

SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 26 FEBRUARY 2015 AT ALAMEIN SUITE - CITY HALL, MALTHOUSE LANE, SALISBURY, SP2 7TU.

Present:

Cllr Christopher Devine (Vice Chairman), Cllr Richard Britton, Cllr Richard Clewer, Cllr Jose Green, Cllr Mike Hewitt, Cllr Ian McLennan, Cllr Ian Tomes, Cllr Ian West, Cllr Peter Edge (Substitute) and Cllr John Smale (Substitute)

Also Present:

Cllr Tony Deane, Cllr Dr Helena McKeown and Cllr Bridget Wayman

20 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Cllr Fred Westmoreland (Chairman) who was substituted by Cllr John Smale. Cllr Christopher Devine (Vice-Chairman) was in the Chair for the duration of the meeting.

Apologies were received from Cllr Brian Dalton was substituted by Cllr Peter Edge.

21 Minutes

Resolved:

To approve and sign the minutes of the last meeting held on 5 February 2015 as a correct record with an amendment to minute no. 18a. Cllr West spoke as the Local Member and did not support the application. A copy of Cllr West's speech is attached to these minutes.

22 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations.

23 Chairman's Announcements

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

24 **Public Participation and Councillors' Questions**

The committee noted the rules on public participation.

25 **Planning Appeals**

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

26 **Planning Applications**

26a 14/10548/FUL - Land to the west of Bake Farm Buildings, Salisbury Road, Coombe Bissett, Salisbury, SP5 4JT - The erection of solar photovoltaic panels and associated works and infrastructure, including switchgear, inverter stations, access tracks, security fencing, security cameras, grid connection, together with temporary construction access, compound and unloading area and continued agricultural use

Public Participation

Jennifer Epworth spoke in objection to the application.

Melinda Simmonds spoke in objection to the application.

Linda Buckley spoke in objection to the application.

Chris Jowett spoke in support to the application.

Richard Jowett spoke in support to the application.

Angus MacDonald spoke in support to the application.

Chris Chelu (Coombe Bissett and Homington Parish Councillor) spoke in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer presented his report to the Committee which recommended that permission be granted subject to conditions. In particular the Planning Officer stated the following:

“The Committee will recall that in October last year it refused an application for a solar farm at this site. The reason for refusal related to the adverse impact of the solar farm on views to and from the nearby AONB.

That earlier application was for a solar farm across four fields totalling some 30 ha in area. The current proposal is for a smaller solar farm covering approximately 10 ha across just over two fields. The reduced area means that the proposed solar farm has lesser overall dimensions than before, avoids panels on the slightly steeper slopes facing the AONB, and is sited slightly further away from the AONB. As a consequence it is not considered that the proposal now has a detrimental impact on the AONB.

The fields in question are currently used for agricultural purposes or are fallow. This time the application is accompanied by an Agricultural Land Quality Assessment which reveals the soils at the site are Grade 3a. Grades 1, 2 and 3a are at the higher end of the quality range, being 'excellent', 'very good' and 'good' respectively, and together they are considered to be 'the best and most versatile'. Below these are grades 3b which is 'moderate', 4 which is 'poor' and 5 which is 'very poor'.

The relevant extracts from the NPPF and NPPG regarding use of the best and most versatile land were read out to members The NPPF states that

"Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile land

.... and

When significant development..... is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use poorer quality in preference to that of higher quality"

It was explained that in relation to solar farms the PPG specifically requires consideration to be given to whether the proposed use of agricultural land has been shown to be necessary or whether poorer quality land has been considered in preference; and whether the proposal allows for continued agricultural use and/or encourages biodiversity improvements around arrays.

To address these 'tests' members were told that the application provides evidence demonstrating that approximately 86% of all land within the solar farm search area of some 1,963 ha is either grade 2 or grade 3. Grade 4 land covers about 6% of the search area, but none is suitable for a solar farm because of constraints such as the AONB, SSSI's and flood zones. There is no grade 1 land in the search area, and there is no suitable grade 5 land.

Of the grade 3 land, It was explained that the application identified about 321 ha in the search area as being potentially suitable for a solar farm having regard to all other constraints. The application concludes that although some of this land may potentially be Grade 3B it is neither feasible nor practical to sample it all.

