

NORTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

29 October 2014

This is information that has been received since the committee report was written. This could include additional comments or representation, new information relating to the site, changes to plans etc.

Item 6a– 14/08210/FUL 19 Garth Close, Wiltshire, SN14 6XF

Additional site visit undertaken 28th October 2014:

Officer Comments:

After being contacted by a local resident at 7 Torr Close regarding previous representations submitted in respect of the application and referenced in the report to Committee the Case Officer agreed to visit the property to view the application site and proposal from that perspective. It is noted that the proposed extension will be visible from this property and residents' views will be altered. However, it is considered that due to the distance and angled position of the properties in relation to one another and the scale of development proposed on balance the proposal would not result in significant harm to existing residential amenities by virtue of overbearing impact or loss of daylighting.

The proposal does not include any windows that provide direct views into habitable rooms within 7 Torr Close such that the proposal would result in significant harm to existing residential amenities by virtue of overlooking or loss of privacy. However, it is acknowledged that there is concern in respect of further windows being inserted within the side elevation and the potential for harm to residential amenities of number 7 Torr Close. A further condition is therefore proposed to remove any permitted development rights for any windows or doors within this elevation and allow the Local Planning Authority to retain control over this matter.

Concern was also raised with regards to covenants attached to the properties within the development. However, such issues are civil matters and not a material planning consideration. An informative note (WP18) has already been added to any approval to ensure the applicant is aware of this matter.

Additional Condition:

Condition WE4:

WE4 - NO WINDOWS, DOORS OR OPENINGS

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), no windows, doors or other form of openings other than those shown on the approved plans, shall be inserted in the side elevations of the development hereby permitted.

REASON: In the interests of residential amenity and privacy.

Item 6(b) – 14/7100/OUT – Hunting Villa Farm, Hunts Mill Road, Royal Wootton Bassett, Swindon SN4 7FS

The applicant has agreed to amend the description of the development to “Temporary dwelling in association with equestrian enterprise (resubmission of 13/06430/OUT)”

Officer Comment:

Given the altered description of development the recommendation is revised as follows:-

That the application be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:-

1 OUTLINE PLANNING PERMISSION -COMMENCEMENT

The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission, or before the expiration of two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 APPROVAL OF CERTAIN RESERVED MATTERS

No development shall commence on site until details of the following matters (in respect of which approval is expressly reserved) have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:

- (a) The scale of the development;
- (b) The layout of the development;
- (c) The external appearance of the development;
- (d) The landscaping of the site;
- (e) The means of access to the site

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: The application was made for outline planning permission and is granted to comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Article 4(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 (as amended).

3 RESERVED MATTERS TO BE SUBMITTED

An application for the approval of all of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON: To comply with the provisions of Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

4 LANDSCAPING TO BE CARRIED OUT & MAINTAINED

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 building(s) 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.

5 CONSOLIDATED ACCESS

The development hereby permitted shall not be first occupied until the first five metres of the access, measured from the edge of the carriageway, has been consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel). The access shall be maintained as such thereafter.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

6 GATES SET BACK & OPEN INWARDS

Any gates shall be set back 4.5 metres from the edge of the carriageway, such gates to open inwards only, in perpetuity.

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

7 PD REMOVAL-GENERAL

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No.2) (England) Order 2008 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending those Orders with or without modification), no development within Part 1, Classes A-H shall take place on the temporary dwellinghouse hereby permitted or within their curtilage.

REASON: In the interests of the amenity of the area and to enable the Local Planning Authority to consider individually whether planning permission should be granted for additions, extensions or enlargements.

8 SURFACE WATER DRAINAGE

No development shall commence on site until a scheme for the discharge of surface water from the site (including surface water from any access/driveway), incorporating sustainable drainage details, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be first occupied until surface water drainage has been constructed in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: To ensure that the development can be adequately drained.

