The Planning Inspectorate

Major Casework
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Direct Line: 0303 444 5531
Customer Services:
0303 444 5000

Email: HELEN.SKINNER@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
www.gov.uk/planning-inspectorate

Your Ref:
Our Ref: APP/Y3940/W/24/3353040

Wiltshire Council
Planning Appeals
County Hall
Bythesea Road
Trowbridge
Wiltshire
BA14 8JN

09 April 2025

Dear Sir/Madam,

Town and Country Planning Act 1990
Appeal by Old Sarum Airfield Ltd
Site Address: Land at Old Sarum Airfield , Old Sarum, Salisbury, Wiltshire, SP4 6FW

I enclose a copy of our Inspector's decision on the above appeal(s).

If you have queries or feedback about the decision or the way we handled the appeal(s), you should submit them using our "Feedback" webpage at https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/planning-inspectorate/about/complaints-procedure.

If you do not have internet access please write to the Customer Quality Unit at the address above.

If you would prefer hard copies of our information on the right to challenge and our feedback procedure, please contact our Customer Service Team on 0303 444 5000.

Please note the Planning Inspectorate is not the administering body for High Court challenges. If you would like more information on the strictly enforced deadlines for challenging, or a copy of the forms for lodging a challenge, please contact the Administrative Court on 020 7947 6655.

The Planning Inspectorate cannot change or revoke the outcome in the attached decision. If you want to alter the outcome you should consider obtaining legal advice as only the High Court can quash this decision.

We are continually seeking ways to improve the quality of service we provide to our customers. As part of this commitment we are seeking feedback from those who use our service. It would be appreciated if you could take some time to complete this short survey, which should take no more than a few minutes complete:

https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/Planning_inspectorate_customer_survey

Thank you in advance for taking the time to provide us with valuable feedback.

Yours faithfully,

Helen Skinner
Helen Skinner

https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notices

Where applicable, you can use the internet to submit documents, to see information and to check the progress of cases through GOV.UK. The address of the search page is - https://www.gov.uk/appeal-planning-inspectorate

Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Inquiry sittings held on 20, 21, 25-28 February and 4, 5 & 7 March 2025

Accompanied site visit made on 24 February 2025

by Nick Fagan BSc (Hons), DipTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/24/3353040
Land at Old Sarum Airfield, Old Sarum, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP4 6FW

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission, dated 15 August 2024.
- The appeal is made by Old Sarum Airfield Ltd against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
- The Council's application Ref PL/2023/07368 was refused on 15 August 2024.
- The development proposed is: Outline application with all matters reserved, except means of access to site, for the demolition, modification & renovation of existing buildings, structures & site development. Provision of approx. 315 residential dwellings, mixture of employment, commercial/leisure, & aviation uses, including a 'flying hub' comprising control tower, heritage centre, visitor centre, café/restaurant, parachute centre, aviation archives & aircraft hangars. Provision of new vehicular access to surrounding highways network, car parking, & connections to surrounding footpath/cycle networks. Green infrastructure provision, including open space, play space, foot & cycle paths, & landscape enhancement areas; & sustainable urban drainage system & waste water treatment works. Associated vegetation removal, ground modification & engineering works.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the above described outline application with all matters reserved, except means of access to the site, at Land at Old Sarum Airfield, Old Sarum, Salisbury, Wiltshire SP4 6FW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2023/07368, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule below.

Applications for costs

2. Applications for costs have been made by both parties against each other and these will be the subject of separate decisions shortly.

Preliminary Matters

3. The main parties have submitted a signed Section 106 Agreement (the S106) dated 27 March 2025 containing relevant planning obligations, including a 'blue pencil' clause relating to the provision of 25% affordable housing, earlier drafts of which were discussed at the Inquiry. I address this in more detail, where relevant, below.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:

   -Whether the development scheme could, in terms of its likely financial viability, deliver 25% affordable housing units [the viability issue];

-Whether the use of the C287 Ford Road to access the dwellings in Area C would be safe and otherwise acceptable including for existing walkers and cyclists using the road and whether Area C would be accessible by sustainable transport modes [the highways issue]; and

- Whether, and if so how, the proposed development would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the designated heritage assets in the area (including potentially their settings), namely any of the listed buildings on or adjacent to the site, the Old Sarum Airfield Conservation Area (CA), the Old Sarum Scheduled Monument (SM) and the Stratford Sub Castle CA that surrounds it, and if so, whether such harm would be outweighed by any public benefits of the development [the heritage issue].

- The planning balance: whether other material considerations would outweigh any conflict with the development plan, either in terms of the standard or tilted balance.

Reasons

Background

5. The appeal site is essentially the land which makes up Old Sarum Airfield which dates from the First World War (WWI) and still includes technical buildings and three listed hangars which have a functional relationship to the grass airstrip. Old Sarum is identified as one of the best-preserved flying fields of the WWI period with one of the most complete suites of technical and hangar buildings of the period. Only three WW1 airfields with grass airstrips survive in England and Wales. This is the only WW1 airfield in England that has retained its suite of hanger and technical buildings fronting onto an airfield relatively unaffected by later developments, hence its great heritage importance.

6. Although no longer in military use, continuous flying activity has been maintained since 1917 from the grass airstrip. In WW2 the hangers were used to support the work of the Air Observation Unit, the Special Operations Executive and the Royal Canadian Air Force and in the D-Day preparations. The Airfield is now operated as a commercial/ civilian airfield, including leisure and training flights, including mainly at present for parachute training.

7. The Airfield was designated a Conservation Area in 2007. It includes three former WWI aircraft hangars with internal Belfast roof trusses, listed as being Grade II* one of which (Hanger 3) is within the site. In addition, further listed (Grade II) buildings, including the Territorial Army (TA) headquarters, which fronts the Portway, workshops immediately behind the central hanger and the camera obscura building in front of it, add to the suite of support structures. The Airfield's location came in the footsteps of a remarkable earlier history of defence and engagement in the area dating back to the Iron Age with fortifications over the Roman, Norman and Saxon periods. It lies within the setting of Old Sarum Scheduled Monument (the SM), which includes a large motte and bailey hillfort as well as the ruins of a Norman cathedral, which preceded the building of the Norman cathedral in Salisbury itself.

8. The open space of the airstrip and its environs are generally defined but the associated historic buildings have been subsumed into a more modern industrial estate accessed from the Portway (a Roman road) made up of large late 20th century industrial sheds.

9. The Airfield currently has an unrestricted level of intensity of flying activity, albeit the number of flights are currently far less than they used to be. Over time there have been issues relating to aircraft noise in the vicinity, including over Salisbury itself. The Wiltshire Core Strategy (CS)[1] Core Policy (CP) 25 is titled Old Sarum Airfield and has essentially sprung from a desire to seek some control and strike an appropriate balance between the flying activity and the amenity of Salisbury's residents, in the context of the facility being highly valued locally for the historical and recreational opportunities it provides, including maintaining flying from the airstrip. Having said that, the number of flights as set out in the Summary of Flying Operations[2] has drastically reduced since the time of the last appeal and the Covid-19 pandemic from about at least 35,000 flights a year between 2007 and 2019 to between approximately only 2,000-6,000 flights a year since 2020, although I am unclear why this is.

10. CP25 seeks to deliver several outcomes to secure sympathetic new development on the airfield perimeter. The number, type and mix of development is not specified in the policy. The inclusion of residential development is specifically mentioned within the accompanying text to the policy which indicates that sympathetic new development on the Airfield perimeter, including high quality residential use will be allowed, but only where it can be fully demonstrated that it will deliver the outcomes identified in CP25. The three areas for development are identified on an accompanying plan to the Policy. The policy does not set out the specificity of development mix and numbers of homes. This is a matter which should be design-led considering all the factors set out in policy as well as other material considerations.

11. This is a policy which essentially has been in the Development Plan since 2012, when the previous South Wiltshire Core Strategy was adopted (Policy 9 in that plan), although it is not being carried forward into the emerging Local Plan, which was submitted for examination in late November last year. The delivery of the specified outcomes of CP25 lies at the heart of this case, as the previous Inspector also indicated in her decision.

12. The proposed development would be divided into three areas around the perimeter of the Airfield. Area A (3.46ha approx.) on the north-west of the airstrip is proposed to accommodate 160 dwellings with main access from the Portway (302 dwellings were proposed in the last appeal). Area B (2.83ha approx.) would be located to the south-east of the existing listed hangars and other commercial buildings, including proposed hangar buildings along with a new control tower, café/restaurant, heritage, visitors and parachute centres, and aviation archives. Area C (8.7ha approx.) is on the far southern periphery of the Airfield adjoining the village of Ford, where the residual 155 homes are proposed taking access from Ford Road (previously 160 dwellings). The three proposed areas of development lie within the three areas indicated on the accompanying plan to CP25.

13. The previous appeal[3] was dismissed on 11 July 2019 because of the inordinate amount of harm to the heritage assets, by eroding the open character and appearance of the Airfield CA, the setting of the listed hangers and that of the SM. The heritage issue turns on whether the lesser number of dwellings and area developed in Areas A and C, the lesser number of hanger buildings and lesser

[1] Adopted in January 2015, the most relevant part of Wiltshire's Development Plan
[2] ID1.17
[3] CD10.04 – APP/Y3940/W/17/3190561

area developed in Area B, and the design of the illustrative scheme and its expression on the parameter plans, would be sufficient in terms of the heritage balance in paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to make the development acceptable.