It was confirmed that the practicalities of sampling is a material consideration, and this, when considered with other considerations— namely, the limited visual impact of the proposed development, the biodiversity improvement, and the continued agricultural use of the site in any event — the officer's view was that the applicant had demonstrated that this site was appropriate for development.

The objectives of the proposed Farm Strategy Programme (appended to the report) were referred to, this investment was considered by officers to further 'tip the balance' in favour of the proposal.

Overall, in view of the increased livestock grazing under the solar arrays, the temporary nature of the solar farm, the offer of the Farm Strategy Plan, and the acceptability of the proposal in all other respects, it was considered by officers that development of grade 3a farmland in this instance had been demonstrated to be acceptable.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. The use of agricultural land for solar farms and the relevant guidance was discussed. The quality of soil in the vicinity of this site was raised.

An item of late correspondence was circulated at the meeting.

The Local Member, Cllr Julian Johnson, spoke in opposition to the application. Cllr Johnson pointed to the strong opposition of local people against the development and raised concerns about the potential impact on the land. Cllr Johnson declared that he did know the applicant but took an objective view of the application.

Members discussed the long-term impact that this development would have on the land. The need for renewable energy was discussed. Members raised the reduction of scale from the previous application that came to a prior Committee. The planting of hedges to reduce the visual impact of the development was raised by Members. The ability to revert the land back to its previous use was also stated. Members debated in regards to land grading and the suitability of the installation of a solar farm. The potential impact of the development on the AONB was raised. The applicant's work on addressing the Committee's previous refusal reasons was discussed.

The potential benefit of resting the land was stated, as well as the benefit of not using chemicals that could have been used for agricultural purposes. Concern was raised at the potential for setting a precedent should this be approved. Members raised concern that no guidance was available in relation to the quantity of panels required in the area and wider Wiltshire. Members debated the suitability of the land. The role of government subsidies was also discussed.

Cllr Ian West, Cllr Richard Clewer and Cllr Richard Britton all wished their vote against approval to be recorded.

Resolved:

To delegate authority to the Area Development Manager (South) to

grant planning permission on expiry of the current outstanding public consultation exercise, this subject to no further representations being received raising new issues which he considers would require further consideration by the planning committee and subject to the following conditions.

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:

**no. 1020-0200-05 Iss 03 dated 10/07/14
no. 1020-0201-01 Iss16 dated 11/12/14
no. 2658_200_Rev F dated 08/01/15
no. 1020-0208-71 Iss 02 dated 07/04/14
no. 1020-0208-50 Iss 02 dated 07/07/14
no. 1020-0208-10 Iss 01 dated 11/07/14
no. 1020-0207-13 Iss 02 dated 07/07/14
no. 1020-0206-09 Iss 02 dated 07/07/14
no. 1020-0205-01 Iss 02 dated 07/07/14
no. 1020-0204-00 Iss 02 dated 07/07/14
no. 1020-0201-20 Iss 01 dated 09/07/14**

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

3 The solar installation and all related on-site built infrastructure (including inverter stations, CCTV cameras and poles, switch gear, access tracks, security fences, etc.) hereby granted shall be removed and the land restored to a condition suitable for agricultural use within 6 months of the PV panels ceasing to be used for the generation of renewable energy, or the expiry of 25 years after the date of first connection of any element of the solar farm to the National Grid, whichever is the sooner.

REASON: In the interests of amenity and the timely restoration of the land.

4 An aftercare scheme detailing the steps that are necessary to restore the land following cessation of the solar installation use shall be submitted by the applicant and/or owner to the Local Planning Authority at least 6 months prior to the removal of the PV panels and associated infrastructure.

REASON: To ensure the satisfactory restoration of the site for

agriculture.

5 No development shall commence within the footprint of the approved development until:

- a) A written programme of archaeological investigation, which should include on-site work and off-site work such as the analysis, publishing and archiving of the results, has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority; and
- b) The approved programme of archaeological work has been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: To enable the recording of any matters of archaeological interest.

