

	Major Issue		
	Minor Issue		
	Resolved/No action required		
Consultee	Comment	Response	Resolved
Highways	I refer to the revised plans received in respect of the above planning application, together with the initial Highway observations dated 23rd June 2021. Further to my previous Highway comments I can confirm that Sherbourne Drive and Roger Way have now been adopted as public highway. It is noted that the layout has changed to provide an internal loop road with two accesses off Roger Way. Individual vehicular accesses have been removed from Bunting Way with the exception of Plot 33 where the first section of Bunting Way has been widened to 3.7m to allow vehicular access. Plots 35 – 41 front Bunting Lane with parking to the rear. Bunting Lane is of single vehicle width with no turning head and is not adopted highway, bollards should be installed beyond Plot 33 to prevent any vehicle access along Bunting Lane. I suggest that the internal loop road should not be offered for adoption as highway given that it only serves a small number of dwellings. However, if the site is to be adopted there should be a 2m service strip on one side of the road with a 0.5m buffer strip opposite. With the absence of a service strip it is not clear where services will run. A buffer / service strip is needed around the entire site including behind the visitor laybys. Small areas of grass verge which may become public highway are not encouraged and should be hard-surfaced. Whilst the proposed tandem garage parking (FOGs) as shown throughout the site are not ideal, in terms of allocation it meets the requirement of the Wiltshire Parking Strategy. Parking spaces for Plots 23 & 24 have not been labelled correctly on the Parking Plan and Plots 40 & 41 require 3 parking spaces each. Cycle parking is required for each dwelling in line with the Wiltshire Cycling Strategy. A visibility splay drawing has been provided, this should be updated to show all accesses onto Roger Way, including individual driveways. With regard to the conversion of Building C to apartments, I have previously advised that there would be no objection from the Highway Authority, subject to adequate cycle parking. The footway / vehicle crossover on Crosier Close which serves Building C has recently been re-laid and adopted as highway. The revised Travel Plan addresses the previously raised comments.	The revised plans show that Bunting Lane is to be stopped up with bollards beyond plot 33 in line with requests. A 2m service strip is now present on highways to be adopted with 0.5m buffer opposite. Plots that were identified as requiring extra parking (3 spaces) have now been allocated in line with standards. Cycle parking has been shown within private rear gardens.	
Drainage	It is highlighted that the proposal has been resubmitted with 41 properties as opposed to 53 and as such a full assessment of the surface water drainage has been undertaken. The site is a 1.0 hectare greenfield site located off Roger Way, surrounded by recently built properties and a football stadium to the south. Proposed Drainage Strategy (taken from Flood Risk & Drainage Technical Note - Old Sarum - Issue 1.pdf) The updated drainage strategy, as outlined in drawings P23-295-SK102 and P23- 295-SK103, continues to incorporate infiltration techniques. Roof and impermeable driveway runoff are directed into an underground drainage system, which is then conveyed to an infiltration basin positioned along the western boundary of the site.This infiltration basin is designed to dispose of surface water runoff from all storm events, including the 1 in 100-year storm event, with a 45% allowance for climate change. Similarly, the permeable driveways are designed to facilitate the infiltration of surface water into the ground, ensuring they can accommodate surface water runoff from all storm events, including a 1 in 100 year storm event, with 45% allowance for climate change The surface water strategy for the wider site allowed for 5380m3 roof runoff to drain to the site wide surface water network. However, in the updated proposal, roof runoff is conveyed to an infiltration basin. The only area discharging to the sewer in Rogers Way is 1134.3m2, runoff from the developments proposed adoptable carriageway.	Not further action required, updated drainage provided however to support updated layout proposals.	

