SP1 2SB

Public Participation

There were no public speakers on this item.

Richard Hughes, (Development Team Leader, South) presented a report which recommended that subject to confirmation from Wiltshire Council Ecology that the revised generic assessment had been agreed between the Council and Natural England, to approve, subject to conditions the proposed extension of White Hart Hotel providing 22 No. new hotel bedrooms, relocation of back of house facilities, infill of ground floor and façade changes to St Johns Street.

Attention was drawn to the following late observations; Wiltshire Council ecology had confirmed the phosphate matters as resolved, and the applicant had sent in a summary of issues that had been resolved as part of the planning process.

Key details were stated to include the principle of development, scale and design, impact on the historic environment/heritage assets, residential amenity, highway/transport considerations, drainage/flood risk and the impact on the River Avon Special Area of Conservation/Phosphates.

The officer presented in detail the slides as published in agenda supplement 1, which included photos of the site, the evolution of the hotel and surrounded listed buildings, plans of the previously refused scheme, plans of the extant permission (19/04857/FUL), plans of the originally submitted scheme, plans of the revised scheme, the extent of the proposed demolition, details of elevations, the relationship to adjacent properties and an overshadowing survey.

It was noted that there were 2 related applications for this item, a Full application and a Listed Building Consent application. There were many comments in the report relating to the original scheme which had now been radically changed. The wall along St. Ann's Street had extant permission for 9 serviced apartments. The under croft would be affected by some minor works. The site was very close to neighbouring dwellings and the relationship to those was important. The glass link had been removed from the application due to Natural England objections. The proposal would mean that parking spaces in the car park would reduce from 68 spaces to 59 spaces. The overshadowing survey showed that there would be some shadowing caused by the proposal, although the current hotel already caused overshadowing, so the proposal would have little effect.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Clarification was sought on the material to be used for the roof of the extension. The officer confirmed that the proposal was for a standing seam metal roof.

The unitary division member, Cllr Sven Hocking, spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Hocking highlighted that economic development, business and

tourism were all important but that these had to be balanced against neighbouring properties amenity as he felt that there would be a negative affect on the neighbours. Cllr Hocking stated that the materials to be used, such as the metal roof and cladding were both issues as these did not fit with the surroundings.

Cllr Hocking therefore proposed that the applications be refused on the grounds of neighbour amenity and visual amenity. This was seconded by Cllr Rich Rogers.

A debate followed where many Cllrs felt that the materials to be used, in particular the metal roof and the cladding on the facades were an issue as these would impact on the listed building and did not fit with neighbouring dwellings and surroundings. There was general favour in principle for the development for economic and tourism reasons, however the design was an issue for many. There was a debate as to whether refusal was best option as it was thought that if the applicant went to appeal they would lose, some thought that approval with extra conditions regarding the materials to be used would be the best option and others felt that deferring the application to seek clarity on the materials to be used would be better. Members also expressed surprise and disappointment that no one representing the application had come to speak at the meeting.

Clarity was sought from the planning officer on the various options available.

Cllr Sven Hocking withdrew his motion to refuse permission which was supported by his seconder Cllr Rich Rogers.

Cllr Hocking then proposed a motion to defer the application in order to seek clarity on the materials and overall design of the building given the close proximity of the building to adjacent dwellings and the impact on the listed building. This was seconded by Cllr Rich Rogers.

There was no further debate and it was;

Resolved:

That planning permission for be deferred (for both 20/10860/FUL and 21/00267/LBC) in order to seek clarity on the materials and overall design of the building given the close proximity of the building to adjacent dwellings and the impact on the listed building.

72 **APPLICATION NUMBER: PL/2021/08150 (FUL) & PL/2021/08151 (LBC) - Pond Close cottage, Ansty, SP3 5PU**

Public Participation

Mr Jonathan Manser (agent) spoke in support of the application.

Miss Patricia Maxwell-Arnot of Donhead St Andrew Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

Richard Hughes (Development Management Team Leader, South) presented a report which recommended that subject to any further comments from WC Ecology, then planning permission should be approved subject to conditions for the demolition of an existing two storey residential annexe and modern conservatory at Pond Close Cottage (Grade II Listed), and the creation of a new two storey guest annexe, connected to the existing cottage by a discrete, single storey link.

The officer took the Committee through the slideshow detailing the location of the site, pictures of the site, views of the site from a public footpath and the proposed plans. It was explained that the site consisted of a grade II listed cottage, with a conservatory and an old farm building to the north of the main dwelling which had been converted to ancillary accommodation and used as an annexe for many years. The proposal included the removal of the conservatory from the main dwelling and the demolition of the 2 storey annexe, which would be replaced by a new 2 storey flat roofed annexe connected to the main dwelling by a glass link corridor. The new annexe was to be a contemporary building made with traditional materials. It was highlighted that there were 2 applications for this item, the FUL application and the Listed Building Consent.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. In response to questions the officer stated that the link from the annexe to the main dwelling was required, so that it was not a separate dwelling and that whilst this was an unusual application as the annexe was so large, it was not unique. The officer confirmed that Members could condition that the annexe was demolished prior to building work being commenced on the new annex in order to ensure a new dwelling was not created, however he highlighted that it would be very hard to build the new annexe without demolishing the current annexe as some of the footprint of the buildings was the same.