6 Before construction works commence, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local planning Authority. The Plan shall provide the following:

A plan showing the position of all features which will be protected during the construction phase

Details of measures to avoid spills of oils and other chemicals

Details of measures to store and remove construction waste

Details of measures to protect trees and hedgerows during construction

Procedures to avoid harm and disturbance to nesting birds

Procedures to avoid harm and disturbance to badgers

Procedures to avoid harm to reptiles where risks are considered to be moderate / high

REASON: To prevent pollution and harm to wildlife during construction.

7 No development shall commence on site (including any works of demolition), until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The Statement shall provide details of the following:

A plan showing areas for the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors a plan showing areas for loading and unloading of plant and materials a plan showing areas for storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development details of wheel washing facilities

details of measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works details of the programme for construction and removal of the temporary compounds required during construction details of the method of pile driving where this is to take place within 200m of any dwellinghouse.

The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the

construction period. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the approved Statement unless first further agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: To minimise detrimental effects to the neighbouring amenities, the amenities of the area in general, detriment to the natural environment through the risks of pollution and dangers to highway safety, during the construction phase.

8 Before construction works commence a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing. The plan shall cover the first ten year period after construction and then be reviewed and rolled forward until the end of the temporary planning permission period. As a minimum, the Plan will set out:

Details of the current baseline condition of every 100m length of hedge in terms of its height, width and position of gaps
Objectives of grassland, hedgerow and tree management
Details of proposed hedgerow and tree planting and grassland seeding
Details of the regime of grassland, hedgerow and tree management to meet the Objectives

Details of design and locations of 10 bat boxes and 10 bird boxes
Safeguards that will be taken to avoid soil erosion and compaction
The Plan shall be implemented as approved.

REASON: To safeguard wildlife interests.

9 Works involving the removal of hedgerows and/or ground preparation shall be carried out during the period 1st September to 28th February. In the event that it becomes necessary to carry out such works outside of this period, then the works will be preceded by a survey by a professional ecologist, and then only undertaken in accordance with the ecologist's written advice.

REASON: To safeguard wildlife interests.

10 All soft landscaping comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first connection of any solar array to the national grid 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.

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

11 With the exception of sensor controlled security lights, there shall be no external lighting/illumination at or on the site unless otherwise approved by the local planning authority following the submission of a separate planning application.

REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of lighting and to protect the open countryside.

12 No development shall commence until a scheme to limit surface water flows from the development during the construction and operational phases has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority. The development shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the details of the approved scheme.

REASON: To ensure that flood risk is not increased.

13 No later than 6 months after the date any part of the solar farm hereby approved first becomes operational the applicant or operator and the landowner shall implement the 'Proposed Measures' set out in the Farm Strategy Programme accompanying the planning application. A written record of the Programme's implementation shall be kept by the applicant or operator and landowner, and shall be made available to the local planning authority at any reasonable time at its request.

REASON: To maintain and/or enhance the productivity of the farm having regard to its soil quality.

14 No construction works or deliveries / collections associated with construction shall take place outside the hours of 7 am to 6 pm Mondays to Fridays and the hours of 8 am to 1 pm on Saturdays. There shall be no construction or deliveries / collections associated with construction carried out at any time on Sundays and Bank or Public Holidays.

REASON: To ensure the creation/retention of an environment free from intrusive levels of noise and activity in the interests of the amenity of the area.

26b 14/09367/FUL - Sarum House & Wandle House, Cow Drove, Chilmark, Salisbury, SP3 5AJ - Demolition of 2 no. detached dwellings, and the erection of 6 no. dwellings; with associated parking, turning, landscaping, improvements to existing access, and a footpath link

Public Participation

James Cain spoke in objection to the application.
Roland Castlemaine spoke in objection to the application.
Alistair White spoke in objection to the application.

Andrew Bracey spoke in support to the application.
Mike Fowler spoke in support to the application.
Richard Humphries QC spoke in support to the application.

Cllr Patrick Boyles (Parish Council) spoke in objection to the application.

The Local Member, Cllr Bridget Wayman, spoke in objection to the application. Cllr Wayman declared that she was a member of the the Cranborne Chase and West Wiltshire Downs AONB Partnership Panel. Cllr Wayman raised the core strategy and stated that the site was in the open countryside. The need to respect the existing character and form of the village was also stated. Cllr Wayman raised concern that this development would be defined as infilling. The visual impact of the design on the surrounding listed building was raised. The potential for changing the characteristics of the loose-knit area was stated. Concern was raised by Cllr Wayman into the materials (and quantities of these materials) to be used in the construction of the proposed dwellings. It was stated that flood prevention guidance was at an early stage and the development was therefore premature.