14. There was, apparently, a substantially agreed position on highways, albeit residual issues weighed against the proposals according to the Council's Closing Remarks at the last Inquiry[4]; indeed, by the end of that Inquiry, even those residual issues had effectively been resolved by draft planning conditions drawn up between the parties[5]. Viability was not a main issue in dispute in the previous appeal, but it is now, and I turn to this issue first.

The Viability Issue

Background and Relevant Policy

15. A viability assessment was submitted with the application the subject of the previous appeal. Although some of the figures were contested, the main parties agreed that the previous larger development (462 dwellings) could not viably deliver any affordable housing. That is not the case now. The Council had (at the previous Inquiry in 2018) agreed to set the site's Benchmark Land Value (BLV) at £10.74M and instructed its expert, Mrs Reed of the District Valuer Services (DVS), to take that agreed figure forward in the Stage 1 and 2 Reports[6] in assessing the viability of this appeal scheme. Mrs Reed agreed that, at that BLV figure, no affordable housing could viably be provided.

16. However, I am unclear why the Council previously agreed a BLV of £10.74M. The DVS in the previous appeal did not agree with it at the time and Mrs Reed has consistently made clear that she does not agree this figure, as she sets out in her letter of 22 December 2024[7] and in her previous Reports; indeed, the Council's position regarding this was reserved in the event of an appeal. In her Proof Mrs Reed explains why she considers the true BLV of the site to be £5M; at this level she considers that the scheme can deliver 25% affordable housing, which is less than the Council's planning requirement of 40% in this part of the County.

17. It is worth setting out current national policy on viability. NPPF paragraph 59 states: *'Where up-to-date policies have set out the contributions expected from development, planning applications that comply with them should be assumed to be viable. It is up to the applicant to demonstrate whether particular circumstances justify the need for a viability assessment at the application stage. The weight to a viability assessment is a matter for the decision maker, having regard to all the circumstances in the case, including whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date, and any change in site circumstances since the plan was brought into force'.*

18. This approach is confirmed in the Viability chapter of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), particularly as follows: *'Policy requirements, particularly for affordable housing, should be set at a level that takes account of affordable housing and infrastructure needs and allows for the planned types of sites and development to*

[4] CD10.16
[5] CD16.02 paragraph 23 – Mr Hughes's Witness Statement pursuant to the appellant's High Court challenge to the previous appeal decision
[6] CD2.48 & CD13.6 respectively
[7] CD13.2

be deliverable, without the need for further viability assessment at the decision-making stage.'[8]

19. The appellant has not argued that the viability evidence underpinning the Core Strategy is out-of-date, and indeed argues that the proposed development complies with CP25. Although CP25 is not a housing allocation as such, since it doesn't specify a particular number of dwellings to be delivered on the site, it does allow residential development in principle. As CP43 (Providing affordable homes) sets out, 40% affordable housing should be provided in this area for sites of five dwellings or more, subject to viability. Therefore, although the appellant can challenge whether affordable housing (AH) is viable because of site specific costs or constraints, the policy assumption is for 40% AH.

20. The appellant had previously put forward a £3.75M BLV figure[9] but changed it to £14.57M in June 2024[10]. I am unclear how and why this increase is justified. So, first I address the difference in what the main parties consider the BLV to be.

Land Value

21. In terms of how land value should be arrived at for any viability assessment, the PPG says that a BLV should be established on the basis of the existing use value (EUV) of the land, plus a premium for the landowner (EUV+). *'The premium should provide a reasonable incentive, in comparison with other options available, for the landowner to sell land for development while allowing a sufficient contribution to fully comply with policy requirements.'*[11]

22. Regarding the factors that should be considered in establishing BLV, the PPG states*: 'In decision making, the cost implications of all relevant policy requirements, including planning obligations and, where relevant, any Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charge should be taken into account.'*[12]

23. I take this to mean, in the context of this appeal, that the EUV here should allow all the requirements of CP25 to be delivered, given that, as the PPG states: *'Existing use value is not the price paid and should disregard hope value'*[13]. This indicates to me that the *'reasonable controls over flying activity in the interests of the amenity of local residents'* required by CP25 iii should be figured into the calculation of the BLV, either in terms of the EUV itself, or, as Mrs Reed maintains, into the + or premium incentivising the owner to sell the land. Either way, what seems to have occurred here in both parties' calculations of land value, is that the noise controls/ restriction of flying activity attached to the proposed development has effectively been double counted in arriving at a BLV.

24. The appellant, through its expert Mr Evans, argues that 'previous aviation experts' have determined that the value of the Airfield with and without restrictions on flying is £1.6M and £8.95M respectively and that the premium or + should be 20%, making the BLV £10.74M. However, I am unclear how these figures have been arrived at in the first place – they have not been justified to me and appear to have been plucked out of thin air, and it is unclear how they have incorporated all the relevant policy requirements set out in CP25, including CIL, affordable housing

[8] PPG Ref ID: 10-002-20190509
[9] In Mr Atfield's (Goadsby's) original Viability Assessment of November 2023 – CD2.6
[10] CD2.39: Mr Atfield's updated June 2024 Viability Assessment
[11] PPG Ref ID: 10-013-20190509
[12] PPG Ref D: 10-010-20190509
[13] PPG Ref ID: 10-015-20190509

and any flying restrictions. Indeed, it would seem that they haven't, leading to a grossly inflated BLV figure, contrary to the PPG text above. In saying this I am conscious that there is no guidance, in PPG or in the RICS Assessing Viability Guidance[14] that specifies what a minimum return should be to a developer in order to maintain delivery of development.

25. Mrs Reed, on the other hand, follows the stepped approach in the RICS Guidance (paragraph 5.7) to arrive at her BLV figure. She first, with the help of her colleague Mr Larkins, an airfield valuation expert at the DVS, values the EUV of the relevant parts of the site (the areas being developed) at £765,000, including £600,000 for Areas A & C based on the agricultural value of that land and £165,000 based on the value of the aviation related buildings and the land in Area B. I agree with Mrs Reed/Mr Larkins that an EUV of the Airfield itself is irrelevant because it will remain in operation after the proposed development. I therefore agree with her EUV.

26. Mrs Reed explains in some detail on pages 23-29 of her Proof how she has arrived at a + or premium of £4.235M. She explains how she has fulfilled the requirement for evidence of cross sector collaboration required by PPG paragraph 16 by comparing the BLV of the nearest greenfield housing site – the Land North East of Old Sarum – adjusted by the figures for density, abnormals and policy requirements on this site, noting in PPG paragraph 14 that higher abnormal costs (as clearly occur here) require a downward adjustment to the + or premium's value. She also provides evidence from another appeal decision[15], which suggests that a figure of £80,000 per gross acre would be reasonable on a greenfield site with very large abnormals in a relatively affluent location, as the appeal site is, which suggests a premium of £4.17M here.

27. In terms of a Residual Land Value (RLV), the alternative way of assessing viability used by Mr Evans, it is necessary for the BLV to obviously exceed the RLV. Mrs Reed's RLV in her Stage 2 Report is £4.518M based on the appellant advisor's EUV of c£3M. So, rounding up the + or premium to £4.235M (a multiple of 6.54 times the EUV) and adding it to the EUV of £0.765M produces a BLV of £5M.

28. This £5M BLV figure has been arrived at by following the stepped RICS Guidance approach. I cannot fault it. Whilst I acknowledge that there is no legal liability on the appellant to restore Hanger 3, it would be restored as part and parcel of any planning permission – and the costs of restoring it is an abnormal cost that must be factored into the EUV because it is a requirement of CP25. The restriction of flying rights is also a requirement of CP25 and, in my view, should not be used to inflate the premium in arriving at the BLV, which both parties' viability experts seem to have done, such that arguably the appellant's (Goadsby's) original BLV figure of £3.75M may well, realistically, be the true BLV figure. In any case, Mrs Reed's BLV figure of £5M is significantly above that figure, giving the benefit of the doubt to the appellant.

29. Mr Evans's arguments concerning the premium's value of £7.35M make no sense because the restriction of the unrestricted flying rights is a requirement of CP25, without which the development could not possibly come forward. As PPG paragraph 13 says, the premium should provide a reasonable incentive, in comparison with other options available, for the landowner to sell land for

[14] CD2.72/CD14.17
[15] APP/Q4245/W/19/3243720 - Land at Warburton Lane, Trafford

development while allowing a sufficient contribution to fully comply with policy requirements. But it is highly questionable whether there is a comparative option here.

30. No explanation has been given by the appellant as to why the number of flights from the airport remain at a fraction of the numbers that occurred before the pandemic, given that there are no restrictions now on flying or people meeting. So, whilst in theory there could be over 60,000 flights (instead of less than 6,000) from the Airfield now, with no restrictions on it as such, in reality this would be very unlikely, as cogently explained in some detail by Mr Larkins with regard to comparable airports[16]. The only incentive the appellant needs for bringing the site forward is to make a profit through the proposed development, which it undoubtedly would. It has, realistically, no other option for doing so.

31. For all the above reasons, I agree with the Council's BLV figure of £5m, which, if anything, is overly generous.

Disputed Costs

32. Just as I am unclear why the Council previously agreed to an inflated BLV of £10.74M, I am equally unclear why the appellant did not originally figure into its cost inputs all the substantive additional cost items it has now put forward in Mr Evans's rebuttal Proof. However, I have some sympathy with the appellant: the Council drastically altered one of the principal input costs (the BLV) and so the appellant should reasonably be entitled to check that the input costs are complete and accurate. I therefore address below the validity of the main additional cost items suggested by Mr Evans.