Ecology	The ecology reports submitted to this application are welcome: Ecological Appraisal, No: 12115_R04a_CGS_HM, Date: 26/03/2021 by Tyler Grange Ecological Impact Assessment, Ref: 2156-EclA-LT-Rev1, Date: 20 December 2023 by GE Consulting The reports confirm the site has suitable habitat to support the following: Reptiles (Local Importance) Invertebrates (Local) Hedgehogs (Local) Breeding birds (Local) Badger (limited foraging potential) Further clarification is required on the survey effort and the proposed mitigation measures. - Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) Habitat Justification supported by evidence is required to confirm the designation of “modified grassland” as the baseline grassland habitat. This evidence should include but not be limited to the percentage of cover of grass species including the cover of rye-grasses and white clover where present and the number of plant species per m2. Clarification is also required on how a site walkover at a sub-optimal time of year for botanical surveys is sufficient to determine the habitat assemblage. Specific justification is required on why some sections of the site are not designated as “Open mosaic habitats on previously developed land”. The above information is also required to inform the BNG requirements and is discussed further in Section 2 of this consultation response. Reptiles Justification supported by evidence is required to confirm why further surveys for reptiles were not completed to determine the importance of this site for these species. Mitigation Measures A Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Plan is required which details the location and specification of the biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures such as but not limited to the bat and bird boxes, hedgehog highways in property fences and reptile hibernacula. The integral features on new developments should be created at the ratio of 1:1 feature to building in accordance with best practice guidelines. Integral features must seek to benefit a target species or group and demonstrate viability in terms of position on building, location and clustering in accordance with relevant guidance. The location and specification of the integral features should be included in the proposed elevation drawings. - Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Core Policy 50 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy requires all development to demonstrate no net loss of biodiversity and for major applications the expectation is that development will deliver a net gain. The NPPF also encourages applications to deliver measurable net gains (para 174 d) and the government has signalled its intention to bring forward legislation to require development to deliver 10% net biodiversity gain. Laverstock and Ford Communities Neighbourhood Plan 2021 to 2036, Policy 2(c) also states; “<i>development shall:</i> <i>. be supported by an ecological assessment of the proposed development, including quantitative evidence of biodiversity net gain using Natural England’s Biodiversity Metric</i>” Natural England has now prepared version 4.0 of the Biodiversity Metric that includes a small site metric Beta version. At the current time therefore, the Council expects all applications to demonstrate no net loss of biodiversity and where appropriate to deliver a net gain. The unlocked Biodiversity Metric calculation spreadsheet should be supported by the condition assessment sheets and maps. Any proposed new individual tress should be allocated the size of “small” and not “medium”. Unless sufficient justification is provided, areas of proposed grassland that are readily accessible by members of the public and their pets are considered unlikely to achieve a higher distinctiveness than Modified Grassland. The submitted evidence suggests the development will result in at least a loss of 4.24 units and measures to deliver net gain are not proposed. Any off-site mitigation/compensation measures will need to be secured by an appropriate legal agreement such as but limited to a S106. The issue of no net loss/BNG must be addressed prior to determination of this application.	A full ecological response has been provided that addresses each point in turn and is summarised as follows: EclA An EclA has been undertaken to asses the impacts of the proposed plans on the site and the wider area. The report identifies habitats and species onsite alongside key ecological constraints before providing recommended mitigation to address potential impacts. The Site was considered to be of relatively low ecological interest, with minimal adverse impacts predicted on important ecological features. Avoidance measures and careful timing of works have been incorporated into the design to eliminate impacts protected and notable species and habitat creation has been included to compensate for habitat loss. Provided the avoidance and mitigation measures are carried out the proposal is considered unlikely to have significant adverse effects on ecological features. BNG The attached BNG report indicates that through a mix of proposed onsite and offsite planting the development can successfully achieve a BNG for both habitats and hedgerow (linear) at a level of 11.75% and 30.04% respectively. The offsite planting is proposed within a parcel of land adjacent to the wider Old Sarum site and would be redeveloped to provide an enhancement. HRA The attached Nutrient Neutrality Assessment identifies that the site would lead to a resultant budget of 4.77kg/TP/year pre-2030 and 1.08kg/TP/year thereafter. Due to limited space onsite to accommodate an uplift it is proposed that these phosphate credits are purchased either from the Council once a scheme has been confirmed or through an agreed third party.	
-----------------------	---	--	--