The Planning Officer presented their report to the Committee which recommended that permission be granted subject to the completion of a section 106 obligation requiring payment of a financial contribution towards off-site recreation / open space provision and conditions.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. The demolition of two existing dwellings was raised. The number of trees and hedges to be retained were discussed, as well as their ecological significance.

An item of late correspondence was circulated at the meeting. Members discussed the benefit to the village of the development. The definition of 'infill' was discussed and how it related to this application. Concern was raised in relation to the design of the proposal and also the removal of existing screening. Members raised Highways concerns. The core strategy was discussed and the need for growth in the area was raised.

Members raised concern in regards to the quantity of dwellings proposed for an area of this size. The sustainability of the location was raised and local need was considered. The potential for a change to the character of the village was debated. Members raised concern in relation to the demolition of two houses that were in the character of the village.

Members debated the need for growth in Chilmark and how this could be achieved sustainably. The need for specific amenities in the village was discussed. The achievement of affordable housing in the area was raised. Members discussed the instalment of a pavement and refuse collection at the development. Members stated that this was not an infill development and was instead an overdevelopment of the site. Concerns in regards to Highways and the impact on streetscene were also debated.

Resolved:

To refused planning permission for the following reasons:

1 Core Policy 1 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the 'Settlement Strategy' for the county, and identifies four tiers of settlement - Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres, and Large and Small Villages. Within the Settlement Strategy Chilmark is identified as being a Small Village. Only the Principal Settlements, Market Towns, Local Service Centres and Large Villages have defined limits of development, and there is a general presumption against development outside of these. However, some very modest development may be appropriate at Small Villages to respond to local needs and to contribute to the vitality of rural communities.

Core Policy 27 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the 'Spatial Strategy' for the Tisbury Community Area which confirms that development in the Tisbury Community Area should be in accordance with the Settlement Strategy set out in Core Policy 1 and growth in the Tisbury Community Area over the plan period may consist of a range of sites in accordance with Core Policies 1 and 2.

Core Policy 2 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy sets out the 'Delivery Strategy'. It identifies the scale of growth appropriate within each settlement tier. The policy states that at the Small Villages such as Chilmark development will be limited to infill within the existing built area where it seeks to meet housing needs of the settlement or provide employment, services and facilities and provided that the development:

- 1. Respects the existing character and form of the settlement**
- 2. Does not elongate the village or impose development in sensitive landscape areas, and**

3. Does not consolidate an existing sporadic loose knit areas of development related to the settlement.

Infill is defined in the Core Strategy as the filling of a small gap within the village that is only large enough for not more than a few dwellings, generally only one dwelling.

In this case the proposal is to demolish two existing houses and erect in their place a development of six new houses. In terms of Core Policy 2 it is considered that development at this scale and in this form does not satisfy the definition of infill, and consequently the proposal is unacceptable in terms of both the Core Strategy's Settlement and Delivery Strategies. Specifically, and in the first place, re-development of this site at the scale and in the form envisaged - namely, demolition of two existing dwellings and erection of six new dwellings - does not amount to the filling of a small gap for generally only one dwelling; and secondly, by reason of its scale, form, layout and design, which are all at odds with established development in the immediate locality, it is not considered that the proposal respects the existing character and form of the settlement, and would consolidate an existing sporadic loose knit area of development to the detriment of its character and appearance.

It follows that the proposal is contrary to Core Policies 1, 2 and 27 in that it would deliver development which does not accord with the Settlement and Delivery Strategies of the Core Strategy. The Strategies are designed to ensure new development fulfils the fundamental principles of sustainability and so it follows that where new development such as this would not accord with the Strategies, it is unsustainable in this defining and overarching context.

2 The proposed development, by reason of its scale, form and layout, would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of established development in the locality, and in Cow Drove in particular.

Established development in Cow Drove is dominated by larger, detached dwellings set in spacious plots defined by, in the main, significant hedgerows and/or tree lines. It is this green and treed appearance which defines the character of Cow Drove, and the two existing properties on the application site conform to this.