33. First, the appellant argues that the communal areas of the apartments in Area A have been omitted. Given such communal areas amount to 15% of the apartment buildings' Gross Internal Areas (GIAs), Mr Evans alleges that that there would be £1.68M additional costs. Mrs Reed understood that the GIAs provided by the appellants to date was inclusive of communal circulation space. While she accepts a 15% amount for such communal space is appropriate, applying this to the overall 6,508m² GIA of the apartment blocks would still leave 44m² for each of the 1-bed flats, 62m² for the 2-beds and 96m² for the 3-beds, which are – to say the least – generous sized. Consequently, I disagree with the appellant that any such costs (nor any applicable CIL costs) have been omitted.

34. Second, it argues that the construction costs of the undercroft parking in these apartment buildings has been omitted, a cost of £2.52M. I understand that it is currently envisaged by the scheme architects to create a basement or undercroft (ground level) parking area for the 6 apartment blocks, as indicated on the illustrated Concept Masterplan for Area A. However, this is just one possible scenario for their design, given that this is an outline application scheme. Suggested Condition 3 merely states that the development 'shall be carried out in general accordance' with this and the other plans and documents, which are merely illustrative. It is not contained in one of the Parameter Plans in the first part of Condition 3 that must be followed in implementing the proposal.

35. This undercroft parking is also not contained in the house plans for the apartments; on the contrary, those illustrative plans indicate flats on ground, first

[16] Appendix vii of Mrs Reed's Proof

and second floors, as do the elevations and colour images, which means that the parking must have been envisaged as being provided outside the envelopes of the apartments on adjacent land within Area A. Whilst those house plans are not included in suggested Condition 3 and may indeed have been withdrawn (unsurprising in an outline application), they show that the design of the dwellings in Area A included 3-storey blocks of flats, so it was clearly envisaged that 160 dwellings and their parking spaces could be accommodated within that Area, without encroaching onto Airfield land in front of the apartment blocks.

36. Mrs Reed quotes the RICS professional standards, which states *surveyors 'must consider whether the advice they give represents the most efficient and effective way to deliver the scheme..'* I agree with her that the undercroft or basement parking design would not be the most efficient and effective way of delivering parking for the apartments, especially since there clearly would be sufficient room nearby to provide open surface level parking for them. Not only would this be cheaper, but it would vastly improve the design of the apartment blocks, especially when viewed from the Airfield itself, which is an important consideration within the CA context. For these reasons, the costs of such undercroft parking (and any CIL costs for such) should not be added onto the overall construction costs of the scheme.

37. Third, Mr Evans argues that the sales fees for selling the market units should be 2.5% rather than Mrs Reed's 1.5%, which in a scenario of 25% AH would add another £1M to the costs of the development. He bases his 2.5% estimate on some recent examples. However, even with two show homes, one in Area A and one in Area C, and with no AH, Mr Evans's total sales fee figure of £3.88M would equate to a £12,300 sales figure for each dwelling in a scheme with an average value of £495K. That seems to me excessive. Given the beauty of the site's setting, and even with the proximity of the new dwellings to the Airfield, I do not believe that it will be difficult to sell them in such a location. Consequently, I consider a 1.5% sales fee to be reasonable.

38. Fourth, the appellant considers that there must be at least an 18.75% profit margin, and preferably 20% due to the riskiness of the proposal, including the need to rebuild/restore Hanger 3. I do not accept this, not least because the restoration of Hanger 3 has been properly costed when the Listed Building application was considered[17]. Paragraph 8 of the PPG accepts 15-20% profit at plan stage, which should be referred back to at decision making stage, which is what Mrs Reed has done in her 17.5% profit margin. This is mid-way between 15-20%. I see no reason why the developer should seek a higher profit level at the expense of AH, a policy requirement in the development plan. Indeed, I see no reason why a 15% profit level would not be acceptable.

39. A number of other cost inputs are disputed. Mrs Reed has reasonably accepted Mr Evans's 7.5% debit and 1% credit finance rate, increasing the total finance costs by £0.9M. She has also acknowledged that CIL should be paid on the single domestic garages, increasing costs by £0.6M. A number of other cost inputs are disputed – including the 'S' curve when considering cash flow, which was not explained to me in an understandable way – but even assuming Mr Evans is correct on these, they are not such as to significantly increase costs when

[17] CD2.28 or CD15.10

compared to the main disputed items above, and so in the overall appraisal are considered to be insignificant.

40. Mrs Reed has incorporated the above outcomes into her Summary Appraisal 2(b) attached to her Rebuttal Proof of 18 February. This takes into account the £5M BLV, CIL, all S106 obligations including S278 highway works, and all the relevant site-specific constraints and scheme requirements including the £3.31M Hanger 3 rebuild/renovation and £3M Wastewater Treatment Works costs, and the 25% AH.

41. The outcome of this Appraisal is a Gross Development Value (GDV) of £153.28M with total costs of £129.63M, giving a profit of £23.65M, which equates to 18.24% on costs or 15.43% on GDV. That would be quite acceptable for this development scheme since it would comply with the PPG and be viable and therefore deliverable. Even if the sales fees were to amount to 2.5%, which I admit is possible, this additional £1M in costs would not be sufficient to render the scheme undeliverable since the profit would still be nearly 15%, even with what I consider to be a BLV that appears to have double-counted the alleged restriction of flying rights, a CP25 policy requirement which seems to be the basis of the original agreed BLV between the respective valuers of £3.75M.

Conclusion on the Viability Issue

42. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development could viably deliver 25% AH. Such delivery, prior to occupation of not more than 50% of the market housing units in Areas A or C, is adequately secured by Schedule 3 of the S106. This would comply with CP43 of the CS.

43. The appellant maintains that the scheme is 'non-viable' at a return of 16.1% on GDV but acknowledges it is still profit making and deliverable[18]. With a scheme that I have explained would make a profit of at least 15% (with Mrs Reed's BLV of £5M), it is clearly deliverable, not least because the appellant has no other comparable way of realistically making such a profit.

<u>The Highways Issue</u>

44. The Council's Opening Remarks[19] summarised this as whether the proposals have done as much as possible to promote walking, cycling and public transport. Its case essentially is that, because the proposed 155 houses in Area C would be accessed off Ford Road, additional vehicle movements would occur on a minor road unsuitable for such movements, which would further discourage its use by pedestrians and cyclists contrary to CS Policies CP60-62, CP25 iv and vi and NPPF paragraphs 115-117.

45. Allied to this is the suitability of the pedestrian and cycle track around the periphery of the site linking Area C to Area A and the Portway, particularly in terms of journey times for Area C residents to local facilities (including bus stops) and the safety of the crossing point from this track to Castle Hill Country Park (CHCP) on the south side of Ford Road. This was the Council's case at the Inquiry; what its case was at the previous Inquiry is largely irrelevant and consequently I am not going to revert to that or seek to compare whether or how its case may have changed.

[18] As set out in Mr Evans's answer to my Question 4 in the Table at the end of the Viability SoCG
[19] ID2 paragraphs 26-31

46. Time was spent at the Inquiry (along with contemporaneous private dialogue between the main parties) discussing the feasibility and costs of extending the existing 30mph speed restriction in Ford and associated traffic calming measures (build-outs) to the west of its current extent (the TRO), to encompass not only the new access road to Area C but also potentially as far west as the crossover from the internal access track to CHCP. However, in the end, the parties stuck to their main positions: the Council's being that the TRO would be unnecessary and inappropriate and on such a minor country road, the appellant's being that the Council's suggested costs for such were unreasonably high and, given the good visibility on this straight Roman road, was unnecessary anyway. Consequently, my assessment of the highways issue does not encompass such a TRO.

Safety of the Proposed New Access and the Crossing to/from the Country Park

47. The Portway and Ford Road are both C-class roads that link the A345 to the west to the A388 to the east. But the Portway is a better and wider road that carries the majority of this traffic including nearly all the regular bus services. Ford Road is far less used, mainly because it only accesses the dwellings in Ford village itself and because the junctions onto these main roads at either end of it are more circuitous than those onto the Portway from these A roads.

48. Although the development in Area C would (roughly) double the number of dwellings at Ford, the Council does not contest that the additional traffic on Ford Road arising from this would be insignificant: at peak am and pm hours it would only generate an additional 15 vehicle movements at the Ford Road/Green Lane crossroads, which itself would be subject to additional traffic calming measures (a built-up table) paid for by the appellant and secured via the S106. The Council agrees that adequate visibility splays in both directions can be achieved for the new Area C vehicular access and the plan incorporates a footpath link between the front of the new development and Merefield Road. Mr Mead, the Council's witness, said in his evidence that an extension of the 30mph speed restriction westwards could not be justified by current guidance[20] or in terms of the safety of the new access to Area C.

49. In light of that, I find it hard to understand the basis of the Council's objections to the use of Ford Road for the new vehicular access, especially given that just such a new access has been recently created to the new residential development immediately to the east of the CHCP car park. Mr Mead said that no part of Ford Road is laid out to the geometric standard of a 'road' under Design Manual for Roads and Bridges or a 'street' in Manual for Streets, or indeed the design criteria in HS2 Rural Roads Design Criteria. It comprises a Type 5 link road in Wiltshire's road hierarchy, rather than a Type 4 secondary distributor like the Portway.

50. As I understand Mr Mead's evidence, a new access from Ford Road for 155 new dwellings would therefore be unacceptable in principle, in part because the 'geometry' of Ford Road would be at odds with that of the new roads within Area C, particularly their width. The primary route into and through Area C would be designed to have a 5.5m wide carriageway with 2m wide footways at each side, whereas the carriageway on Ford Road itself is generally of varied width of 4.75-5m without any footways.