	3. Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) - Hampshire River Avon Special Area of Conservation (SAC) catchment This development falls within the catchment of the River Avon SAC and has potential to cause adverse effects alone or in combination with other developments through discharge of phosphorus in wastewater. Appropriate Assessment (AA) under Section 63 of the Habitats Regulations must be carried out by the relevant Competent Authority (the LPA) to determine the potential significant effects and the suitability of any measures proposed to avoid or mitigate those effects. Insufficient information has so far been submitted to enable the AA to be undertaken, which must be completed prior to the application being determined. In line with the Council's Strategic Appropriate Assessment of Developments in Wiltshire Occurring in the River Avon SAC Catchment (16/03/2023) all planned major and non-mains sewerage applications are required to submit a nutrient calculation and statement confirming how sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS) and other measures have been adopted on Site to avoid and mitigate phosphorus burdens. New Forest Protected Sites - 15km recreation zone The development lies within the zone of influence for the New Forest protected sites which includes the New Forest SPA, New Forest SAC and New Forest Ramsar site. It is screened into appropriate assessment under the Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended) on account of its potential to cause adverse effects through increased recreational pressure, which may occur alone and in-combination with other plans and projects. Many of the special features afforded protection are vulnerable to increased recreation as demonstrated in Natural England's supplementary advice issued for the SPA on 19 March 2019 and for the SAC on 18 March 2019. The Council has prepared an "Interim recreation mitigation strategy for the New Forest internationally protected sites" (Version 1.1, 21 March 2023) which identifies the zones of influence within which residential and tourism development have the potential to generate additional recreation pressure. The strategy details mitigation required to avoid and reduce impacts. Provision of Suitable Areas of Natural Greenspace (SANGs) will be provided to reduce visitor numbers at protected sites and where visits are unavoidable, strategic access management and monitoring (SAMM) methods will be used to control people's behaviour. The strategy explains that residential developments of 50 or more homes will be required to directly provide high quality open space while other development will contribute indirectly through allocation of funds from the Community Infrastructure Levy. Together this package of measures has been endorsed by Natural England on 17 April 2023 who consider the strategy to be sufficient to mitigate for development coming forward through the Wiltshire Core Strategy. The Council therefore concludes that, provided the necessary mitigation is secured by condition or S106 as appropriate, the current application alone and in-combination with other plans and projects will not lead to adverse effects on the New Forest protected sites. The necessary mitigation for this development is: Contributions through CIL towards SAMM. In carrying out its statutory function, the LPA must be reasonably sure that the proposal will not result in significant adverse effects on protected habitats or species. The information outlined above must therefore be submitted and reviewed by the LPA's ecology team prior to determination of the application.		
--	---	--	--