The proposal would introduce to the site six dwellings in place of the existing two. This increase in built form, with the new dwellings sited relatively close together and also relatively close to the boundaries of the site, is at odds with the green and treed character defined above. Whereas established development is dominated by hedgerows and trees, the proposal would be dominated by the dwellings, with

insufficient space between and around them to allow new and existing landscaping to establish and/or remain to maintain the established character.

More specifically, the removal of sections of and cutting back of established hedgerows necessary to achieve the required visibility splay at the site entrance and provision of a footpath along part of the frontage to Cow Drove (required in order to provide improved visibility at the B3089/Cow Drove junction and provide a benefit for all users of Cow Drove); would be harmful to the established green and treed character defined above. From this it is concluded that the proposal has not satisfactorily addressed the dichotomy between maintaining the character of the area and achieving safe access to the site.

So, in essence, the proposal, by reason of its scale (specifically 6 units), its form (specifically, large detached or semi-detached houses), and its layout (with limited space between and around the houses to maintain a spacious appearance and to enable landscaping to establish and/or remain), is cramped and overcrowded and would consolidate the existing sporadic and loose knit arrangement of established development in Cow Drove, and so be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area, which will have a resultant adverse impact on the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Black Dog Public House. This is contrary to Core Policy 2, Core Policy 50, Core Policy 57 (in particular points i, ii, iii and vi of Core Policy 57) and Core Policy 58 of the Adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy, Objective 16 of the Adopted Supplementary Planning Document "Creating Places Design Guide April 2006", and guidance within the NPPF and NPPG (in particular paragraph: 023 Reference ID: 26-023-20140306).

3 The proposed development does not make provision for off-site public recreational open space facilities and is contrary to saved policy R2 of the Salisbury District Local Plan (included in the saved policies listed in Appendix D, of the Adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy) and Core Policy 3 of the Adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy.

INFORMATIVE: The refusal reason given above relating to saved policy R2 has been included in the event the applicant decides to appeal against the decision in order for the Planning Inspector to consider this, but it is noted that the applicant is willing to enter into such an agreement and the refusal reason could be overcome if all the appropriate parties complete a Section 106 Agreement contributing to recreational open space provision.

Cllr Mike Hewitt and Cllr John Smale wished their dissent for the

decision to be recorded.

26c 14/11528/FUL - St.Thomas Church, St Thomas Square, Salisbury, Wiltshire. SP1 1BA - Installation of new glazed outer doors to western entrance

Public Participation

John Foster spoke in support to the application.

Mrs Salter spoke in support to the application.

Rev. David Linekar spoke in support to the application.

Cllr Jo Broom (Mayor of Salisbury) spoke in support to the application.

The Planning Officer presented her report to the Committee which recommended that permission be refused with reasons stated in the report.

In particular the Planning Officer emphasised the following: St Thomas' church is a highly significant Grade I listed church within the context of the City's ecclesiastical heritage and an important testament to the formation of New Sarum as the Parish Church for the new settlement. The list description explains that it was probably founded in 1220, enlarged in the 14th and 15th centuries and rebuilt and extended in the 15th century.

English Heritage had advised that of significance externally are the bell tower and the west elevation and their prominence when viewed from Silver Street/St Thomas' Square. Internally, the church was especially renowned for the 15th century Doom painting and other important wall paintings within its impressive interior.

The proposal was to install new glazed outer doors to the western entrance of the church. The design and access statement outlines other internal alterations (including a replacement internal lobby and re-ordering of the nave and aisles) which would be subject to Faculty approval under the Ecclesiastical Exemption so are not under consideration in this application.

Sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 place a duty on the local planning authority to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the listed buildings and their settings and conservation areas.

The NPPF outlines government policy, including its policy in respect of the historic environment and explained that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be.

Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, including grade I listed buildings should be wholly exceptional.

The NPPF explains that where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss and where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. (officer's emphasis)

English Heritage guidance on church alterations states existing doors often contribute to the special interest of a church by virtue of their age, design or traditional role. A strong characteristic of parish churches and a long established character of St Thomas' is entering into a very large space through a comparatively modest door to behold the 'wonder' of the interior. Although the proposals retain the timber doors, they would no longer be the outer doors to the church.

