The Guildhall Market Place Salisbury Wilts SP1 1JH



Contact: Janine Whitty
Direct Line: 01722 342860

Email: corporate@salisburycitycouncil.gov.uk

Web: www.salisburycitycouncil.gov.uk

Minutes

Meeting of : Planning CommitteeDate : 25 February 2019Meeting held in : The Guildhall, Salisbury

Commencing at : 6:30pm

Present:

Chair: Cllr J Farquhar Vice Chair:

Cllrs: J Baber, S Berry, T Corbin, C Rogers, A Hoque, M Osment and J Walsh.

Officers: J Whitty and Y Pustarnakov

1369. Apologies:

1369.1. Cllr Sirman and Cllr Foster gave her apologies.

1369.2. Cllr Tomes gave apologies and was substituted by Cllr Osment.

1370. Election of the Deputy Chair of the Planning Committee for 2018/19:

The Chairman called for nominations for this position. It was:

Resolved that:

1370.1. Cllr T Corbin was elected as Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee.

1371. Public Questions/Statement Time:

- 1371.1. The Chair announced that a statement had been submitted by Mr Eric Hart regarding agenda Item 10, planning application 19/00991/FUL. This statement is attached at the end of minutes.
- 1371.2. The Chairman directed the Clerk to write a response to Mr Hart, and formal letter to Wiltshire Council enquiring why the planning department chose to take the action to ask the applicant to submit a new application, as opposed to enforcing the original one.

1372. Councillor Questions/Statement Time:

There were no questions submitted from Councillors.

1373. Minutes of the Previous Meeting:

1373.1. Due to the length and complexity of the minutes from the last meeting on 4 February, the Chairman postponed signing of the minutes until he had proof read them again. These will be signed at the next Planning meeting.

1374. Declarations of Interest:

1374.1. Cllr Corbin declared a non-pecuniary interest in Item 15 because he works with the applicant.

1375. Dispensations:

No dispensations were requested.

1376. Chairman's Announcements:

The Chairman made no announcements.

1377. Late Business:

The Committee considered the following applications and it was:

Resolved that:

- 1377.1. 19/01925/TCA- SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1377.2. 19/01870/TPO- SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1377.3. 19/01710/TCA -SCC asks that WC Tree Officer's comments be sought.
- 1377.4. 19/01749/TCA- SCC asks that WC Tree Officer's comments be sought.
- 1377.5. 19/01659/FUL SCC asks that the applicant incorporates a gabled roof design to the planning development in order to be consistent with the architecture of other properties on the street.
- 1377.6. 19/01497/LBC SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1377.7. 19/01499/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1377.8. 19/01824/TCA SCC has no comment to make on this application.

1377.9. 19/01830/TCA - SCC asks that WC Tree Officer's comments be sought. 1377.10. 19/01547/LBC - SCC has no comment to make on this application.

1378. Proposed development at 141 Castle Street - Public consultation:

1378.1. The Chairman observed that the applicant was not present during the meeting to give a presentation on the proposed development. Therefore the Chair suggested to the Councillors not to comment on this proposed development, and it was:

Resolved that:

1378.2. SCC has no comment to make on the proposed development.

1379. Salisbury City Planning Applications submitted since 1 February 2019;

Recent applications were discussed and responses were agreed as set out below. It was:

Resolved that:

- 1379.1. 19/00211/FUL SCC is concerned about the lack of parking spaces, which could result in traffic congestions due to spill over of residents cars parked on the road. SCC suggests that parking restrictions are applied outside of this property. SCC also support the recommendations made by SWAS for the development to incorporate swift bricks into the design of the properties in order to preserve swift colonies in the city.
- 1379.2. 19/01190/FUL –SCC objects to this application because it is overbearing on the adjacent property and on the street scene.
- 1379.3. 19/01511/TPO SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.4. 19/01485/TPO SCC objects to this application, and asks that WC Tree Officer's comments be sought.
- 1379.5. 19/01469/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.6. 19/00991/FUL SCC asks that the WC Planning Officer and Enforcement Officer ensure that the applicant adheres to the planning protocol.
- 1379.7. 19/01348/FUL –SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.8. 19/01021/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.9. 19/01185/TPO SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.10. 19/01584/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.11. 19/01282/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.12. 19/01327/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.13. 19/01443/FUL SCC is concerned that the proposed development is unsafe and impractical. SCC asks that WC Highways Officer's comments be sought.
- 1379.14. 19/01546/FUL –SCC supports this application.
- 1379.15. 19/00967/OUT SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.16. 19/00970/LBC SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.17. 19/01032/TPO SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.18. 19/01167/LBC SCC has no comment to make on this application.