Public Protection	Noise I have given consideration to the Entran Residential Noise Assessment dated November 2023. I have also looked back through the history of this consultation. It is noted that there is a revised layout which includes single aspect dwellings along some of the boundary with the football pitch. The protection these buildings offer plus the acoustic fencing are beneficial to noise levels across some of the site. Unfortunately during football matches a number of plots, including 1,2,3,4,5, 8, 30, 40 and 41 will have windows to habitable rooms which need to be closed to achieve internal noise level guidelines. With windows open internal noise levels would be above the 35dB recommended by the WHO and in BS8233 for noise without specific character or ‘anonymous’ noise. It is important to remember here that this is not anonymous noise and it will be impulsive and unpredictable. It is from a specific commercial/leisure source which will make the noise less acceptable to some people than noise such as road traffic which is anonymous and more easy to accept because of community benefit. The contour diagram below, which is figure 7 from the noise report demonstrates noise propagation across the site. Where the light blue, light grey and mustard colours touch building facades this demonstrates where windows will need to be closed to achieve the levels recommended for anonymous noise. It may be argued that future residents will be aware that they are moving to properties near a football field and there will be noise, but they may not appreciate the extent of the disturbance, or the timings until they move in. Also, some may be rented and the occupants have little choice but to live there. I believe the stadium has matches most Saturday afternoon/evenings during the season and some start at 19:45 so may go on late into the evening when residents are trying to put children to bed and go to bed themselves. I understand, where necessary games may go on after 23:00 as there are currently no restrictions over this. In regards to the external amenity space noise levels, it is predicted in section 4.12 of the report that during a match noise levels will meet the ‘55dB criterion’. I believe this 55dB is taken from the upper guideline limit provided by the WHO and in BS8233. Again, this is the level recommended for anonymous noise without specific character, not specific commercial noise. In addition to this the Sports England Publication ‘Artificial Grass Pitches Acoustics Planning Implications Guide’ recommends not exceeding a level of 50dB LAeq1hr in outside amenity spaces. It is appreciated this is for artificial pitches but the guidance can be extrapolated for this similar situation. I believe the noise models, for football stadium and bar noise are for ground floor of the proposed dwellings only, the assessment has not considered first floor windows. There will be living rooms and bedrooms at first floor level for plots 15 and 16 and bedrooms for the other plots. Noise from games, supporters and the bar are likely to have a significant impact at first floor level into the late evening which is when people are going to bed. There is also the issue of music/entertainment noise. The bar is licenced to have music until midnight every day. Section 4.17 of the report predicts noise levels from music in the bar will be below the ‘55dB criterion’. This is not an appropriate criteria for music from a commercial source in a private garden. Again, it is the upper guideline limit in WHO and BS8233 for noise from an anonymous source. In addition to this, if the noise level from music in the bar is 55dB in the garden, with windows open it would be at least 40dB inside. For residents to be able to hear music at this level inside their homes up until midnight would cause a significant adverse impact. For both noise sources it is also foreseeable that residents may complain to the council about noise nuisance. The noise assessment prescribes acoustic glazing and mechanical ventilation for many plots. Unless the windows are sealed closed, which we would not support, the residents are within their rights to open them. If they are then subject to unreasonable levels of noise they may complain to the council. We would have a duty to investigate these complaints under the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and should a statutory noise nuisance be found, serve a noise abatement notice. If not complies with this may result in formal action through the courts. The football club may be able to demonstrate a best practical means defence which may result in a statutory nuisance continuing and the local authority not being able to bring about resolution. It is appreciated there are other dwellings in the vicinity on Bunting Lane and Sherbourne Drive but these are approximately 40m away, with Sherbourne Drive having the protection of the stands and a carpark between them and the noise source. The majority of this development site is within 40m of the stadium boundary with no protection from stands. Around the rest of the football ground there is an informal ‘buffer’ where there are no residential properties within 40m. Lighting I have considered the submitted lighting assessment and compliance with the appropriate guidance from the Institute of Lighting Professionals. The recommended vertical illuminance limits for zone E2 is 5Lux before 23:00 and 1 Lux after 23:00 vertical Lux. The predicted vertical illuminance level for plot 15 is 5.5lux and 16 is 4.34lux. For plot 15 this is already above the 5lux limit pre curfew. The report states this is at ground floor level where these dwellings will not have habitable space on the ground floor but as this is the only evidence we have to go on.	Since the last submission there has been informal discussions undertaken with the Planning Officer and the Public Protection officer. In response to both comments received in this time and to address the comments provided as the formal consultation response both noise and lighting have been responded to in separate reports. Noise Noise levels were assessed using criteria provided within BS 823:2014 and the WHO guidelines. Modelling of noise based on recorded levels shows the within the proposed mitigation measures all gardens are compliant with the 55dB criteria. In relation to internal noise levels that may be impacted for short periods of time during matches at the adjacent football club the public protection officer has stated that the closing of windows is not acceptable mechanism for rural areas even with suitable means of ventilation available. Firstly it is contended that the site is not located within a rural area, with development on all four boundaries of the proposed site. Secondly the council have recently accepted the principal that closing windows is acceptable as a noise mitigation measure. In response to application PL/2023/04469 the public protection officer states: <i>“...we have to consider that the application site is in the centre of the city, and other nearby properties overlooking the market square have already been converted to residential dwellings. Therefore, future occupants should have an expectation that they will hear anonymous city noise if windows are open. In addition, the applicant and any future occupants should be aware of the developments proximity to the market square which hosts the annual charter fair (in October), traditional weekly markets (on Tuesday and Saturday) and from time to time other regulated entertainment events which may include loud amplified music. Although these issues are not so significant so as to justify the refusal of the application all parties should be aware of the potential for residual impact on residential amenity. I therefore recommend (in addition the conditions previously recommended by my colleague) the following condition is applied to any approval of this application: All noise mitigation recommendations as detailed in Section 6 (pages 9 and 10) of ISVR Consulting Noise Assessment Report, dated September 2023, are implemented in full and maintained at all times thereafter.”</i> This response accepts that residents should be aware of potential noise prior to purchase and that windows can be closed to mitigate not only anonymous noise (from the urban environment) but also commercial noise originating from specifically highlighted markets on a far more regular basis than football matches. We wish to also highlight the internal noise levels accepted within the application are higher than those on the proposed. The application proposed has undertaken all reasonable measures to mitigate noise in regard to orientation of buildings and facades alongside enhanced noise barriers. Light	
--------------------------	---	--	--