9 DISPOSAL OF SEWERAGE-SUBMITTED & IMPLEMENTED

No development shall commence on site until details of the works for the disposal of sewerage including the point of connection to the existing public sewer have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be first occupied until the approved sewerage details have been fully implemented in accordance with the approved plans.

REASON: To ensure that the proposal is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage and does not increase the risk of flooding or pose a risk to public health or the environment.

10 DISPOSAL OF SEWERAGE -IMPLEMENTED

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the approved sewage disposal works proposed have been completed in accordance with the submitted and approved details.

REASON: To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage.

11 EQUESTRIAN OCCUPANCY

The occupation of the temporary dwelling hereby permitted shall be limited to a person solely or mainly working, or last working, in the training/keeping/breeding of horses, in agriculture or in forestry in the locality, or a widow or widower of such a person, and to any resident dependants.

REASON: The site is in an area where residential development for purposes other than the essential needs of agriculture or forestry is not normally permitted and this permission is only granted on the basis of an essential need for a new dwelling/residential accommodation in this location having been demonstrated.

12 TEMPORARY PERIOD & REINSTATEMENT

The dwelling hereby permitted shall be removed and the land restored to its former condition on or before 20/10/2017 in accordance with a scheme of work submitted to the Local Planning Authority at least 3 calendar months in advance of this date and subsequently approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of amenity, in order to secure the restoration of the land upon removal/extinguishment of a building/use for which permission can be justified only on the basis of a special temporary need.

13 APPROVED PLANS

The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan; 11365-200-001 dated 22nd July 2014.

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

14 SCALE OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The dwelling hereby permitted shall not exceed 120sqm of Gross Internal Floor Area.

REASON: To ensure that the building is commensurate with the functional requirement of the holding and its temporary nature.

INFORMATIVES:

WP5 RESERVED MATTERS OUTSTANDING

The further approval of the Local Planning Authority in respect of those matters reserved by condition(s) 2 and 3 of outline planning permission dated 14/07100/OUT is required before development commences.

WP6 ALTERATIONS TO APPROVED PLANS

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.

WP13 PUBLIC SEWERS

The applicant should note that the grant of planning permission does not include any separate permission which may be needed to erect a structure in the vicinity of a public sewer. Such permission should be sought direct from Thames Water Utilities Ltd / Wessex Water Services Ltd. Buildings are not normally allowed within 3.0 metres of a Public Sewer although this may vary depending on the size, depth, strategic importance, available access and the ground conditions appertaining to the sewer in question.

WP18 PERMISSION NOT AUTHORISING WORK ON LAND OUTSIDE THE APPLICANT'S CONTROL & PARTY WALL ACT

The applicant is requested to note that this permission does not affect any private property rights and therefore does not authorise the carrying out of any work on land outside their control. If such works are required it will be necessary for the applicant to obtain the landowners consent before such works commence.

If you intend carrying out works in the vicinity of the site boundary, you are also advised that it may be expedient to seek your own advice with regard to the requirements of the Party Wall Act 1996.

Item 6(e) – 14/04179/OUT– Land at Bradford Road, Corsham, Wiltshire

Duncan Hames MP, received 26 October 2014

I have recently been contacted by a number of my constituents regarding the above planning application.

Objections have been made to this development on policy grounds as it is outside the Corsham settlement boundary and would undermine the strategic green buffer between Corsham and Rudloe. Many local residents agree with Corsham Town Council and Spatial Planning officers that allowing this development would be against policy and could cause significant detriment to the natural environment. The committee may feel it helpful to visit the site and assess the impact this proposal would have on the green buffer.

Comments by the Spatial Planning Service published on the Council's website on 4th July note that Core Policy 2 requires the provision of at least 42,000 homes between 2006 and 2026. The report to committee has highlighted the Abberd Lane appeal decision, which suggests that as the Inspector examining the emerging Core Strategy, Andrew Seaman, has not yet reached a final conclusion, the best estimate of an objectively assessed number of homes required is 44,000.