[20] Setting Local Speed Limits, DfT, March 2024

51. However, I fail to see the harm in this difference of 'geometry'. There are some 'pinch points' on Ford Road under 5m in width where two vehicles, especially a bus/lorry and a car, would have to slow down to pass each other. But the volume of traffic, even with the new development, would still be well within the road's capacity. As a country lane it is still wider than very many country lanes in the country and in the locality and it is generally straight, including the whole of the section from Ford village to Old Castle Road where it junctions the A345. It is only slightly winding and narrower to the east of Ford village where Ford Lane links to the A30 roundabout and Spire View to the A338 including where it passes under the railway line, and much of the traffic from the new development will probably not travel east from Area C.

52. Anyway, the design (and width) of the internal access roads within Area C is a reserved matter and could therefore be addressed by the Council at a later stage if it considered the design or width of the roads within the site to be unacceptable. Having driven both ways along Ford Road, Spire View and Ford Lane myself on several occasions, I am satisfied that two vehicles can comfortably pass each other without any danger, albeit it is sometimes necessary to slow down at the narrower sections of the road.

53. Mr Mead references non-compliance with the HS2 Rural Roads Design Criteria including its statement that 5.5m is the minimum width for two cars to pass in safety at low speed and cites the recent Alderholt appeal dismissal[21] on highway grounds in this context. But that decision is not a valid comparison to this appeal. The proposed development there was for up to 1,700 dwellings, 10,000m² of employment space and a new village centre with retail, commercial, community and health facilities: basically the doubling in size of a large village in east Dorset near the Hampshire and Wiltshire boundaries and remote from any large towns. One of the principal routes from that scheme would have increased daily vehicle movements by 700 taking average daily traffic to about 3,400 movements on a bus route with often limited visibility, tight bends and restricted width. That is simply incomparable to the size of the proposed scheme in Area C here: the much lower volume of traffic and the better quality of Ford Road (in terms of straightness and width) compared to the description of the access road at Alderholt.

54. The Council contests the safety of the crossing point on Ford Road from the perimeter pedestrian/cycle path on the site to the CHCP. The speed limit is the unrestricted national speed limit of 60mph for such roads, but the road is level and straight here and so visibility in both directions for pedestrians and cyclists crossing would be safe, even in adverse weather conditions. The crossing would be to and from the vehicular access to the CHCP car park on the south side of the road. The Council argues that a crossing at this point would bring pedestrians and cyclists using the CHCP into conflict with vehicles leaving or entering the car park.

55. I accept that there is a potential for such conflict and acknowledge that the appellant's reason for siting the crossing at this point is because of the existence of a ransom strip controlled by the developer of the land at Hampton Park elsewhere along the southern frontage of Ford Road. However, the car park is small (no more than 20-30 cars). On the two weekday afternoons I drove into it (including on a school day after local schools had closed for the day), it was less than half full of cars. Even if it was full, which may possibly occur at some times,

[21] APP/D1265/W/23/3336518

the volume of traffic leaving and entering it would not be a constant stream sufficient to endanger pedestrians or cyclists crossing into or out of it. Those crossing from the site would simply allow a vehicle to leave or enter the car park before crossing into it themselves. There is clear visibility of the car park entrance from the north side of the proposed crossing point.

56. The car park is also a convenient place to cross since it connects easily to the footpaths/cycleways in the CHCP itself and would be a very convenient link for residents of Area C to Hampton Park, Bishopdown and the city centre and their facilities. Obviously, such a crossing would be safer if the speed limit here was 30mph. But, for the above reasons, it would be safe enough even at the national speed limit, especially since local people using this route would become accustomed to pedestrians and cyclists crossing at this point.

57. The Transport Assessment (TA)[22] includes a review of Personal Injury Collision (PIC) data for the most recent 5-year period on the Portway, Ford Road, and the circular linkages onto the A345 and A338. There was less than one recorded PIC per annum and all of them were identified as most likely resulting from factors unrelated to the road environment. In terms of access for the scheme's construction traffic, this will all be accessed from the Portway, including to Area C and for the construction of the wastewater treatment works in the southwest corner of the site; no construction traffic will be routed via Ford Road.

58. In summary, the fact that there is no suitable design criteria on which to judge Ford Road is inconsequential – because it would be safe at current speed limits with the expanded volume of traffic created by the development. The crossing between the site and the CHCP would be safe for the above reasons. In the unlikely scenario that it wasn't safe at the current speed limit, the Council (with or without the support and CIL funds of the Parish Council) could of course choose, as the local highway authority, to extend the 30mph zone to where it thought necessary, notwithstanding that it does not consider this to be necessary now.

Journey Times to Local Facilities by Sustainable Transport Modes

59. I acknowledge that the proposed houses in Area C would have a closer relationship with the northern outskirts of Salisbury than they would to the facilities of Old Sarum or the proposed dwellings in Area A. But that is not necessarily problematic, given that CP25 envisages residential development on these perimeter parts of the Airfield, provided day-to-day facilities are within suitable sustainable journey times.

60. The proposed perimeter walking/cycling track has been designed to link these two areas together. The eastern part of the Area C development would similarly link onto Manor Farm Road, Old Sarum Park and Green Lane to facilitate cycling and walking both to the eastern side of Old Sarum and to the facilities within the town to the south. This track would be a dedicated permissive route secured by Schedule 1 of the S106. It would be hard surfaced such that it could be used year-round and would be an attractive route between Area C and the facilities at and adjacent to the Portway, including the bus stops with their frequent and multiple services and the primary school and retail facilities.

[22] CD2.7

61. The S106 would also deliver the £500K contribution to upgrading Green Lane in order to secure improvements to it as per the requirements in the adopted Salisbury Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan 2022 (LCWIP)[23], which will markedly improve such sustainable travel links to the facilities in Bishopdown (including the secondary schools and the planned Asda supermarket) and the city centre to the south.

62. Table 5.1 of the TA accurately identifies the walking and cycling distances in metres to facilities and services from the 3 Areas of the appeal site. Only two of the facilities on this list – Salisbury Rugby Club on Castle Road and the Aldi supermarket on London Road – are more than 2km from the centre of Area C.

63. The Council argue that the National Design Guide defines walkable distances to facilities as being no more than 800m, a 10-minute walk, and RTPI research considers 1200-1600m or a 15–20-minute walk to be acceptable. However, Guidelines for Journeys on Foot (Institution for Highways and Transportation, 2000) references 2km as the maximum walking distance for healthy pedestrians, and this distance is referenced accordingly in Manual for Streets.

64. The land is predominantly flat around the site and the surface of the perimeter route would be hard surfaced. The distance between the centres of Areas A and C is about 1km. The nearest bus stops on the Portway, those adjacent to the Hendy Land Rover showroom, are within 900m of the centre of Area C. A £45K contribution to provide a real time information scheme at the bus stops on the Portway will be provided via Schedule 1 of the S106. The nearest grocery shop (the Co-Op at Crossier Close) would be 1.2km and Old Sarum Nursery and Primary School 1.4km and 1.5km respectively. The nearest doctor's and dental practice would be 1.75Km away in Bishopdown. I consider all these facilities would be accessible by walking by all healthy residents of Area C, and certainly by bike.

65. The LCWIP identifies 8km as the distance which most people consider reasonable to cycle (a 34-minute cycle). The city centre and all local facilities including the secondary schools in Bishopdown and Salisbury railway station (which has 110 cycle parking spaces) are easily within this cycling distance, in fact generally within 5km. Cycling times will be enhanced by the works to Green Lane funded by the appellant.

66. The facilities in Old Sarum would therefore be accessible by walkers or cyclist from Area C, either on the perimeter track to its west or via Old Sarum Park or Green Lane to its east. Such access would be enhanced by the mobility hubs for ebikes and escooters in Areas A and C. Walkers and cyclists wishing to travel south from the new dwellings could do so by the enhanced Green Lane or via the crossing into the CHCP. There are plenty of options, and these options would also benefit existing residents in Ford, Old Sarum and Longhedge. I cannot realistically see why pedestrians or cyclists from Area C would choose to use Ford Road itself to access local facilities and the city centre when they would have the opportunity to use these much better and safer alternative off-road routes, in the same way that I saw walkers and cyclists using the paths and tracks in the CHCP.

[23] CD5.16

Conclusion on the Highways Issue

67. A realistic assessment of Area C's locational sustainability must be made. Via Green Lane it would be tantamount to a further extension of the town northwards. Whilst I understand that Ford residents do not want to be a suburb of Salisbury, in terms of transport connections by sustainable modes I have no doubt that Area C would be a sustainable location for new residential development, given the footpath/cycleway links that the development would facilitate, and the fact that CP25 specifically allows for this in principle. In terms of CP25 vi (the delivery of community benefit for Old Sarum residents), the above off-road access routes for walkers and cyclists, the etransport hubs in Areas A and C and improved bus services would clearly benefit existing residents of Ford and Old Sarum in addition to the proposal's residents.

68. Core Policies CP60-62 together seek to locate new development where travel by private car can be reduced and encouraged by sustainable transport alternatives and that any adverse impacts at both construction and operational stages can be mitigated. NPPF paragraphs 110, 112, and 115-117 mirror such requirements in national policy and require safe and suitable accesses to sites. For the above reasons I consider that all these local and national policies would be complied with by the proposed development, including the above benefits in the S106.