	It is understood that the football stadium is not restricted to hours of use and that although the lighting is usually off by 23:00 this may not be the case into the future. For both plots they would be well above the post curfew limit should the lights stay on past 23:00. Again, it is appreciated there are other dwellings in the vicinity but these are all further away than the proposed and the impact of lights will be different. Conclusion We appreciate the steps that have been made in an attempt to provide mitigation to noise and lighting impacts at this site. However, for the reasons stated we do not consider this site suitable for dwellings in such close proximity to the football ground and have to maintain our recommendation for refusal. If this site was to be pursued, I would suggest that as well as good design being used to provide mitigation, dwellings are located no closer to the stadium than existing. Wiltshire Councils Core Policy 57 centres around ensuring high quality design and place shaping and requires the planning process to ensure a high standards of design through: vii. Having regard to the compatibility of adjoining buildings and uses, the impact on the amenities of existing occupants, and ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable within the development itself, including the consideration of privacy, overshadowing, vibration, and pollution (e.g. light intrusion, noise, smoke, fumes, effluent, waste or litter) We do not believe the current proposals meet the requirements of this policy.	The application is supported by a light report that looks at the impact of floodlights. The public protection officer in a response provided by the case office on the 22nd April 2024 stated: <i>The evidence supplied around lighting is accepted in regard to the pre curfew levels. I remain concerned about the impact post curfew should lighting stay on past 23:00.</i> The information alluded to is that attached report that supports this resubmission. In response to the above comment it is recognised and welcomed that light within the parcel is accepted pre-curfew levels. Concern is raised around lights remaining on past 23:00. The latest a football match in the UK will kick off is 20.00, it is noted that Salisbury FC had 3 home games within the 2023/24 season kicking off at 19.45 midweek this year with only one being a game that had the possibility of running into extra time. It is therefore sensible to look at the timings as such with a standard football match being 90 minutes with a 15 minute break for halftime, when considering any additional stoppage, normal games that are not cup games (i.e. no possibility of Extra Time) will cease at around 21.45 with the stadium vacant shortly after. If consider a cup game kicking off at the same time and duration but the possibility of 30 minutes extra time and the possibilities of penalties the match under any normal circumstances would cease before 22.30 again with the stadium vacant shortly after. There are very little circumstances under which lights should remain on past 23:00 (curfew). Pausing for a moment to consider this in some perspective - we are talking about an event (flood lighting beyond 11pm) that is unlikely to occur given knowledge of kick off times, and even if it was to occur it would surely be no more than a couple of times a year and seems only likely to apply for a few minutes to complete a match, which would hardly be a surprise event to a resident moving into one of these dwellings. We require further clarity on what the public protection officer believes what lighting will occur beyond 11pm before we would be able to consider suitable further mitigation if required. For the avoidance of doubt the above was accepted by the Public Protection Officer in an email received 24th May 2024.	
--	--	---	--

It should also be noted that in order to reflect demonstrable need, the following person number requirements should be provided:

- 1 bed / 2 person
- 2 bed / 4 person
- 3 bed / 5 person
- 4 bed / 6 person

Whilst the floorplans don't show furniture layouts, some of the bedrooms look as if they may be too small to accommodate the required person numbers. The applicant should confirm that the proposed units meet the minimum person criteria above. The Unit Size Mix relating to Area A/F should be re-visited to take account of the above comments. A mix which would reflect demonstrable need would be:

Area A / F	
<u>Affordable Rented:</u>	<u>Shared Ownership:</u>
2 x 1 bed / 2 person flats	4 x 2 bed / 4 person houses
2 x 2 bed / 4 person houses	2 x 3 bed / 5 person houses
1 x 3 bed / 5 person house	
1 x 4 bed / 6 person house	

There is also a demonstrable need for adapted housing in Laverstock and Salisbury. On all schemes which provide more than 10 Affordable Housing units, it is requested that 10% of affordable units are provided as adapted units in order to help meet this need. These units should be provided to Building Regulations M4(2) standards with a level access shower provided. In this instance it would be appropriate to provide 2 Ground Floor flats as adapted units to meet demonstrable need. Please note that if these are provided in Block C, the applicant should ensure that entry through the communal areas is accessible. The applicant should confirm which units will be provided as adapted units.