Members' attention was drawn to the late correspondence which includes an additional representation letter (from a local resident – Mr Richard Isaac of 21 Old Street, Salisbury) including photographs of glazed entrances to Salisbury Methodist Church on St Edmund's Church Street and the United Reform Church on Fisherton Street. Both these buildings are grade II listed.

As the national legislation explains, substantial harm to grade I listed buildings should be wholly exceptional, and whilst in this case the proposal is considered to amount to less than substantial harm due to the size of the doors in comparison to the rest of the church and the reversibility of the proposals; English Heritage advise that demoting of the main timber doors to an internal door will undermine their status, alter the visual character of the church and will have an adverse impact on the evidential significance (which is defined by English Heritage as the potential of a place to yield evidence about past human activity) and aesthetic significance (defined as the ways in which people draw sensory and intellectual stimulation from a place) of the Grade I listed church by creating a modern and discordant impact on the traditional structure.

It was pointed out that the applicants have explained that the purpose/public benefit resulting from the glazed doors is to control draughts and to make the building more welcoming and enable passers-by to see into the

building's interior both when the building is open for business and when closed. However, the officer's view was that it was not considered that this would be sufficient recompense for the damage to the character of the space (external and internal) that would be caused if the glazed doors were installed and this is not a persuasive justification that would outweigh the harm caused by the proposals.

An alternative option had also been suggested to the applicants to retain the timber doors in their existing position and set glazed doors back from these within the church/lobby, but this had been discounted.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. Questions were asked in regards to the opening and closing of the proposed glazed outer doors, as well as their proposed location.

An item of late correspondence was circulated at the meeting.

The Local Member, Cllr Helena McKeown, spoke in support to the application. Cllr McKeown supported the design and believed it would encourage visitors to the church. Cllr McKeown saw this as an opportunity to invest in the area's future.

Members debated the merits of the design and how it could enhance the church. The importance of medieval history at the site and the need to display this history was discussed. Members raised the potential for increasing tourist visitors to the site. The ability to remove the glass doors was discussed should that be required in the future. The input of English Heritage was discussed and the potential for changing the nature of the building was raised. It was stated that proposed changes were reversible. The need to preserve the existing building was raised. It was emphasised that this was a grade 1 listed building and that there was a potential for 'harmful impact' on the site.

Resolved:

To grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

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:

Drawing Reference: 858/x/25 Proposed Street Elevation, dated Aug 2014, received by this office 04/12/2014

Drawing Reference: 858/x/19 Site Location Plan, dated Aug 2014, received by this office 04/02/2014

Drawing Reference: 858/x/20 Block Plan, dated Aug 2014, received by this office 04/12/2014

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

**Cllr Ian McLennan wished his dissent for the decision to be recorded.
Cllr Peter Edge wished his abstention to be recorded.**

27 **Urgent Items**

There were no urgent items

(Duration of meeting: 6.00 - 9.20 pm)

The Officer who has produced these minutes is David Parkes, of Democratic Services, direct line (01225) 718220, e-mail david.parkes@wiltshire.gov.uk

Press enquiries to Communications, direct line (01225) 713114/713115

Thank You Chairman

I have been following this application closely throughout the consultation period and when the consultation was complete I contacted the Planning officer to discuss the application and what his recommendations were likely to be ? after looking at all the comments from Statutory Consulates he said he would be Recommending Approval.

At this time I decided to call the application in to committee so that all the evidence for and the objections against could be heard and debated and a decision made by this committee.

I have not read or heard any objection to the cricket field and the scheme itself. This I believe would be an excellent project and an great asset to the community.

But it all boils down to just one issue is the access to the application site acceptable or not ?

The applicant I believe has done everything possible to make this acceptable, pull ins along the track putting directions in the cricket fixture book and improving the site lines at the London Road bends, and new signage but with the increase of traffic a long London Road it would not be satisfactory in my view.

I am sorry I do have reservations regarding both ends of the approach road to the site at the London Road by the clump and the A360, the A360 end is much closer to the field and people who know this I believe would use this way as it is closer than going up the London Road, but you have read the Highway Officer's position he is happy. I wish I had the same confidence on the road issue as the Highway officer has.

This page is intentionally left blank