<u>The Heritage Issue</u>

69. I second the way in which the previous Inspector addressed the heritage issue, (updated by the revised NPPF paragraphs)[24] and how she described and summarised the vital historical importance of the group of heritage designations at Old Sarum, which I will not repeat here.

70. I agree that the dominant heritage asset in the landscape is the Old Sarum SM, set within the Stratford-sub-Castle CA which, whilst not adjoining the Airfield CA is closely physically associated with it being only a field's width apart with a skirting roadway, the A345. The Old Sarum Airfield CA is important for what remains of the WW1/WW2 functioning Airfield, including the surviving grass airstrip, the Grade II* hangers, other Grade II listed buildings, shooting range, officers' mess and quarters. The Airfield's openness maintains an expression of the extent of the operational area of its historical military purpose and the continued use of the airstrip for flying purposes is obviously key to its significance. I have no doubt that the proposed development is designed to continue its use for flying purposes.

71. I repeat that the heritage issue turns on whether the lesser number of dwellings and area developed in Areas A and C, the lesser number of hanger buildings and lesser area developed in Area B, and the design of the illustrative scheme and its expression on the parameter plans, would be sufficient in terms of the heritage balance in paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) to make the development acceptable.

72. Paragraph 2.2 of the Heritage Statement of Common Ground (the SoCG) states: *'It is agreed that any development in Areas A, B and C of the Appeal Site, as defined by CP25, would inevitably result in a level of harm to relevant designated heritage assets, including the Old Sarum Airfield Conservation Area, Stratford-sub-Castle Conservation Area and Old Sarum Scheduled Monument.'*

[24] Ibid, especially paragraphs 15-30

73. The rest of Section 2 of the SoCG assesses the impact of the proposals on each of the designated heritage assets. There would be less than substantial harm to:

    - the SM, the Stratford-sub-Castle CA, and the Grade I listed remains of Old Sarum Castle and Cathedral because they derive some of their significance from the open setting to their east, into which further built form would be introduced;
    - the Airfield CA arising from some loss of its open character by the development of Areas A, B & C;
    - the 3 Grade II* listed hangers by virtue of the development of the new buildings in Area B adjacent to them and within their setting; and
    - the Grade II camera obscura building through the limited erosion of its wider flying field setting.

    It is agreed that there would be no harm to the Grade II workshops to the north of the central hanger, Hanger 4, nor to the Grade II listed TA Headquarters.

74. Of central importance here are the public benefits, including the heritage benefits, to be weighed in the NPPF paragraph 215 balancing exercise. Crucially important here is Historic England's (HE) view that the heritage benefits on their own (my emphasis), notably the restoration/rebuilding of Hanger 3, outweigh the above less than substantial harm to these designated assets[25], especially given HE's objection to the previous appeal scheme.

75. The agreed prime benefit is the restoration/rebuilding of Hanger 3, now a category 'A' priority building ('Immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric') in 'Very bad' condition on HE's 'Heritage at Risk' Register. HE gives this benefit considerable weight. This is a benefit not just for this hanger but also to the adjacent two Grade II* hangers, the Grade II listed buildings and the Airfield CA. Other heritage benefits to all these assets are the demolition of the detracting buildings on the hanger apron (the café, building currently used by the parachute training company and the modern and unattractive airfield control towers). The Grade II camera obscura building would undergo repairs to its fabric and would also be subject to the above benefits. The SM and Stratford-sub-Castle CA would benefit from the improved relationship and visual accessibility of the former Roman Road route as part of the overall design for the Area A development: the linear park.

76. Much of the Council's case in respect of the Hanger 3 prime benefit was pinned on the appellant's alleged deliberate neglect of an obviously very important listed building that should be preserved. I note in this respect that the other two listed hangers, which are not owned by the appellant, are in much better condition, although I do not know why that is. However, I cannot accept that there has been 'deliberate neglect' in terms of NPPF paragraph 209. The appellant has attempted, albeit largely failed, to prop up the roof by the installation of various shipping containers on top of each other in order to support the Belfast trusses and scaffolding has been erected to try and preserve what is left of the roof following the extensive damage to it by Storm Isha in January 2024.

[25] CD3.22

77. No advantage has been gained by the appellant if it has neglected Hanger 3, whether deliberately or not, in view of HE's view that the benefit of restoring it has been weakened because much more rebuilding is now required than in 2019. Its restoration/rebuilding is of significant weight, whether such restoration amounted to essentially repair and refurbishment, as it would have been at the time of the previous appeal, or a substantial part-rebuilding exercise as it would now be. The difference is that it will now cost (the appellant) a lot more, but the weight I attach to its preservation is equally important now as it was in 2019, notwithstanding that the works to restore it need to take place as soon as possible, otherwise there may be no building at all to restore.

78. I acknowledge that there was no impediment to the appellant implementing the listed building consent PL/2024/00102 granted in March 2024 – indeed the consent positively encouraged it – and ideally it should have done so. But the damage from the storm had already occurred by then. The works required are obviously substantial and costly and it is quite conceivable that the appellant did not have a spare £3.31M to spend on implementing the necessary works that had been agreed as part and parcel of that application. Indeed, the appellant made clear during the Inquiry that the proposed residential development would be used to cross-subsidise the works to Area B, the new hanger etc buildings and the necessary works to preserve Hanger 3. I do not doubt that is the case.

79. I now consider the proposed development in each Area of the Airfield, as the previous Inspector did.

Area A

80. The previous scheme in the last appeal in Area A (the northwestern corner of the site) was the more polemical part of the development in respect of the impact on the heritage assets. I agree with the previous Inspector that from the ramparts of the SM the openness of the land at the foot of its slopes is of particular prominence, both visually and in terms of the character of the expanding wider view of the open low-lying countryside off to the north and east, which is part of the SM's setting.

81. But the Longhedge extension to Old Sarum now exists and is very much appreciated from the SM's ramparts, whereas in 2019 it was only an agreed proposal. Whilst Area A is nearer to the SM than Longhedge, what is noticeable from the SM ramparts is that the built-up development to the north of the Airfield, including Castlegate Business Park, the mainly residential development north of the Portway, Longhedge and the Beehive Park & Ride is perceived visually as one block of development. Apparently, this will shortly be added to by the development of the site immediately to the north of the Park & Ride next to the A345.

82. As the wire frame photomontage in verified Viewpoint 6 clearly shows, the development here would be visually perceived as part of this block of development in the middle distance despite itself being nearer to the SM. The built development would not block continued open views of the Airfield from the SM but would partially screen the industrial/commercial buildings behind it on the Business Park, which would be no bad thing.

83. This is undoubtedly because the site area of Area A has been reduced by approximately a third and the numbers of dwellings nearly halved from 302 to 160. In my view this change, including the curved southern edge of the new Area A,

maximises the change in the topography of the land here. This would not only concentrate the development of this part of the Airfield away from the listed hangers and other listed buildings further east but would maximise the lower lying land in this location closer to the Portway. As such its impact on the Airfield CA would also be minimal, as well as complying with CP25.

84. The previous Inspector criticised the lack of detail in the 2018/19 Illustrative Masterplan and she was also critical of the attempt to landscape screen the then much larger Area A in views from the SM. However, in the current scheme, much thought has gone into the design and layout of the buildings in Area A and notably into the design of the landscaped vista and footpath or linear park running through the site that will form a visual extension of the original Roman road at the Portway defining its original alignment.

85. I consider this to be an important benefit of the proposed scheme for Area A. Whilst still illustrative, proposed Condition 3 states that the development shall be carried out in general accordance with the updated Design & Access Statement (D&AS) and the Design Code (DC), both of which contain substantial detail about Area A's design and layout, especially the visual extension of the Roman road, which will be obvious in views from the SM, combined with the more subtle approach to landscaping of the western boundary. As such I consider it would be difficult for any prospective purchaser of Area A, even if it was a volume housebuilder, to avoid complying with the details and the spirit of these quite detailed documents. The design of the Area A scheme set out in these documents is well thought out and of a high quality.

86. For these reasons I conclude that the development proposed in Area A would now be acceptable in that it would not unduly affect the setting of the SM or the Stratford-sub-Castle CA, nor the open character of the Airfield CA.

Area B

87. The previous Inspector was of the view that the modern buildings in the Business Park had engulfed the historic listed buildings of the Airfield and that the new hangar buildings and aviation building including restaurant and control tower presented an exciting and innovative glimpse at what could be achieved here by revitalising the flying field and paying respectful homage to its past.

88. I agree that the current proposals for Area B would also do that. The only main change here is the deletion of the most westerly hanger building, which would in the 2019 scheme have visually linked together the new proposed hanger buildings with the residential development in Area A. That is a good revision to the scheme. Area A is now set back from the Airfield frontage and the new hanger and aviation buildings would be distinctly separate. They would front and successfully screen the open Airfield from the modern functionally designed industrial/commercial buildings in the Business Park, which the previous Inspector considered beneficial. I agree, as does HE.

89. The new buildings would however be set back to the east and west to ensure framed views of the listed hangars as a centrally located aviation focus, creating a clear visual statement of the aviation purpose of Old Sarum, something which is currently lacking on the Airfield frontage with its clutter of newer ramshackle buildings, which would be demolished as part of the development. HE acknowledges that the airstrip would need to be moved to accommodate these

new buildings but points out that the grass airstrip has historically occupied a number of different positions, so this is not problematic. It would also allow landings by more planes since the airstrip's length would be increased slightly.

