

Agenda item

Application Number: PL/2025/05762 - Armishaw Removals, Netherhampton Road, Netherhampton, Salisbury, SP2 8RA

- [Meeting of Southern Area Planning Committee, Thursday 20 August 2026 3.00 pm \(Item 41.\)](#)

Mixed-use commercial development including a convenience/food retail unit, a drive-through coffee unit, two B8 units with ancillary office use, and the retention of an existing B8 warehouse, along with associated parking, access, and servicing arrangements.

Minutes:

Public Participation

Mr Carl Chambers spoke in objection to the application

Ms Gill Anlezark spoke in objection to the application

Ms Maragaret Willmott spoke in objection to the application

Mr Ed Esdon (Agent) spoke in support of the application

Mr Lloyd Armishaw (Applicant) spoke in support of the application

Cllr Annie Riddle of Salisbury City Council spoke in objection to the application.

The Principal Planning Officer, Adam Madge, introduced a report which recommended that the application for Mixed-use commercial development including a convenience/food retail unit, a drive-through coffee unit, two B8 units with ancillary office use, and the retention of an existing B8 warehouse, along with associated parking, access, and servicing arrangements. be approved.

Attention was drawn to a briefing note which had been published as Supplement 1 to the agenda, which provided an update on points within the report since the Governments publication of a revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Key details as set out in the report included:

- 1) Principle of development
- 2) Highways impacts
- 3) Design and appearance
- 4) Flooding and drainage
- 5) Ecological impacts
- 6) Trees
- 7) Landscape
- 8) Flooding
- 9) Archaeology

It was noted that any signage shown on the plans was not part of the application for consideration at the meeting and would be subject to a separate application.

The rear windows on the two B8 units had been removed due to their proximity to the neighbouring houses.

Members of the public then had the opportunity to present their views to the committee as detailed above.

The representative of Salisbury City Council noted objection to the application.

Cllr Brian Dalton, the Unitary Division Member, declared that he was also a member of Salisbury City Council but did not serve on its Planning Committee. He then addressed the Committee in relation to the application.

Cllr Dalton advised that he had visited the site with the applicant and had also met with the owner of the adjacent Inexcess, who held the access rights to the site. He acknowledged that a retail outlet on the site was long overdue and would be welcomed by the local community.

He noted the substantial level of development that had taken place along the Netherhampton Road corridor, including developments at Chapple Gate and Wilton Gate, amounting to approximately 828 dwellings. Whilst recognising the need for additional retail provision arising from this growth, he expressed concern regarding the cumulative impact of development on the highway network.

It was stated that evidence from 2019 and 2022 had identified a demand for additional shopping facilities in the area and the existing One Stop store, further along Netherhampton Road was operating at a much higher intensity, with associated parking pressures.

Cllr Dalton referred to Core Policies TR4 and TR6 and noted that, whilst the Highway Authority had raised no objection, the Committee must be satisfied that the proposal would provide safe and suitable access for all users. He felt that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate why additional mitigation measures for pedestrians and cyclists had not been assessed. In particular, he noted the absence of any assessment of a right-turn lane, ghost island provision or pedestrian refuge, and argued that the lack of such measures had not been adequately justified.

The cumulative impact of existing uses along Netherhampton Road was noted and reference to operational figures provided by the owner of Inexcess, indicated significant daily vehicle movements, including HGV traffic and approximately 70 staff movements, with an estimate of between 800 and 1,200 vehicle movements through the shared access each day and argued that the proposed development would add materially to these figures.

Referring to the trip generation data contained within the officer report, Cllr Dalton stated that the proposed convenience store would generate approximately 2,072 vehicle movements on a weekday, with around 1,058 being additional movements by his calculations. He contended that the proposal therefore required a more detailed assessment of access arrangements, taking account of future transport impacts, cumulative traffic movements and all travel modes, rather than focusing solely on trips generated directly by the development.