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

Cllr Brian Dalton read a statement on behalf of the unitary division member, Cllr Nick Errington, and spoke in objection to the application. It was highlighted that the statement was written prior to the publication of supplement 1. Cllr Errington had stated that he was aware of the concerns of Donhead St. Andrew Parish Council regarding the impact on the 17th century building and the wider landscape and that he shared these concerns. The site was located within the Grade II Registered Park and Garden of Wardour Castle. The proposed annexe was modern, out of place and not the right design for the location. The site was also in a Dark Sky Park and there could be issues with light pollution. Screening of the site, in particular from the footpath could be an issue and it would have been good to know the size and species of the proposed planting for screening purposes.

Cllr Brian Dalton proposed a motion to refuse planning permission on the grounds that it did not comply with CP57 (High Quality Design and Place Shaping), CP58 (Ensuring the Conservation of the Historic Environment), NPPF

174 and 176 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment). This was seconded by Cllr George Jeans.

A debate followed where one of the issues raised was whether this was an annexe, or simply a separate house, which at some point could be separated and possibly sold on. Members questioned whether it could be conditioned that the annexe could not be separated. The planning officer confirmed that this was already covered by condition 8.

Many Members expressed their support for the application and felt that the contrast between the old cottage and the proposed new annexe would be positive. They also felt the screening would be adequate and that Members had to trust that officers had looked into any light pollution issues. Others did not like the juxtaposition of the old and new.

The motion was put to the vote and the motion to refuse fell.

Cllr Sven Hocking then proposed a motion to approve, with conditions as per the officer recommendation, with an additional condition that the existing annexe be demolished before the new annexe is built. This was seconded by Cllr Richard Britton.

There was no further debate and it was;

Resolved:

That planning permission for application PL/2021/08150 (FUL) be granted with the following conditions:

Conditions: (9)

- 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:**

1214_001 (Location Plan) dated 18/12/20

1214_003-revE (Proposed Site Plan) dated 10/03/22

1214_P010 (Demolition Plan) dated 18/12/20

1214_P110-revA (Proposed Basement Plan) dated 02/07/21

1214_P111-revD (Proposed Ground Floor Plan) dated 13/07/21

1214_P112-revC (Proposed First Floor Plan) dated 13/07/21

1214_P113-revA (Proposed Roof Plan) dated 13/07/21

1214_P300-revE (Proposed Elevations AA – Annexe and house west elevation) dated 11/02/22

1214_P301-revC (Proposed Elevations BB – Annexe and house south elevation) dated 13/07/21
1214_P302-revD (Proposed Elevations CC – Proposed east (whole) elevation including house and link to annexe) dated 13/07/21
1214_P303-revB (Proposed Elevations DD – Proposed east (part hidden) elevations of house and annexe) dated 13/07/21
1214_P304-revC (Proposed Elevations EE – Proposed north side elevations of house and link to annexe) dated 13/07/21
1214_P305-revE (Proposed Elevations FF – Proposed north east side elevations of house and annexe) dated 11/02/22
1214_400-revB (Existing and Proposed Site Section AA – north elevation) dated 21/07/21
1214_401-revC (Existing and Proposed Site Section BB – front view of house and annexe) dated 21/07/21
638-P-00-100 P02 (Proposed Landscape Plan) dated 12/07/21
638-S-AA-101 P02 (Proposed General Arrangement AA – west elevation of house and annexe) dated 08/07/21
638-S-BB-102 P02 (Proposed General Arrangement BB – north side elevation of house and link) dated 12/07/21
638-S-CC-103 P02 (Proposed General Arrangement CC – north side elevation of house and annexe) dated 12/07/21

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

3. No external lighting shall be installed on-site until plans showing the type of light appliance, the height and position of fitting, illumination levels and light spillage in accordance with the appropriate Environmental Zone standards set out by the Institution of Lighting Professionals in their publication “The Reduction of Obtrusive Light” Guidance Note 01/21 (reference GN01/21), have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved lighting shall be installed and shall be maintained in accordance with the approved details and no additional external lighting shall be installed.

REASON: In the interests of the amenities of the area and to minimise unnecessary light spillage above and outside the development site and to avoid illumination of bat habitats

4. No development shall commence on site until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, the details of which shall include:-
 - location and current canopy spread of all existing trees and hedgerows on the land;
 - full details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development;
 - a detailed planting specification showing all plant species, supply and planting sizes and planting densities;
 - finished levels and contours;

- means of enclosure;
- car park layouts;
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- all hard and soft surfacing materials;
- minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, play equipment, refuse and other storage units, signs, lighting etc);
- proposed and existing functional services above and below ground (e.g. drainage, power, communications, cables, pipelines etc indicating lines, manholes, supports etc);
- retained historic landscape features and proposed restoration, where relevant.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

5. All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the annexe or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner; All shrubs, trees and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any trees or plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority. All hard landscaping shall also be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the occupation of any part of the development or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development and the protection of existing important landscape features.