90. Mr Minting for the Council argued for the Council that the hanger buildings significantly erode the open ground of the Airfield by extending some 80m into the Airfiled from the front of the nearest commercial buildings in the Business Park and by being overly dominant by being up to 14m high, higher than the industrial buildings behind them. I consider the footprint and height of these proposed buildings would be acceptable given their sympathetic hanger designs and the remaining openness of the Airfield, even with the proposed development at Areas A and C. This is especially given that the dominant view across the airstrip from the south would be these buildings exhibiting Airfield related uses and effectively screening it from unrelated commercial shed-type buildings in the Business Park.

Area C

91. The only change to Area C, in the southeastern part of the site, from the 2019 scheme is the deletion of 5 houses from its northeastern corner. Area C, like Area A, is on the lowest part of the Airfield and the part of it that has been now excised was at the higher northern end of it, which is obviously beneficial.

92. Although there would still be 155 new houses here, they would all be situated on this lower ground and within the designated area identified in CP25. The northern boundary of this block of development would align with the contours of the land and would have an open landscaped boundary with copses of trees, in addition to the retained hedgerow that runs just below the realigned airstrip. The tops of the roofs of the new houses on the eastern part of Area C would just be glimpsed over this hedge when standing in front of Hanger 3 and more of the roofs of those on to its western side would be seen from the northern part of the Airfield, but these would be much further away, as shown on verified Viewpoint 1.

93. The roofs of the dwellings would also be detectable from the SM, as shown in verified Viewpoint 6. But Area C is considerably further away from the SM than Area A, and such views would not be prominent from the SM's ramparts or significantly detract from its setting or from the openness of the Airfield CA. In time the planting would partially screen such views anyway. HE considers that any harm caused would be towards the lower end of less than substantial harm, which I agree with.

94. I consider that the illustrative designs of the houses in Area C with their Arts & Crafts style-appearance, as set out in the D&AS and in the DC, would be of high quality and entirely appropriate as effectively an extension to the military, ex-military and other dwellings at Ford.

The Heritage Balance

95. I agree with HE that the totality of the proposed development (in Area A-C combined) will adversely impact the setting and thus significance of the SM and the Stratford-sub-Castle CA and the open character and thus significance of the Airfield CA and the settings of the listed buildings including the Grade II* listed hangars within it. But, like HE, I agree that the overall level of harm is towards the mid-range of less than substantial harm. Crucially, I agree with HE that the

heritage benefits alone, including primarily the restoration/rebuild of Hanger 3 and the other benefits listed above, outweigh such harm for all the above reasons.

The Planning Balance

96. Whether or not it is a heritage benefit or simply another benefit, I consider that the removal of agricultural production on those parts of the Airfield outside the airstrip and their planned creation as wildflower meadows would benefit the CA and area generally in landscape terms, as well as all local residents, as would the creation of the peripheral hard surfaced path/cycle route.

97. The provision of landscaped amenity areas including children's play areas and the emobility hubs would benefit residents, not only those of the proposed new dwellings but many existing local residents.

98. The extension and improvement of the existing flying hub, including new well-designed control tower, café/restaurant, heritage centre and aviation archive and signboards showing the history of the Airfield will benefit visitors as well as those actively using the Airfield's flying facilities.

99. And, of course, the provision of 315 new dwellings (25% of which, 79 dwellings, would be affordable) in a Council that can currently deliver only a 2.03-year housing land supply, is a substantial benefit of the proposed scheme.

100. These are all additional benefits to the heritage benefits above, which themselves outweigh the less than substantial harm to heritage assets.

101. In terms of CP25 I consider the proposed development would comply with it as follows:

i. The architects have produced an updated Conservation Management Plan for the Airfield CA[26], which includes the provision of public access and visitor/interpretative material on its historic relevance. This is a detailed, substantial and well executed documents running to 141 pages, which is worthy of the site's national heritage importance.

ii. This and the proposed scheme as set out in its parameter plans, D&AS and DC set out a high-quality strategic landscape improvement to mitigate impacts of existing intrusive commercial buildings and to soften impacts when viewed both out and into the Airfield CA and from the SM.

iii. The S106 agreement (and the Conditions) set out reasonable controls over flying activities in the interests of the amenity of Salisbury's residents, including those living local to the Airfield, as explained above and in the Conditions themselves.

iv. In essence the development masterplan is comprised of all the above documents. I am confident that the development will be of high quality that takes opportunities to enhance the historic environment and protect the amenity of residents.

v. As set out above, I am confident that it will retain and safeguard flying activity from the Airfield.

[26] CD1.23

vi. I have set out the various community benefits for Old Sarum residents above, including the heritage benefits.

102. The Council and residents argue that the proposals for Area C would contravene Policy 23 and the spatial strategy in CP1 because Ford is part of the 'small village' of Laverstock and Ford where only limited housing, employment, services and facilities are allowed. I disagree. Although Laverstock and Ford is described as a 'small village; in CP23, CP25 is a site-specific policy for the Airfield that in principle allows sympathetic high quality residential development on its perimeter, including in Area C. Consequently, there is no conflict with the CS as a whole in this respect.

103. In terms of the viability and highways issues, the proposed development would meet the requirements of CS Policies CP43 and CP60-62 respectively. In relation to the heritage issue, it would meet the requirements of CP58: that designated heritage assets and their settings will be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, as well as the specific requirements of CP25 covered above. The development would also consequently meet the relevant requirements of the Laverstock and Ford Neighbourhood Plan and the relevant parts of the NPPF as regards the main issues in this case.

104. Consequently, since it would accord with the development plan for the area, there is no reason to withhold planning permission for this scheme.

Conditions

105. Below is the Schedule of Conditions, which is agreed between the main parties. The reasons for these 37 Conditions are attached to each one below and are self-explanatory. I have made minor alterations to the wording, but only where necessary and in the interests of clarity and precision. I have deleted a duplicate condition requiring a Construction Management Plan.

Conclusion

106. For the reasons given above the appeal is allowed.

Nick Fagan

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT: *Christopher Young KC* (No 5 Chambers) appointed by Timothy Burden called:

-Mathew Grist, Jubb – Highways

-Ramsay Evans, Turner Morum LLP – Viability

-Edmund Stratford, EDP – Heritage

-Timothy Burden, Turley – Planning

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY: *Hashi Mohamed* (Landmark Chambers) appointed by the Council's solicitor called:

-Christopher Mead – Highways

-Cecilia Reed, DVS – Viability

-Andrew Minting, Wiltshire Council Conservation Officer – Heritage

-Richard Hughes, Wiltshire Council DM Team Leader – Planning

INTERESTED PARTIES:

-Andrew Daniel, Green Lane resident

-Andrew Oliver, Cllr for Old Sarum

-Tom Corbin, Salisbury City Council & Chair of its Planning Committee

-Annie Riddle, City Cllr, Deputy Chair of its Planning Committee & Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

-Lainey Barker, Ward Cllr for Laverstock & Ford

-Sarah Champion on behalf of Cllr MCLennan, Wiltshire Cllr for Laverstock division

-Ron Champion, local resident

DOCUMENTS

All the documents for this appeal, including those submitted during the Inquiry (ID1.01-1.19), are on the Council's website via this link: Appeal: AP-37245

Schedule of Conditions

General

Duration of Planning Permission etc

01. Details of the access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale ("the reserved matters") shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority before any development takes place and the development shall be carried out as approved.

Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the local planning authority not later than three years from the date of this permission.

The development hereby permitted shall take place not later than two years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved.

REASON: As required by the Act.

Building Heights

02. No development shall commence within a phase until details of the finished floor levels, existing and proposed ground levels, ridge heights and building heights for buildings within that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved. The building heights in Areas A, B, and C shall be no higher than that shown by Parameters Plan – Building Heights (ref. 020 Rev A04).

REASON: In the interest of the visual amenity of the area, in accordance with policies CP57 & CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy

Control and Phasing of Development

03. The Development shall be carried out in accordance with the principles contained within the Environmental Statement as supplemented as amended by the Supplementary Environmental Statement 2024 and in accordance with the following:

Document	Reference	Revision
Site Location Plan – Area of Planning Application	001	A07
Site Location Plan – Area for ES	001A	A00
Existing Site survey (levels) drawings (Sheets 1-11)	002(A-K)	A01&A02
Site Plan – Proposed	010	A18
Parameters Plan Building Heights	020	A04
Parameters Plan Land Use	021	A05
Parameters Plan Density	022	A04
Parameters Plan Movement and Street Hierarchy	023	A03
Parameters Plan Construction Traffic and Environmental Management Plan	024	A03

Parameter Plan – Retained Ecological Features	9441-FM-XX-XX-DR-A-025-A03	A03
Construction access to Area C via Portway (without Area A access) – Plan	22317-010-P1	
Construction access to Area C via Portway (with Area A access) – Plan	22317-011-P1	
Highway works for Area A – Plan	22317-002-P4	
Highways works for Area C – Plan	22317-029-P	
Demolition Plan	7796 005 A002	
Noise contour diagram	A11482 01 SK001 4.0	

The Development shall be carried out in general accordance with the following:

Document	Reference	Revision
Concept Masterplan Area A	011	A02
Concept Masterplan Area C1	012	A03
Concept Masterplan Area C2	013	A03
Site Wide Concept Masterplan ref 9441 0110 A18		
Street Elevation Sheet 1	100	A00
Area B Buildings Old Sarum (July 2023)	8441 A01	
Street Elevation Sheet 2	101	A00
Street Elevation Sheet 3	102	A00
Preliminary Drainage Layout	SK-C001	P1
Design and Access Statement (September 2024)	7865/Rev A01	A05
Design Code (September 2024)	9441 Rev A05	A05

REASON: In order to provide certainty as to the development approved.