Design of Scheme (including Minimum Floorspace Standards):

Affordable housing in Wiltshire is expected to meet high standards of design and quality, and to be visually indistinguishable from open market housing. When considering scheme design options, the following should be taken into account:

Clustering / Distribution: The Affordable Housing units should be evenly dispersed, in small clusters, within mixed tenure developments.

Adjoining Properties: To aid marketing/sales of Affordable tenures all Affordable tenures should, where possible, not be directly connected to the other affordable/market tenures in semi-detached pairs or in terraces.

Parking: Electric Vehicle Charging Points or infrastructure should be provided for each affordable home to meet current building regulation and local requirements. The scheme layout should be designed to have as much in-curtilage parking as possible in order to facilitate the provision of on-plot Electric Vehicle Charging Points for the Affordable dwellings wherever possible. Parking courts are not considered suitable for affordable homes (other than for blocks of flats). I note that there do not appear to be sufficient parking spaces for the 4 bed properties (plots 40 and 41).

In order to ensure that the affordable housing units are eligible for inclusion in Homes England's Affordable Housing programme, we would advise that all affordable homes are built to meet at least 85% of the Nationally Described Space Standard (NDSS) relevant to the dwelling type and minimum person criteria. NDSS and 85% NDSS are shown in the table below:

	Number of bedrooms	Number of bed spaces	NDSS			Minimum 85% NDSS		
			1 storey (sqm)	2 storey (sqm)	3 storey (sqm)	1 storey (sqm)	2 storey (sqm)	3 storey (sqm)
	Studio	1p	39 (37)*			34 (32)*		
	1b	2p	50	58		43	50	
	2b	3p	61	70		52	60	
		4p	70	79		60	68	
	3b	4p	74	84	90	63	72	77
		5p	86	93	99	74	80	85
		6p	95	102	108	81	87	92
	4b	5p	90	97	103	77	83	88
		6p	99	106	112	85	91	96
		7p	108	115	121	92	98	103
		8p	117	124	130	100	106	111

*Where a one person flat has a shower room rather than a bathroom the floorspace may be reduced from 39 sqm to 37 sqm (NDSS) or from 34 sqm to 32 sqm (85% NDSS).

Transfer of Affordable Rented and Shared Ownership Units to Registered Provider:

The affordable dwellings will be required to be transferred to a Registered Provider, approved by the Council, or to the Council, on a nil subsidy basis.

It is strongly recommended that the applicant makes contact with Registered Providers and Wiltshire Council's Residential Development Team as soon as possible in order to discuss the best option for the affordable dwellings including an indication of transfer prices that can be expected. A list of Registered Providers who work in partnership with Wiltshire Council, and contact details for Wiltshire Council's Residential Development Team, can be provided on request.

Archaeology	Thank you for informing Wiltshire Council's Archaeology Service of the submission of revised plans in relation to this application. Having reviewed the amended plans, I have no further comment to add to the Archaeology Service's response of 28 May 2021, namely that the Archaeology Service has no objection subject to a condition requiring a programme of archaeological investigation. The programme should comprise: 1. an initial phase of exploratory investigation prior to the commencement of development to identify any areas of archaeological interest that will be impacted by the development. 2. further archaeological investigation of any areas of archaeological interest either prior to or during development. 3. Analysis and reporting commensurate with the significance of the archaeological results. I trust that this is satisfactory. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss this further or require any further information.	Noted.
--------------------	---	---------------