On 6th October, however, Mr Seaman wrote to Wiltshire Council to confirm that he is completing his report and intends to provide Wiltshire Council with a fact-check report by the end of this month. After the Council's fact-check, the final report will be completed and the examination closed. I note that the Abberd Lane decision accepts that the Inspector considered the Council's proposed figure of 42,000 homes to be reasonable. Moreover, it appears Mr Seaman's final comments on the Core Strategy are imminent.

The development is recommended for refusal by Sustainable Transport in their response of 23rd June 2014 for reasons including highways safety, and the application failing to meet good standards of accessibility by sustainable modes of transport.

Revised access plans recently submitted by the applicant were posted online on 20th October 2014 and further comments by Highways and Sustainable Transport officers are not yet available. Members of the public have therefore not yet had the opportunity to fully comment on these revisions.

Recommendations to refuse this application have previously been made by a number of consultees, including Spatial Planning, Sustainable Transport, and Corsham Town Council, in addition to the objections raised by many local residents.

I would urge the committee to fully review these issues before any decision is made. In view of the issues outlined above, members of the committee may feel it appropriate to defer a decision.

This would enable local residents to comment on the very recent revisions and consultation responses relating to aspects that have caused serious concern to consultees, allow a site visit if this is felt to be useful, and may also enable the committee to consider Mr Seaman's further comments if he delivers them in line to the timetable he outlined less than three weeks ago.

I hope that this information is useful. If you would like to discuss this further, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Highways, received 16 October:

I refer to the plans which were submitted to me yesterday. The changes detailed would overcome the previous highway objection. The route on SK03 would be preferred to the route on SK04 as it picks up pedestrians on the internal route running parallel to Bradford Road.

Any grant of planning permission should be subject to the following obligations:-

- A framework residential travel plan has been included which is acceptable in principle. However, vouchers for each household should be at a level of £250 per household with a reduction to £150 per household where one or more residents are eligible for concessionary travels. The vouchers to cover a mix of public transport use and possible cycle purchase.
- Right turning lane at the access from Bradford Road including resurfacing and visibility splays.
- Right turning lane at the access from Park Lane including resurfacing and visibility splays.
- Tree removal at the A4 / B3109 junction (see above).

- Highway improvements at the A4 / B3353 mini roundabout.
- Highway improvements at the A4 Bath Road / Park Lane mini roundabout.
- Street lighting improvements over the Park Lane frontage of the site.
- Street lighting of Bradford Road over the site frontage and as far as Toghill Crescent.
- A half width layby and bus shelter on the Bradford Road frontage of the site, towards the north-eastern end. Drawing SK05.
- Minor footway alterations at Toghill Crescent to provide a better route between the development and the Rudloe Primary School.
- There should be conditions to require:-
 1. The pedestrian visibility splays and the footway alterations on drawing SK03.
 2. The provision of the pedestrian refuge and visibility splays on Drawing SK05.
 3. The provision of the pedestrian refuge and visibility splays on Drawing SK06.
 4. The provision of the pedestrian refuge and visibility splays on Drawing SK07.

Officer Comments:

The submitted amended plans now overcome the objection previously raised by the highway officers. A reason for refusal based on highways matters would be difficult to substantiate at appeal.

Landscape and Design Team (Ecology), received 22 October 2014:

You'll be aware from my previous comments on the application (dated 13/06/14, copy forwarded to applicant) that I had requested further survey work for bats and dormice, as recommended in the original ecological assessment submitted with the application. The following comments therefore focus mainly on those species.

The bat survey work is still not in accordance with best practice and fails to assess the seasonal use of the site by bats which have previously been highlighted as an issue by the applicant's own consultants. The assessment also does not evaluate the use of the wider landscape by commuting bats, in particular the potential effects of the loss of the dry stone wall feature which crosses the site, and could represent a commuting route for horseshoe bats associated with the Bath and Bradford SAC. Potential effects upon bechstein's bats are unreported and therefore cannot be assessed by the Council. At the current time there are still significant uncertainties about the potential impacts of development upon the SAC and the Council therefore does not have sufficient information to satisfactorily carry out a Habitats Regulations Assessment of the application in line with the requirements of Regulation 61 of the Habitats Regulations, which requires a precautionary approach to assessment and decision making. At the current time the Council cannot legally issue consent for the proposals, and if the Council intends to determine the application at the forthcoming committee I strongly advise that it may only issue a refusal notice, for approve the application would expose the Council to risk of legal challenge.