Other commercial premises on Netherhampton Road, including Booker and the trading estate, had dedicated arrangements for HGV movements, whereas it was stated that no comparable provisions had been proposed for the application site. Concern was expressed that the access represented the first junction encountered by eastbound traffic and could therefore give rise to conflicts between vehicles, particularly as right-turn movements into the site were likely to increase. In addition, the ghost island right-

turn facilities had been provided at three nearby junctions and suggested that the applicant should have demonstrated why similar measures were either unnecessary or incapable of being delivered at this location.

It was noted that when Inexcess was relocated to the current site in 1990, highway improvements had been required, including the extension of a footway.

It was stated that the shared access was approximately 18 metres wide and that pedestrians would be required to cross the full width in a single movement, without the benefit of a central refuge island similar to that provided at Booker, and that appropriate crossing arrangements had not been fully assessed, leaving it unclear on how pedestrian priority would be managed, or how pedestrians could safely cross in two stages.

Councillor Dalton referred to Core Policies 60, 61 and 62, together with Policies TR4, TR6 of the NPPF, and argued that the proposal had not adequately demonstrated that the transport impacts on all users had been properly assessed and mitigated. He also considered that improvements to the existing crossing serving Chapple Gate should have been explored. In his view, insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate that pedestrian and cyclist safety concerns had been satisfactorily addressed, noting that Policy TR6 supported refusal where development would result in increased highway safety risks.

In addition, Councillor Dalton raised concerns regarding the proposed operating hours. He noted that the existing One Stop store served the wider community between 7.00am and 10.00pm, whereas the proposed development sought permission to operate between 6.00am and 11.00pm. Cllr Dalton was not persuaded there would be significant demand from residents at 6.00am, particularly for the drive-through facility, and suggested that operating hours should instead be restricted to 7.00am to 10.00pm in line with the existing retail provision on Netherhampton Road.

Finally, Councillor Dalton stated that, whilst he supported the provision of local retail facilities, he would not wish to see the delivery of a shop on this site used as justification for reducing the scale or provision of community facilities within the Wilton Gate development.

The Officer responded to points raised, noting that there were no objections from statutory consultees, including Highways and that should the application go to appeal with a refusal on Highways grounds, it would be difficult to defend.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officer. It was clarified that signage was considered under a separate process.

Members queried the applicant's assessment of alternative sites, noting that 20 locations had been considered, all of which were within the city centre and none were located within several miles of the application site. It was explained that planning legislation required consideration of the impact on city centre retail uses. As the applicant had not undertaken a retail impact assessment, the Council's consultants had completed one. Beyond the legislative requirement to assess retail impact, matters

relating to commercial competition could not be considered through the planning process.

Reference was made to the ecological appraisal, specifically a bat survey undertaken on 6 November 2024 which stated that it remained valid for 18 months. Concern was expressed that the survey was now out of date and clarification was sought as to whether approving the application would be unlawful. It was explained that the applicant had submitted an ecological report and that it remained the applicant's responsibility to undertake any necessary update or top-up surveys. The Committee would not be acting improperly by considering the application with the existing survey information. However, without a top-up survey there was a possibility that the ecological information might not be fully up to date. It was noted that the Council's Ecology Officer was aware of the survey date and had raised no objection. Consequently, it would be difficult to justify refusal on ecological grounds.

Members sought clarification regarding whether fencing was proposed around the site and, if so, its height. Concern was also expressed regarding the risk of informal access from Ridell Way should the development proceed. Further clarification was sought regarding the height of the retail units, their proximity to neighbouring dwellings and whether they would cause overshadowing of adjacent gardens. It was confirmed that no fencing proposals formed part of the current application. A condition was recommended requiring details of all boundary treatments to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development. It was also confirmed that the impact of the retail units on neighbouring residential properties had been assessed and was considered acceptable given the proposed separation distances.

Clarification was sought as to whether the buildings could be relocated 1 to 2 metres further west. It was explained that the Committee was required to determine the application as submitted and could not require buildings to be repositioned on the approved plans.