Parish Council	Laverstock and Ford Parish Council had submitted the response ‘OBJECT with reasons’ to the original application. At its meeting on 20th November 2023, Laverstock and Ford Parish Council discussed the changes made and agreed that the provision of electric vehicle charging points and storage of refuse bins has been addressed in the new plans. However, the Parish Council do not believe any of the other objections have been addressed, and resolved to OBJECT to the updated application for the following reasons. Regarding residential development of the land to the west of Roger Way. 1. The Parish Council strongly supports the land remaining as employment land as defined in the 2007 S106 agreement, being “6ha of employment land principally comprising uses B1 and B2”. No evidence has been provided of sufficient effort made in marketing or developing the land, to encourage take up for this use. 2. The noise and light from the neighbouring Salisbury Football Club, being immediately adjacent to the site, would have a significant adverse effect on any residential properties. 3. The roads approaching the site are already overcrowded. Many cars are parking along both sides of Sherbourne Drive, including near junctions and blind corners. The bus already has great difficulty negotiating this area, and concerns have been raised about access for Emergency Services. Laverstock and Ford Parish Council believe the proposed design does not provide sufficient parking for residents and visitors and will add to the problems already evident. 4. This road is part of the route for many children to nearby Old Sarum Primary School. The lack of parking spaces, and poor parking on the road combined with the increase in traffic to a residential development would make this an extremely hazardous area. 5. The proposed design of the new homes in this area is over-dense, with too many properties in a small area. Regarding the Old Sarum Local Centre. Not enough has been done to make this area an easy enough option for any consideration of Community use. We have seen no evidence of any marketing of this area for Community use, and the units have been left empty and unmaintained for some time.	A response is provided to each point below: 1. The land within the proposed application does not form any of the allocation of the Principal Employment Land identified within CP35 in the Core Strategy. CP35 further states where sufficient evidence is present to justify the change of use of employment land (i.e at least 6 months marketing) then it can be deemed the site is no longer viable for employment land. A marketing report that supported the original application provides evidence of the lack of suitable proposals. 2. Noise and lighting has been explored earlier within this technical response sheet. 3. The highway officer has not deemed Sherbourne Drive to be an issue in relation to the proposed. Parking is proposed inline with Wiltshire’s Parking Standards. 4. Sufficient footpaths are provided within the proposals to allow for safe access and navigation through the development and is not raised as a concern by Wiltshire’s Highways officer. 5. The density of the proposed is akin to its surrounding area and provides dedicated POS and incidental open space and green areas. 6. The change of use of the ground floor of the Old Sarum Local Centre to affordable housing has previously been accepted by Wiltshire’s Planning Officers (application 15/112244/FUL) where evidence was provided that the NHS deemed there no requirement for the unit. It is therefore proposed that providing affordable housing is beneficial to the community and would bring active use to the empty unit.	
Education	I’ve now had a look at the amended details submitted here and can see that the number of units proposed has been reduced to 41. As a result, I’ve reviewed our assessment from 2021 and not that the only S106 case being made was one for early years places. I can confirm that there remains no case for primary and secondary school places contributions from this application, so our position is unchanged. I have also checked with my EY colleague, and she has reviewed her case. Nicola advises that the EY case is no longer valid, and so please treat this email as notification of its withdrawal	Noted	