Bats

The level of survey effort failed to meet best practice guidance which stipulates that for a site of this nature, in close proximity to a significant greater horseshoe roost (such as Box Mine) transect surveys at least once per month throughout the active season (April – October inclusive), with two surveys per month during the core period of May-September inclusive; the reason for this level of survey is that bats are highly mobile and their use of the landscape can vary significantly over the course of the year. The April 2014 report therefore concluded that *'Further surveys for bats are required to provide an adequate representation of the seasonal activity to inform a planning decision and potentially inform a Habitats Regulations Assessment if scoped in by Wiltshire Council and Natural England.'* I agreed

with the conclusion that further survey work was necessary, and advised that the extent of such surveys should be discussed and agreed.

The updated ecological report (October 2014) includes additional survey data for the period of late-August – early September 2014, however it still does not include any data for the key periods of activity between April – early-August. Further to this some of the records provided in the April 2014 report are now omitted in the current report, particularly a record of greater horseshoe bat commuting south along the dry stone which bisects the site. It is also not clear from the report whether or not this feature has been surveyed during the 2014 transects. Given that this feature would be lost to the development proposals and given that the land to the south of Park Lane is a known horseshoe bat foraging area, the proposals could have significant effects upon a commuting feature linked with the SAC which have not been adequately assessed. There is also a mine shaft adjacent to the north eastern boundary of the site, where most of the horseshoe activity was recorded, however the report does not consider the possibility of underground roosts at that location or how they may be impacted by the development. A significant proportion of *Myotis* sp. bats were recorded at the site, which could include the rare bechsteins's bat which also form part of the designated populations associated with the SAC. However the report does not indicate where or when these bats have been recorded and there is no assessment of how they may be affected by the proposals.

Further inspections of the drainage holes in the wooded copse have confirmed that these are blind ended and do not lead to any underground structures which might support roosting bats.

Dormouse

It is understood that nest tubes have been set out across the site since September 2013, however they have only been checked three times since then. The survey guidelines also stipulate that the tubes should be checked monthly or bi-monthly during the active season (April-November inclusive) in order to establish presence / absence therefore it appears that this survey has also not been carried out in accordance with best practice, while this is also not acknowledged in the limitations of the report.

Other Habitat / Species

Other than the above, the report confirms that site is dominated by arable land of limited ecological value and does not support any other protected or notable species.

Officer Comments:

The bat survey work is still not in accordance with best practice and fails to assess the seasonal use of the site by bats which have previously been highlighted as an issue by the applicant's own consultants.

The Council does not have sufficient information to satisfactorily carry out a Habitats Regulations Assessment of the application in line with the requirements of Regulation 61 of the Habitats Regulations, which requires a precautionary approach to assessment and decision making. At the current time the Council cannot legally issue consent for the proposals.

It is recommended that the application is **REFUSED** planning permission for the reason set out in bold text below. The deferral of this application to a future meeting to allow further survey work to take place would not be an acceptable approach as the further survey work can't take place until 2015 (April-October). Officers would strongly advise that an approval would not be lawful and could expose the Council to risk of legal challenge.