- 1379.19. 19/01294/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.20. 19/01423/TCA SCC asks that WC Tree Officer's comments be sought.
- 1379.21. 19/01283/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.22. 19/01000/FUL SCC has no comment to make on this application.
- 1379.23. 19/01148/FUL SCC supports this applications. SCC also support the recommendations made by SWAS for the development to incorporate swift bricks into the design of the properties in order to preserve swift colonies in the city.
- 1379.24. 19/01270/LBC SCC supports this application.

1380. <u>Development at Phase E, Land To The North West Of Fugglestone Red & Bemerton:</u>

1380.1. The Committee discussed street names for the proposed developed location, and the following names were chosen. It was:

Resolved that:

The following street names will be submitted to Wiltshire Council as follows;

- 1380.2. Fawcett
- 1380.3. Melchester
- 1380.4. Golding
- 1380.5. Chicheley
- 1380.6. Dareham
- 1380.7. Ponting
- 1380.8. Longspee
- 1380.9. Dove
- 1380.10. Good
- 1380.11. lvie
- 1380.12. Whatley
- 1380.13. Wick

1381. Premises Licence Application - Leonardo's La Piazza WK/201902813:

The Committee discussed premise licence application for Leonardo's La Piazza. It was:

Resolved that:

1381.1. SCC has no comment to make on this application.

1382. Waiting Restriction Request Application - 51 Moberly Road:

The Committee considered a waiting restriction for this address. It was:

Resolved that:

1382.1. The Committee supports this application.

1383. Waiting Restriction Request Application - 32 Donaldson Road:

The Committee considered a waiting restriction for this address. It was:

Resolved that:

1383.1. The Committee supports this application.

1384. <u>Matters, if any, which by reason of special circumstances the Chairman decides should be considered as a matter of urgency:</u>

No matters were raised.

There were 1 member of the public and 1 member of the press present.

The meeting closed at 8:53 pm.

PUBLIC STATEMENTS

Eric Hart

Councillors.

As this committee is aware the 'Compleat Artist' building, 102 Crane Street, has been almost completely demolished contrary to planning regulations and in serious breach of the original planning application 18/00991/FUL. A new planning application 19/009991/FUL has been submitted. The accompanying 'Construction Method Statement' states "The works involve the partial demolition of the existing building and it (sic) re- construction."

NOTE: 'partial demolition'. There are other seriously misrepresentative statements made in the accompanying documents.

Such statements made in the second application regarding work on the public access area and river drain culvert, carried out in Salisbury City Council's name, are blamed for historic architectural features of the original building becoming unsafe. A mechanical digger was used on the site!

It was clear from the commencement of the works under the original application that the workmen on site were intent on pulling down nearly all of the building. These workmen adopted an aggressive attitude towards any members of the public attempting to witness what was being done. The intimidating attitude they adopted had nothing to do with safety.

The new proposal is vastly different from the original building even though there are dubious claims that preserved 'historical features' are being included. The original building was single storey throughout. The current plan is for a two storey building which is significantly different in architectural style from the original. The new proposal also has a chimney stack.

Wiltshire Council Planning has obviously demonstrated dereliction of its duty of care responsibilities in overseeing that such works are compliant with the planning application from the outset. There is a clear need for this SCC committee to challenge such dereliction on behalf of the electorate to ensure the evident malpractices cannot occur in relation to other properties in the Salisbury Conservation Area and to have the now inevitable reconstruction of the 'Complete Artist' building more closely resemble the original building.

Definitive photographic reference of that building accompanies the second application. How will this committee, in conjunction with the full Salisbury City Council, challenge this new application and ensure that public conservation interests are fully enforced and employed in the reconstruction of the 'Compleat Artist' building and any other such buildings in Salisbury for which planning applications are submitted in the future?

Yours sincerely.

Eric G Hart