6. The mitigation measures detailed in the approved Protected Species Report (1372.01 rep 01 KC.docx dated 19/07/2021) shall be carried out in full prior to the first bringing into use/occupation of the development.

REASON: To mitigate against the loss of existing biodiversity and nature habitats.

7. All works shall be carried out in strict accordance with the approved Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) from Woodland & Countryside Management Ltd dated 19/07/2021.

REASON: In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied that the trees to be retained on and adjacent to the site will not be damaged during the construction works and to ensure that

as far as possible the work is carried out in accordance with current best practice and section 197 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

8. The existing annexe accommodation/building as shown on the approved plans, shall be removed from the site, prior to the new replacement annexe building being commenced. The new replacement annexe building hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the main dwelling, known as Pond Close Cottage and it shall remain within the same planning unit as the main dwelling.

REASON: The additional accommodation is sited in a position where the Local Planning Authority, having regard to the reasonable standards of residential amenity, access, and planning policies pertaining to the area, would not permit a wholly separate dwelling. The Council would not wish to see two annexe buildings on the site in the open countryside.

9. The residential annexe development hereby approved shall be designed to ensure it does not exceed 110 litres per person per day water consumption levels (which includes external water usage). Within 3 months of each phase being completed and the accommodation being brought into use, a post construction stage certificate that this standard has been achieved shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval.

REASON: To ensure compliance with the prevailing mitigation strategy for nutrient neutrality in the water catchment within which this development is located.

Informatives: (3)

Any alterations to the approved plans, brought about by compliance with Building Regulations or any other reason must first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before commencement of work.

The applicant is reminded that this planning permission must be read in conjunction with listed building consent PL/2021/08151.

The roof space of the main house and annexe are both used as a bat roost. Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, it is an offence to harm or disturb bats or damage or destroy their roosts. Planning permission for development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this legislation. The applicant is advised that a European Protected Species Licence will be required before any work is undertaken to implement this planning permission. Future conversion of the roof space to living accommodation or replacing the roof could also

breach this legislation and advice should be obtained from a professional bat ecologist before proceeding with work of this nature.

Members then considered the associated Listed Building Consent, application PL/2021/08151(LBC). All matters for this application were the same as for the FUL application.

Cllr George Jeans proposed a motion to approve the application, with conditions, as per the officer recommendation, which was seconded by Cllr Richard Britton.

There was no further debate and it was,

Resolved:

That planning permission for PL/2021/08151 (LBC) be granted, with the following conditions:

Conditions (2):

- 1. The works for which Listed Building Consent is hereby granted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this consent.**

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:**

1214_001 (Location Plan) dated 18/12/20

1214_003-revE (Proposed Site Plan) dated 10/03/22

1214_P010 (Demolition Plan) dated 18/12/20

1214_P110-revA (Proposed Basement Plan) dated 02/07/21

1214_P111-revD (Proposed Ground Floor Plan) dated 13/07/21

1214_P112-revC (Proposed First Floor Plan) dated 13/07/21

1214_P113-revA (Proposed Roof Plan) dated 13/07/21

1214_P300-revE (Proposed Elevations AA – Annexe and house west elevation) dated 11/02/22

1214_P301-revC (Proposed Elevations BB – Annexe and house south elevation) dated 13/07/21

1214_P302-revD (Proposed Elevations CC – Proposed east (whole) elevation including house and link to annexe) dated 13/07/21

1214_P303-revB (Proposed Elevations DD – Proposed east (part hidden) elevations of house and annexe) dated 13/07/21

1214_P304-revC (Proposed Elevations EE – Proposed north side elevations of house and link to annexe) dated 13/07/21

1214_P305-revE (Proposed Elevations FF – Proposed north east side elevations of house and annexe) dated 11/02/22

1214_400-revB (Existing and Proposed Site Section AA – north elevation) dated 21/07/21

1214_401-revC (Existing and Proposed Site Section BB – front view of house and annexe) dated 21/07/21

638-P-00-100 P02 (Proposed Landscape Plan) dated 12/07/21

638-S-AA-101 P02 (Proposed General Arrangement AA – west elevation of house and annexe) dated 08/07/21

638-S-BB-102 P02 (Proposed General Arrangement BB – north side elevation of house and link) dated 12/07/21

638-S-CC-103 P02 (Proposed General Arrangement CC – north side elevation of house and annexe) dated 12/07/21

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Informatives: (1)

The applicant is reminded that this listed building consent must be read in conjunction with planning permission PL/2021/08150.

73 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items

(Duration of meeting: 2.00 - 4.15 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is Tara Shannon of Democratic Services, direct line (01722) 434560, e-mail lisa.alexander@wiltshire.gov.uk

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