The development, by means of its nature, location and scale could have likely significant effects upon the nearby Bath and Bradford Bats Special Area of Conservation. Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to allow the Council to reasonably carry out an appropriate assessment of the application in line with the procedure set out in Circular 06/2005, as required under Regulation 61 of the Habitats Regulations. In the absence of this information the application is contrary to policies C1, C3(ii), NE5, NE6, NE7, NE9, NE10 & NE11 of the adopted NWLP 2011; and CP50 and CP57 (ii) of the emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy (submission Draft as proposed to be amended April 2014); and paragraphs 14, 17, 109, 118 and 119 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Subsequent to this the applicant has submitted a further report with regards to the potential impacts of the development upon the Bath and Bradford Bats SAC. This report contains largely the same information as previously submitted, although it does now acknowledge the limitations of the survey data. The report has been reviewed in detail by the Council's Ecologist. The report includes additional bat survey data that has been extracted from a selection of other planning applications in the local area over the past 7 years in an attempt to infer that the application site would not be used significantly by bats. In coming to this conclusion, the report is unfortunately based on a large degree of assumption and postulation, and in the absence of site specific data one might just as easily come to the conclusion that features within the site could be significantly used by bats. In the absence of reliable site survey and given the need for the Council to apply a precautionary approach to Habitats Regulations Assessments under Regulation 61, Officers cannot accept the assumptions of this report that the development proposals would have no likely significant effects upon the Bath and Bradford Bats SAC. In Officers' professional opinion the development could reasonably have likely significant effects, particularly upon commuting bats, and as such an appropriate assessment of the application is required. In carrying out such an assessment the Regulations 61(2) requires that '*A person applying for any such consent, permission or other authorisation must provide such information as the competent authority may reasonably require for the purposes of the assessment or to enable them to determine whether an appropriate assessment is required*'. In your Officers' professional opinion and in accordance with published best practice, the Council would reasonably require bat surveys throughout the active season, which are likely to take until August 2015 to complete. Therefore if the Council is to determine the application at the current time we can only recommend that it is refused. If the Council were to issue a consent at the current time it would fail to have discharged its legal obligations under the Habitats Regulations and as such would be exposed to legal challenge.

Item 6(f) – 14/00153/FUL & 14/02535/LBC- RAF Yatesbury, Jugglers Lane, Yatesbury, Wiltshire, SN11 8YA

The North Wessex Downs AONB Unit, received 16 October:

- Given the sites location in the open countryside of the North Wessex Downs AONB that Council are asked to reconsider the condition of the buildings and their suitability for conversion given their continued deterioration. Further to this the Council should consider this proposal in the light of the NPPF and whether this proposal can deliver sustainable development. (There are also some references within the application to possible additional new development in the future. It should be noted that any

additional development beyond the existing buildings should be strictly controlled given the countryside AONB location).

- No reference has been made within the Committee report to paragraph 115 of the NPPF in that “great weight” should be attached to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Further to this paragraph 116 of the NPPF advises that planning permission for major development should be refused in AONBs except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest.
- The Officer’s report to Committee has also not referred to Core Policy 51 (Landscape) of the Emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy which states “...ix. *special qualities of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONBs) and the New Forest National Park, where great weight will be afforded to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty.*”
- In terms of sustainable development and housing delivery the Officer’s report has referred to Paragraph 14 of the NPPF but has not referred to the fact that restrictions apply due to Footnote 9 of the NPPF as the site has restrictions placed upon it both due to its location in a nationally protected AONB and because of its Heritage Assets. This is confirmed at Paragraph 6.76 of the Emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy but does not feature within the report: “*When determining proposals in AONBs and the New Forest National Park, great weight will be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in accordance with paragraph 115 and 116 of the NPPF. Particular attention is also drawn to paragraph 14 (including footnote 9) which restricts the presumption in favour of sustainable development in such areas*” (Emerging Wiltshire Core Strategy Para.6.76).
- The Officer’s report to Committee does at least confirm “*The development does not therefore conform with the NPPF, local plans or Core Strategy in terms of sustainable development.*”
- Therefore, there is “no presumption” in favour of this development as it is not “sustainable development” and the presumption does not apply to AONBs or designated Heritage Assets.
- Finally the Council should not form a decision on this application until the Viability Report has been fully assessed and reported to the Committee. The loss of contributions and affordable housing from this proposal should weigh against its approval.
- In conclusion, in coming to a determination of this planning application under the relevant policies, the Committee are therefore required, not simply to weigh all material considerations in a balance, but to refuse an application unless they are satisfied that (i) there are exceptional circumstances, and (ii) it is demonstrated that, despite giving great weight to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB, the development is in the public interest.