Restriction on number of dwellings

04. The number of dwellings hereby approved shall not exceed a maximum of 315.

REASON: In order to limit the number of dwellings in accordance with the permission in the interests of visual amenity in accordance with policies CP57 & CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Removal of Permitted Development Rights (Area B)

05. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and County Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Use Classes Order 2020 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification, the buildings hereby approved in Area B shall be used only for the uses and maximum floor areas as listed below, and no change of use shall take place within any Use Class of the above Order unless approved as part of a formal planning application in that behalf.

- Hangar /Ancillary use – totalling no more than 6,360sqm
- Restaurant/Aviation Building - totalling no more than 2,545sqm

REASON: In the interests of maintaining the integrity of the heritage assets and character of the area in accordance with policies CP57 & CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Phasing Plan

06. No development shall commence until a phasing plan showing the detailed phases of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out as approved and comply with the approved phasing plan.

REASON: In order to limit the overall impact of the construction of the scheme on the surrounding area in compliance with policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Archaeology

07. No development within a phase shall take place until: (i) An archaeological Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority; and (ii) Any necessary safeguarding measures to ensure the preservation in situ of important archaeological remains and/or further archaeological investigation and recording identified in the WSI have been undertaken in accordance with a specification and timetable that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development should be carried out in full accordance with the approved details within the WSI.

REASON: In order to limit the impact on heritage assets in compliance with policy CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy

Drainage

08. No development shall take place until a detailed surface and foul water drainage scheme for the site, including future responsibility and maintenance, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The submitted details shall: i) provide information about the design storm period and intensity, the method employed to delay and control the surface water discharged from the site and the measures taken to prevent pollution of the receiving groundwater and/or surface waters; ii) include a timetable for its implementation; and, iii) provide, a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime

of the development which shall include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The sustainable drainage system shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the approved management and maintenance plan.

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area and in order to limit the impact of the proposal on the water resources of the area, in accordance with policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Contamination

09. Any contamination that is found during the course of construction of the development hereby permitted that was not previously identified shall be reported immediately to the local planning authority. Development on the part of the site affected shall be suspended until a risk assessment has been carried out and submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Where unacceptable risks are found, the development [or relevant phase of development] shall not resume or continue until remediation and verification schemes have been carried out in accordance with details that shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area and in order to limit the impact of the proposal on existing contamination sources in accordance with policy CP55 & CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Lighting

10. No development shall commence on any phase until details of a lighting strategy for that phase have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details submitted shall include measures to protect the sky and protected species including bats from light pollution. The lighting strategy for each phase shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details prior to the completion of that phase. The plans will be in accordance with the appropriate Environmental Zone standards set out by the Institution of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance Notes on the Avoidance of Obtrusive Light (GN 01/2021) and Guidance note GN08/23 “Bats and artificial lighting at night”, issued by the Bat Conservation Trust and Institution of Lighting Professionals. Before the first use of the lighting scheme hereby approved, the applicant shall appoint a suitably qualified member of the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) to validate that the lighting scheme as installed conforms to the recommendations for environmental zone E2 or better in the ILP document “Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Obtrusive Light - Guidance Note 01:20. A letter written by a suitably qualified member of the ILP confirming this shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be permanently retained in accordance with the details submitted.

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area and in order to limit the impact of the proposal in terms of light spill and impact on protected species in accordance with policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Construction works controls

11. No construction or demolition work or deliveries shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or outside the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays. For the avoidance of doubt this condition will not relate to internal or fitting out works.

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area and the living conditions of local residents in accordance with policy CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Open Space and Public Realm

12. Details of Play Areas and Open Spaces including locations, and types of play equipment, to Council adoptable standards. Following construction and provision of any open spaces or play area to adoptable standards, it shall not be used for any other use or purpose. Details of a scheme for the provision of footpaths and cycle ways, viewing points, interpretation/information boards and picnic areas based on the location and extent of such features shown on the Landscape Masterplan in the Design and Access Statement 2024. Details should include materials to be used.

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area in accordance with policy CP57, CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, including saved policy R2.

Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP)

13. Prior to the start of construction, a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP will include long term objectives and targets, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for each ecological feature within the development, together with a mechanism for monitoring success of the management prescriptions, incorporating review and necessary adaptive management in order to attain targets. The LEMP shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanism(s) by which long-term implementation of the plan will be secured. Before any dwelling is first occupied, the LEMP shall be implemented in full and for the lifetime of the development in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area in accordance with policy CP50, CP51, CP52 and CP57, of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Tree and hedge protection

14. No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of the retained trees and hedging (the tree protection plan) and the appropriate working methods (the arboricultural method statement) in accordance with paragraphs 5.5 and 6.1 of British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - Recommendations (or in an equivalent British Standard if replaced) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme for the protection of the retained trees shall be carried out as approved. [In this condition "retained tree" means an existing tree which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars.]

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area in accordance with policy CP50, CP51, CP52 and CP57, of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

River Avon SAC and Nutrient Mitigation

Compliance with Memorandum of Understanding regards River Avon SAC

15. The residential development hereby approved shall be designed to ensure it does not exceed 100 litres per person per day water consumption levels (which includes external water usage). Within 3 months of each phase being completed and the housing being brought into use, a water efficiency report certifying that this standard has been achieved shall be submitted to the local planning authority for its written approval.

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area in accordance with policy CP50 & CP52 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Nutrient Mitigation Strategy

16. An updated nutrient neutrality mitigation strategy and SUDS strategy must be submitted in support of the Reserved Matters application, which demonstrate how the development's nutrient neutrality is to be achieved.

REASON: In the interests of the general amenity of the area in accordance with policy CP50 & CP52 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Airfield Uses, Noise and Heritage

Repair and Restoration of Hangar 3

17. No dwellings shall be occupied (with respect to Areas A & C housing only) until completion of the main Hangar 3 structural repairs and Hangar 3 roof as outlined in the cost plan and Listed Building Consent (ref PL/2024/00102). No more than 160 dwellings shall be occupied (with respect to Areas A & C housing only) until completion of all of the Hangar 3 repairs as outlined in the cost plan and Listed Building Consent (PL/2004/00102). For each stage of the repairs an architect's certificate of practical completion of the approved works shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The condition will be discharged by confirmation in writing from the Local Planning Authority that the relevant works have been undertaken to its satisfaction. Such confirmation would include a site visit facilitated by the applicant.

REASON: To ensure that the repairs to Hangar 3 are undertaken in association the building of the dwellings so that the heritage asset is rebuilt in accordance with the aims of policy CP25 and CP58 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Repair of listed Camera Obscura

18. No dwellings shall be occupied (with respect to Areas A & C housing only) until a scheme for repairs to the Grade II listed Camera Obscura Building including the timing of such works, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning

authority. The scheme for the repairs to the Grade II listed Camera Obscura Building shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

REASON: To ensure that any repair work to the listed building is undertaken in a manner acceptable to the Local Planning Authority and sympathetic to the listed structure. Works that are considered to go beyond “repair” work will require an application for Listed Building Consent.

Demolition and replacement of Existing Aviation Facilities

19. Before the occupation of the 250th dwelling, the new aviation facilities approved as part of Building 5 in Area B shall be completed and made available for use. The existing aviation facilities shown on plan reference 7796 005 A00 Demolition Plan shall be demolished within 60 days of completion of construction of Building 5 on Area B. All materials removed and the land restored in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, before practical completion of the approved works to Building 5

REASON: In the interests of delivering the requirements of Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy CP25 in terms of retaining the airfield use,

Restriction on the Number of Flights

20. The number of flights per annum (take-off and landing movements) shall not exceed 35,000 per annum.

REASON: To make clear that this is the maximum number of flights that the Airfield is considered of capable of accommodating, with the noise control conditions also in place, without giving rise to excess noise and disturbance to residents of Salisbury, Ford, Laverstock and Old Sarum.

Controls over Aviation Noise – Relocation of runway

21. Before the occupation of any dwelling, the Runway Strip shall be realigned in accordance with Feilden and Mawson Drawings 090 A00 S106 Ref Plan 2 and 050 A07 and retained in that position thereafter.

REASON: To secure delivery of Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy CP25 and to protect the amenity of residents living in the surrounding area.

Aircraft timings

22. On commencement of development and subsequently, no departures or landing by any aircraft (including helicopters) shall take place at the airfield between 1900 hrs and 0800 hrs except in cases of emergency or up to 5 returning aircraft based at the Airfield. No helicopter flying training shall be permitted/take place.

REASON: To secure delivery of Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy CP25 and to protect the amenity of residents living in the surrounding area.

Monitoring of aircraft noise

23. Prior to commencement of development, a scheme of monitoring and reporting of aircraft noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include measures for quarterly monitoring of aircraft noise levels to be carried out and the results provided in writing to the Local Planning Authority for the first 2 years following the date following the occupation of the first residential property on the site. Thereafter, unless there has been a breach of the agreed parameters, monitoring shall be carried out on a six-monthly basis for the period from January 1st to June 30th and from July 1st to December 31st for a further period of 4 years. Thereafter, unless there has been a breach of the agreed parameters, monitoring shall take place on an annual basis for the lifetime of the airfield.

If there has been a breach in the agreed parameters at any point, monitoring and reporting will revert to a quarterly frequency for a period of two years. The results of monitoring shall be supplied to the council in a report completed by a competent acoustician in a format agreed in writing by the Council no later than 6 weeks after the model has been used.