Waste	Background: Waste management services have commented on this application and support, the only change is the S106 contribution as number of units have changed. Provision of containers for waste and recycling: The on-site infrastructure required by the proposal is the provision of waste and recycling containers for each residential unit. The following s106 contribution is required for the provision of this essential infrastructure to make the application acceptable in terms of the policies listed below: <table border="1" data-bbox="371 514 1522 972"><tr><th>Property type category</th><th>Contribution per house/per category</th><th>Quantity</th><th>Total</th></tr><tr><td>Individual house</td><td>£101.00</td><td>41</td><td>£4,141</td></tr><tr><td>Bin store for block of 6-10 flats</td><td>£815.00</td><td>1</td><td>£ 815</td></tr><tr><td>Bin store for block of 11-14 flats</td><td>£1,545.00</td><td></td><td>£ 0</td></tr><tr><td>Bin store for block of 15-18 flats</td><td>£2,276.00</td><td></td><td>£ 0</td></tr><tr><td colspan="3">Total</td><td>£4,956</td></tr></table> This contribution is directly related to the development and is specifically related to the scale of the development, as it is based upon the number of residential units on site. Policy: Policy support for seeking developer contributions towards the provision of waste management facilities is provided by the adopted Wiltshire Core Strategy, Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Core Strategy and the Wiltshire Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, as detailed in the sections below. <i>Wiltshire Core Strategy – Core Policy 3 (CP3)</i> Core Policy 3 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy (adopted January 2015) provides overarching policy support for securing developer contributions towards ‘waste management services such as recycling and collection facilities’, which is classed as ‘essential infrastructure’. In the event of competing demands for infrastructure provision, essential infrastructure will be afforded the highest priority. <i>Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document</i> The Wiltshire Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Adopted May 2015) supports Core Policy 3 and provides further detail on the council’s approach to developer contributions. The Planning Obligations SPD lists ‘waste and recycling containers’ as a type of site-specific infrastructure that would be sought through section 106 contributions rather than through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The provision of bins, and the services required to support waste collection, is a burden on the council that can often be directly related to new developments and hence firmly within scope for financial contributions to be made through s106 agreements. Container provision is directly related to the type and scale of the development, as they are issued on a per-residential-unit basis (except where communal containers are required for apartments sharing the use of bin stores). To meet the requirements of the Written Ministerial Statement on small-scale developers, contributions are not sought for developments which include 10 residential units or fewer. <i>Policy WCS6 of the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Core Strategy</i>	Property type category	Contribution per house/per category	Quantity	Total	Individual house	£101.00	41	£4,141	Bin store for block of 6-10 flats	£815.00	1	£ 815	Bin store for block of 11-14 flats	£1,545.00		£ 0	Bin store for block of 15-18 flats	£2,276.00		£ 0	Total			£4,956	Noted.	
Property type category	Contribution per house/per category	Quantity	Total																								
Individual house	£101.00	41	£4,141																								
Bin store for block of 6-10 flats	£815.00	1	£ 815																								
Bin store for block of 11-14 flats	£1,545.00		£ 0																								
Bin store for block of 15-18 flats	£2,276.00		£ 0																								
Total			£4,956																								

	Policy WCS6 of the Wiltshire and Swindon Waste Core Strategy requires developers “to design and provide facilities for occupiers of the development to recycle/compost waste [...] and/or facilities within individual groups of properties or premises for the source separation and storage of different types of waste for recycling and/or composting”. Wiltshire Council retains control of procuring containers that are issued to occupiers of residential properties. The reasons for this are to ensure that the containers are compatible with lifting equipment and that branding – which is essential for ensuring that residents know what materials are designated for each container – meets the required standard. As a developer cannot directly provide the facilities for the separation and storage of waste, instead the requirement under WCS6 is met by securing a section 106 contribution. The same policies provide policy support for ensuring that developments are designed so as to be suitable for delivery of waste collection services. Core Policy 3 states that it is “important that all new development proposals build safeguards into schemes to protect and enhance appropriate services and facilities, including [...] waste collection and management services”. These safeguards can be achieved by allowing suitable space for waste storage and collection operations in accordance with the council’s waste SPD at the outset of the application process. Policy WCS6 requires developers to provide facilities for separation and storage of waste for recycling and composting. It also states that any such provision must “have regard to [...] the existing [...] Municipal Waste Management Strategy”. The council’s waste strategy expects that new developments are designed to enable waste collection services to operate safely and efficiently and, to this end, the waste SPD sets out what is deemed to be safe and efficient. Meeting the requirement of WCS6 can be achieved by following the guidance in the waste SPD. Access to waste collection services: <i>Vehicle access</i> Vehicle tracking supplied. <i>Collection points</i> Are shown on plan <i>Storage points</i> <i>Routes between storage and collection points</i> Shown on plan <i>[The collection service for flats]</i> If final designs include communal bin stores for flats, the detailed guidance in section 5.6 of the attachment should be followed. Particular attention should be paid to the location and accessibility of bin stores, as the RCV should be able to park within 10 metres of the store without obstructions and with dropped kerbs in place to enable the bins to be safely manoeuvred to the rear of the RCV. <u>Conditions:</u> S106 contribution of £4,956 toward waste and recycling containers. <u>Informatives:</u> none <u>Conclusion:</u>		
--	---	--	--

	Support subject to conditions.		
--	--------------------------------	--	--