Officer Comments:

It is acknowledged that paragraph 115 & 116 of the NPPF have not been specifically mentioned within the report. The report clearly assesses the impact on the AONB and the open countryside location, to argue that a proposal to restore and improve decaying

buildings will have a negative impact on the visual appearance of the area is misguided. Furthermore, the exceptional circumstances relating for allowing this development have been clearly set out within the report. It is considered that the development will preserve the character and appearance of the AONB, the development is therefore in accordance with Paragraph 115 of the NPPF and CP51 of the CS.

The AONB Board suggest that the restoration of this internationally significant and decaying heritage asset would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the AONB and wider countryside setting. Officers strongly disagree with this and believe that this has been assessed within the committee report. However, members must determine and conclude if the proposal would conserve or enhance the character of the area and AONB.

It has also been requested that a decision isn't made until the outcome of the viability assessment is known. The previously approved application, though different to this scheme, provide no financial contributions or affordable housing. It would therefore not surprise officers if the current scheme is considered to be unviable. Furthermore, English Heritage concluded that the new dwellings would constitute enabling development. Should the viability assessment conclude that contributions or part of can be paid or provided on site the applicant has agreed to these.

Errors/Clarification in the Officer Report:

- Within the site description the report states *'two of these hangars have been demolished and removed from site'*. Though it would appear that the hangars have been demolished, they have not. One has consent for demolition and the other has collapsed but no formal consent for demolition.
- Within the planning history section of the report three applications are listed- N/06/02567, N/06/02566 & N/10/00214. These applications do not relate to this site, however, the applications are relevant in terms of local context.
- The hanger, as seen on site, would appear to be fully restored, this is not the case. Further works are required to complete the restoration and details of these and the future internal works are controlled by condition (condition 16). English Heritage confirmed that the proposed development is legitimate enabling development.
- Local residents have raised concerns about the provision of broadband in the locality. The delivery of broadband is the responsibility of the network provider and not the developer. For the council to require this would be onerous and unlawful.
- The installation of satellite dishes on properties is likely to require listed building consent. For the avoidance of doubt it is recommended that a condition is added to the permission removing permitted development rights for the installation of satellite dishes on properties.
- It is important to clarify the content of Paragraph 14, 15, 115 and 116 of the NPPF. It has been claimed that planning permission can't be granted for this development as it is within an AONB and is deemed not to be a sustainable location. This assumption is incorrect. These paragraphs state that specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted. However, paragraph 116 does allow major

development in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. The officer report clearly sets out the balanced approach that has been taken and the relevant considerations in concluding that permission should be granted.

Amended & Additional Conditions:

The following alterations and amendments to the proposed conditions are required:

Condition 5:

i) Details of the new pedestrian access onto Juggler's Lane including gate

Condition 14:

Delete (Not required covered by condition 20)

Condition 19

Delete (Not required covered by condition 20)

New Condition

No satellite dish or apparatus shall be installed on any building or within the curtilage of any property or building or within the application site without first obtaining formal consent from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To allow control of satellite dishes within the site ensuring there is not an over proliferation of these and in the interest of the setting of the listed buildings & character of the area.

New Condition

The development shall not be commenced until a foul water drainage strategy is submitted and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority in consultation with Wessex Water acting as the sewerage undertaker

- A drainage scheme shall include appropriate arrangements for the agreed points of connection and the capacity improvements required to serve the proposed development phasing
- The drainage scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and to a timetable agreed with the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that proper provision is made for sewerage of the site and that the development does not increase the risk of sewer flooding of downstream properties.

New Condition

Prior to the commencement of development full details of the proposed soakaways and their locations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these details.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not result in localise flooding