Reference was made to national and local transport policies which prioritised pedestrian movement. Concern was expressed that the proposal did not provide a cycle link to Wilton Gate and that the drive-through café would be primarily vehicle-oriented. Clarification was sought as to how the proposal complied with those policy requirements. It was explained that drive-through developments were not prohibited in planning policy and could be considered acceptable where they complied with relevant policy requirements. The proposal had been assessed by both the Highways Authority and Public Protection officers, neither of whom had raised objections. Reference was also made to other drive-through developments which had received planning permission, including one approved on appeal by a Planning Inspector. It was therefore considered difficult to justify refusal on planning grounds.

Concern was raised that the proposal would encourage motor vehicle use and would not support net-zero objectives. In response to a query regarding electric vehicle charging provision, it was confirmed that six charging points were proposed within the development.

Questions were raised regarding groundwater flood risk. Reference was made to evidence of flooding at the site entrance and north-eastern corner, together with Environment Agency changes to climate change allowances published in May 2026.

Clarification was sought as to whether the flood risk assessment relied on out-of-date information and whether sufficient mitigation measures were proposed. It was explained that the Council's drainage team had assessed the information and found it acceptable. It was noted that updated Environment Agency mapping had not yet been formally released and was expected later in the year. Until such time, the current mapping remained the appropriate evidence base for assessing flood risk.

Concern was reiterated that flood risk was being assessed using data which would soon be superseded and did not reflect higher climate change allowances. It was confirmed that, whilst updated information was anticipated, there was currently no alternative dataset available and therefore the assessment had been undertaken using the most up-to-date information presently in force.

Reference was made to Condition 3 and comments regarding site access. Clarification was sought as to whether access arrangements could be amended prior to first occupation to accommodate any additional requirements identified by the Committee. It was explained that any amendments would need to be reasonable and proportionate. Significant measures, such as requiring a pelican crossing, would be unlikely to be considered reasonable. However, minor amendments could be reviewed and considered where appropriate.

It was further observed that relocating one of the units' eastwards could potentially provide a wider access arrangement, although it was acknowledged that such a change could not be incorporated into the application at this stage.

Clarification was sought regarding the number of pedestrians using existing routes across the site. It was confirmed that no such data was available during the meeting, although relevant information may have been contained within the Transport Assessment.

Further explanation was requested regarding the proposed access arrangements, as concerns had been raised regarding access for larger vehicles, including lorries. In response, further details were provided in relation to the submitted access plans.

Clarification was sought regarding whether a marked pedestrian crossing was shown on the proposed layout. It was confirmed that the plans included a designated area for pedestrian crossing, and it was suggested that a condition could potentially require this area to be finished in a contrasting colour. A further suggestion was made that a marked crossing be provided at the entrance to Inexcess. It was explained that the land required for such a crossing was not within the applicant's ownership or control.

Clarification was sought regarding Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), specifically whether a mechanism had been identified by the applicant to secure BNG for the site. It was explained that an informative had been included with the application and that details of BNG would be provided through the discharge of planning conditions at a later stage. This was noted to be the normal process for an application of this scale.

Members sought clarification regarding the B8 buildings, including their relationship to nearby dwellings, ground levels and separation distances. It was confirmed that the site

was generally level. The distance from the B8 buildings to the boundary fence was approximately 3 metres and the distance from the fence to the nearest houses was approximately 1 metre, providing a total separation distance of around 4 metres.

It was further explained that the white strip shown on the access plan represented a shared pedestrian and cycle path. The route extended approximately 18 metres from Wilton Gate, and it was acknowledged that pedestrians currently walked to the site using that route.

The Chairman then invited a motion for debate from the Committee, where Cllr Brian Dalton moved the motion of Refusal, noting reasons as:

The proposed development, by reason of the scale and mix of uses served by the shared access, the volume and nature of existing and anticipated vehicle movements, and the absence of a sufficiently robust assessment of the cumulative operation of that access, had not been demonstrated to provide safe and suitable access for all users. Insufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate that the arrangements adequately address the potential conflict involving vehicles waiting to turn right from Netherhampton Road, or the safety and convenience of pedestrians, cyclists and other vulnerable users crossing the approximately 18-metre-wide entrance. The proposal had therefore not demonstrated that it would avoid an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to Core Policies 60, 61 and 62 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and policies TR4 and TR6 of the National Planning Policy Framework, August 2026.