The noise level of aircraft landing or taking off from the airfield shall from the date of commencement of development shall not exceed 57 dB LAeq 16 hours (0700-2300 hrs) as shown by the blue 57 dB line on Appendix 14.3 Figure A11482 01 SK001 4.0 dated 13th June 2023, averaged over the monitoring period the subject of this condition.

REASON: To secure delivery of Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy CP25 and to protect the amenity of residents living in the surrounding area.

24. In the event that monitoring shows that the restrictions in condition 24 have been exceeded, action shall be taken by the airfield operator to ensure that the breach is remedied as soon as practicable and in any event during the next monitoring period following the breach.
Prior to commencement of construction of any dwellings predicted to be exposed to sound levels above 51dB LAeq 16hours, a written scheme for noise mitigation based upon details contained in the Environmental Statement Chapter 14 shall be submitted to the Council for approval in writing. Prior to occupation, these dwellings shall be fitted with noise mitigation in accordance with such an approved scheme.

Upon the commencement of any works/development pursuant to this permission, a detailed electronic record shall be kept of all aviation movements (including without limitation Business Aviation, historic aircraft and helicopter) that is each landing and take-off and shall record a minimum for each movement the aircraft registration number and time of movement (GMT) origin and destination (airport codes) and runway used. The record shall be updated immediately upon completion of the movement. These records shall be kept available for inspection by Council officers for a period of 5 years.

A record of all complaints received regarding noise from the airfield site shall be kept by the Airfield Operator including the name, address and contact details of the complainant and detail of the nature of the complaint. A record shall also be kept of the response in terms of its timing, details as to the cause(s) of the complaint and if referring to a specific aircraft its registration number and the action taken, if any, to

remedy the situation. Records of the complaints shall be kept for a minimum of 5 years and will be made available to a Council officer on request.

REASON: To secure delivery of Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy CP25 and to protect the amenity of residents living in the surrounding area.

Reduce noise impact on dwellings from aircraft

25. No reserved matters applications for any dwellings, including private external amenity space on the sites will be proposed within the blue 57 dB contour defined on Figure A11482_01_SK001_4.0 dated 13th June 2023 Appendix 14.36.

REASON: To secure delivery of Wiltshire Core Strategy Policy CP25 and to protect the amenity of residents living in the surrounding area.

Pistol Range Noise

26. Prior to commencement of construction of any dwellings in Area C within 200m of the rifle range on Green Lane a written scheme for noise mitigation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include layout and orientation of buildings, internal layout and a boundary treatment to protect outside amenity areas and ground floor windows. Prior to occupation, these dwellings shall be fitted with noise mitigation measures in accordance with the approved scheme and shall be retained in that way at all times thereafter.

REASON: To comply with CP57, ensuring high quality design and place shaping such that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable.

Noise from road traffic and adjacent commercial land uses

27. Prior to commencement of development of Area A the developer shall submit a scheme as part of the reserved matters, detailing noise mitigation measures to protect internal noise levels within the proposed dwellings and noise levels of private external amenity areas from commercial and industrial uses in Castle Gate Business Park and Portway Business Centre to the local planning authority, for their written approval. Commencement of construction will not be undertaken until written approval has been issued by the local planning authority. The details shall include the internal dwelling layout, façade construction details including windows, ventilation and boundary treatments.

The scheme shall be designed following assessment of impacts using BS4142:2014 +A1:2019. Background levels are to be taken as a LA90 1 hour and the ambient noise levels shall be expressed as an LAeq 1 hour during the daytime [07:0- - 23:00] and shall be expressed as an LA90 and LAeq 5 minutes during the night [23:00 – 07:00].

The assessment shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority together with a scheme of attenuation measures to demonstrate the rated level of noise (LarTr), shall be equal to or less than typical background sound levels (LA90T) for facades with openable windows to habitable rooms (living rooms and bedrooms) and for private outside amenity spaces when assessed using BS4142:2014+A1:2019. The scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. A post

installation noise assessment shall be carried out within 3 months of completion of Area A to confirm compliance with the noise criteria and additional steps required to achieve compliance shall be taken, as necessary. The details as approved shall be implemented prior to occupation of the development and thereafter be permanently retained.

REASON: To comply with CP57, ensuring high quality design and place shaping such that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable.

28. Prior to development starting on site, details of a scheme for protecting the proposed dwellings from external road traffic noise shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

The reserved matters application(s) for Area A and Area C shall be accompanied by a Stage 2 Acoustic Design Statement (ADS) Recommended internal noise levels could be achieved with open windows in as many properties as possible. Where this is not possible the justification for this should be included in the ADS. External amenity spaces shall be designed to achieve a 16 – hour LAeq (07:00 to 23:00) of ≤55dB(A) where practicable. This guideline value may not be achievable in all circumstances. In such a situations development should be designed to achieve the lowest practicable noise levels in these external amenity spaces. The justification should be included in the ADS. For the avoidance of doubt, using closed windows to achieve the internal noise level target shall only be considered by the Local Planning Authority once all other good acoustic design mitigation measures have been utilised.

The submitted scheme shall ensure that, prior to occupation of any of the dwellings in Area A and Area C, the following noise criteria shall be met for all the dwellings in Area A and Area C, in accordance with the Professional Practice Guidance: Planning and Noise – New Residential Development (May 2017 or later versions), and written confirmation of the compliance shall have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

A. bedrooms shall achieve an 8-hour LAeq (23:00 to 07:00) of 30dB(A) and an LAmax, F of 45 Db
B. living rooms and dining rooms shall achieve a 16 – hour LAeq (07:00 to 23:00) of 35dB(A)
C. external amenity spaces shall achieve a 16 – hour LAeq (07:00 to 23:00) of 55dB(A)

REASON: To comply with CP57, ensuring high quality design and place shaping such that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable.

Highways

Car Parking Strategy - Area A

29. Before the occupation of Area A housing hereby approved (and as part of the reserved matters application), a car parking management scheme shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted scheme shall include for the layout, control and management of the designated parking areas, at street level and below ground, together with measures for controlling the parking of vehicles on all other parts of the site, including unadopted roads. The development

shall thereafter be operated in accordance with the approved scheme for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: In the interests of road safety and reducing vehicular traffic within the development in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy

Area A Construction access and emergency access

30. Before commencement of any part of the development of Area A housing, the proposed construction and emergency access shall be provided and made available for those uses only in accordance with the details shown on the submitted Construction Environment Parameters Plan 9441- FM- XX- XX- DR- A- 024- A03 and subject to detailed approval by the Council as Local Highways Authority. The details of the emergency access shall include the following:

The road width to be a minimum of 3.7m between kerbs
Details of the gateway width and visibility splay
Details of carrying capacity (minimum 32 tonnes)
Details of any removable barriers
Details of a management scheme for the barriers

The approved emergency access scheme shall be fully implemented prior to the occupation of any dwellings and retained thereafter

REASON: In the interests of road safety and reducing vehicular traffic within the development in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Area A - Operational Access point

31. Before the first occupation of any part of the Area A development, the proposed vehicular and pedestrian accesses including off-site highway works shall be provided and made available for use in accordance with the details shown on the submitted Plan 22317-002-P4 and subject to detailed approval by the Council as Local Highways Authority. The visibility splays shown on the approved plans shall be maintained free of obstruction for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: In the interests of road safety and reducing vehicular traffic within the development in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy

Area C - Operational Access point - Vehicular only

32. Before the first occupation of any part of the Area C development, the proposed vehicular access and internal paths excluding off-site highway works shall be provided and made available for use in accordance with the details shown on the submitted Plan 22317-029-P2 and subject to detailed approval by the Council as Local Highways Authority. The visibility splays shown on the approved plans shall be maintained free of obstruction for the lifetime of the development.

REASON: In the interests of road safety and reducing vehicular traffic within the development in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy

Area C - Country Park Access - Walking and Cycling

33. Before the first occupation or operational use of any part of the development, the proposed walking and cycling access between the site and the Castle Hill Country Park shall be provided and made available for public use for the lifetime of the development, in accordance with a scheme submitted to and agreed as part of the reserved matters application.

REASON: In the interests of road safety and reducing vehicular traffic within the development in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Layout of Roads and Footpaths

34. No development above ground level shall take place until details of the standards to which the unadopted roads serving the development are to be constructed have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority as part of the reserved matters application. No house or building shall be occupied until the roads have been constructed in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: The application contains insufficient information to enable this matter to be considered prior to granting planning permission and the matter is required to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority before development commences in order that the development is undertaken and that the roads are laid out and constructed in a satisfactory manner in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Construction Management Plan

35. No development shall take place, 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 for:
the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors; loading and unloading of plant and materials; storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development; the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate; wheel washing facilities; measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction; a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works; delivery, demolition and construction working hours. The approved Construction Method Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period for the development

REASON: In the interest of highway safety and general amenity in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Travel Plan

36. Within 6 months of first use of the development hereby approved a full travel plan shall be submitted based on the framework travel plan. The full travel plan when approved shall be implemented including the appointment of a travel plan co-ordinator for three years from the date of first appointment.

REASON: In the interests of promoting sustainable patterns of travel to and from the development in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy

Mobility hub matters

37. No part of the development hereby approved shall be occupied until details of mobility hubs and a mobility hub management plan to include details of the proposed measures for the site hereby permitted has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be implemented solely in accordance with the approved details in accordance with the timetable identified within the mobility hub management plan and will be monitored via the approved mobility hub management plan and Travel Plan as agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of safe and suitable movement in accordance with the aims of policy CP57 and CP61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

_____*End of Conditions*