This was seconded by Cllr Sven Hocking.

A debate followed where members discussed the Highway Authority's consultation response of March 2026, noting that a previous request for vehicle tracking analysis had not been fully addressed.

Concern was expressed that the junction may need to be re-tracked to demonstrate that the largest vehicles could safely negotiate the access arrangements.

Reference was also made to a nearby junction on Bodenham Lane, approximately 50 yards east of the site entrance, which incorporated a ghost island and dedicated turning lane. It was suggested that a similar arrangement could improve safety at the application site, although this may require road widening. It was further suggested that restricting vehicles exiting the site to left-turn movements only would direct traffic towards the roundabout and enhance highway safety.

Further concerns were raised regarding highway safety. It was noted that, whilst the Highway Authority had accepted the transport assessment and concluded that the impact would not be severe, mitigation measures were nevertheless required. It was argued that this suggested a more significant impact than indicated and that relevant planning policies required priority to be given to pedestrian safety.

Concerns were also raised regarding BNG, with Members questioning whether it was appropriate for details to be secured after the grant of planning permission. Reference was made to the condition of the site prior to ecological surveys taking place.

Concerns were also expressed regarding the trip generation data contained within the transport assessment. It was noted that the proposed development was expected to generate 208 vehicle movements between 8.15 am and 9.15am, equating to approximately one vehicle entering or leaving the site every 17 seconds. It was suggested that the comparison sites used within the assessment were not representative of a drive-through coffee shop and that vehicle movements could therefore be higher than predicted.

The Committee discussed loss of amenity for the houses on Ridell Way, which would be impacted by the proximity of the B8 units, noting that they would be overshadowed by the units which would negatively impact the residents living there.

It was further argued that the TRics (Trip Rate information computer system) data was open to interpretation and that only one comparison site appeared to be located adjacent to a main road.

Concerns were also raised regarding flood risk, and it was suggested that the site's impacts had not been fully assessed.

Support was expressed for the motion on highway safety grounds. Concerns were raised that insufficient account had been taken of actual traffic behaviour, cycling provision and pedestrian access. It was considered that concentrating all vehicle movements, including HGVs, through a single shared access point between the proposed uses could create conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians.

Concerns were also expressed regarding the potential for traffic to queue back onto Netherhampton Road.

Following discussion, Cllr Dalton agreed to add CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy, and policy P3 2a & 2b of the NPPF 2026, loss of amenity to the motion on the grounds of overshadowing, size and proximity of the B8 units on the neighbouring dwellings. This was also accepted by the original seconder of the motion, Cllr Hocking.

At the close of debate, the Committee voted on the motion of Refusal for the reasons, Core Policies 57, 60, 61 and 62 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and policies TR4 and TR6 of the National Planning Policy Framework, August 2026.

It was;

Resolved

That planning permission be REFUSED for the following reasons:

1.The proposed development, by reason of the scale and mix of uses served by the shared access, the volume and nature of existing and anticipated vehicle movements, and the absence of a sufficiently robust assessment of the cumulative operation of that access, has not been demonstrated to provide safe and suitable access for all users. In particular, insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the arrangements adequately address the potential conflict involving vehicles waiting to turn right from Netherhampton Road, or the safety and convenience of pedestrians,

cyclists and other vulnerable users crossing the approximately 18-metre-wide entrance. The proposal has therefore not demonstrated that it would avoid an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to Core Policies 60, 61 and 62 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and policies TR4 and TR6 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2026

2.The proposed B8 industrial units, by reason of their height and positioning close to the boundary with neighbouring properties at Riddell Close to the east would be an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development having an adverse impact on those residential properties to the detriment of occupants as such the proposal would be contrary to policy CP57 of the Wiltshire core strategy, and policy P3 (2a and b) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2026

Supporting documents:

- [Report - PL.2025.05762 - Netherhampton Road, item 41. PDF 1 MB](#)
- [PL.2025.05762 Aerial Plan, item 41. PDF 993 KB](#)
- [PL.2025.05762 Location Plan, item 41. PDF 662 KB](#)
- [Briefing Note - SAP 260820, item 41. PDF 131 KB](#)