

Agenda item

Application Number: PL/2021/04084 - Land to the west of Roger Way and Old Sarum Local Centre (Block C), Old Sarum, Salisbury

- [Meeting of Southern Area Planning Committee, Thursday 24 September 2026 3.00 pm \(Item 49.\)](#)

Residential development of 49 no. new dwellings in total comprising development on land to the west of Roger Way to include the erection of 42 no. dwellings, alongside the change of use of the vacant ground floor unit at Block C of the Old Sarum Local Centre, to provide for 7 no. affordable apartments.

Minutes:

Public Participation

Jim Ayres, Director Salisbury Football Club, spoke in objection to the application.

Barnaby Harris (Persimmons) spoke in support of the application.

John Gantlett (Persimmons) spoke in support of the application

Cllr Liz Holland of Laverstock & Ford Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

The Senior Planning Officer, Joe Richardson, introduced a report which recommended that the application for residential development of 49 no. new dwellings in total comprising development on land to the west of Roger Way to include the erection of 42 no. dwellings, alongside the change of use of the vacant ground floor unit at Block C of the Old Sarum Local Centre, to provide for 7 no. affordable apartments, be approved, subject to completion of a s106 Agreement and conditions.

Key details set out in the report, included:

- Principle of development/planning history and policy background;
- Site History including s106 clauses and the use of Block C as a Doctor's surgery;
- Current Housing Land Supply Position;
- Design and impact on character of area/landscape;
- Heritage Impacts including the Old Sarum Airfield;
- Amenity Impacts;
- Archaeological Impact;
- Access and Highway safety/parking;
- Drainage;
- Ecological Impact including River Avon SAC neutrality/New Forest SPA/BNG;
- S106 contributions

Attention was drawn to the late representations received. Laverstock and Ford Parish Council had provided briefing notes on both elements of the proposal to the Committee, which contained requests that the Committee thoroughly consider certain matters and possible additional conditions should the Committee be minded to approve the application. Furthermore, an agenda supplement (supplement 2) had been published containing additional information from the applicant, which was a letter from William Wallis regarding the marketing of the site. Members confirmed that they had seen the additional material.

The Senior Planning Officer then ran through presentation slides as published in agenda supplement 1.

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

A statement provided by the unitary division member, Cllr Lainey Barker, who was not able to be in attendance, was read on her behalf by Cllr Sven Hocking. Cllr Hocking noted his disappointment that the meeting was not moved to accommodate Cllr Barker's leave, as he felt that the meeting should have been held when she was able to be present.

Cllr Barkers statement raised concerns that the proposal comprised two distinct sites with separate planning issues and should therefore have been submitted as separate applications.

Furthermore, in relation to the former community benefit site, it was argued that the land should be retained for community facilities, particularly given the lack of local healthcare and community services and the planned growth of housing in the area. Concern was expressed that the existing units had not been adequately marketed or maintained to attract potential occupiers.

Regarding the Roger Way site, Cllr Barker raised objection to the proposed change from employment (B1/B2) to residential use. Cllr Barker argued that the original employment designation was intended to provide a buffer between residential development and Salisbury City Football Club, which generated noise and light impacts that were expected to increase following approved improvements to the club's facilities. It was further stated that residential development could lead to future amenity complaints affecting the club's operations and growth. Reference was made to previous interest from the football club in acquiring the land, indicating that employment-related use remained viable. Cllr Barker urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Members of the Committee then had the opportunity to ask technical questions of the officers in attendance (Joe Richardson, Senior Planning Officer, Richard Hughes, Planning Manager and Vicky Brown, Senior Environmental Health Officer, Public Protection).

Members asked a number of technical questions relating to the application sites, design, parking provision, community use, ecology, and potential impacts arising from the adjacent football club.

Officers clarified that the proposed 3G/4G pitch had not been subject to a planning application but had been discussed through pre-application advice. It was confirmed that, although the application comprised two separate sites, Members must determine the application as submitted and could not approve or refuse the sites independently.

Questions were raised regarding the design of the proposed dwellings adjacent to the football club, including single-aspect layouts, natural light, and mitigation measures. Officers advised that the properties complied with relevant standards and that the rear blank elevations formed part of the acoustic and lighting mitigation strategy.

Members sought clarification on the former community use building at Block C. Officers confirmed that the space had been allocated for community use but had remained

vacant for approximately 15 years and had never operated as a doctor's surgery. Concerns were raised regarding parking provision and the loss of potential community facilities.

Discussion took place regarding the historic employment designation of the Roger Way site and the role it had played as a buffer between residential development and Salisbury City Football Club. Officers explained that earlier objections from environmental health had led to the employment allocation, but that no current objections were maintained following assessment of contemporary evidence.

Members questioned the extent and recency of marketing undertaken for both sites. Officers advised that the sites had been marketed between 2008 and 2022 and highlighted the long-standing lack of interest in either community or employment uses. Concerns were nevertheless expressed by Members regarding compliance with national policy expectations on recent marketing evidence.

The Chairman called a recess at 16:39. The meeting reconvened at 16.43.

Further questions focused on noise, lighting and future complaints arising from football club activities. Officers advised that, whilst impacts would occur, the proposed mitigation measures, including acoustic barriers, glazing and integral blinds, would reduce effects to an acceptable level under national planning guidance. It was noted that the football club's existing lawful use should be recognised through the agent of change principle and that future residents would be informed of the neighbouring stadium.

Members also discussed the long-term maintenance and enforceability of mitigation measures, including acoustic fencing and ball-stop barriers. Officers confirmed that mitigation would be secured through planning conditions and maintained in perpetuity, and the in perpetuity element could be added to some conditions should the Committee be minded to approve and request that. Additionally, enforcement powers were available where necessary.

Finally, concerns were raised regarding ecological survey information. Officers acknowledged that survey data was no longer fully up to date due to delays in determining the application but advised that updated ecological checks and any necessary further surveys would be secured by condition prior to development proceeding.

The Chairman invited a motion from the Committee for debate.

Cllr Sven Hocking proposed a motion to refuse the application in line with the local Members statement as detailed above. Reasons for refusal included poor design of the properties at the Rogers Way site where they back onto the football stadium; particularly the limited natural light available to some units; that Block C if it was marketed properly would be commercially viable so should not be changed to residential use; and amenity impact on residents at both sites. This motion was seconded by Cllr Zoe Clewer.

In support of the motion, Members expressed concern about the suitability of locating residential properties in close proximity to Salisbury City Football Club. It was argued that future residents would be exposed to significant noise and lighting impacts and that the proposed mitigation measures did not sufficiently address these concerns. Members noted that mitigation requirements, including acoustic measures and restrictions relating to lighting, had influenced the design of the dwellings to such an extent that concerns arose regarding the overall quality of the accommodation and living conditions.

Discussion also focused on the community facility site at Block C. Some Members questioned whether sufficient evidence had been provided to demonstrate that community use was no longer achievable. Concerns were raised that the premises had not been marketed in a way that would attract potential occupiers and that the loss of the site could remove opportunities for future community services, healthcare provision, or other local facilities as the area continued to grow. Similar concerns were expressed regarding the loss of employment land, with Members noting that business needs and community requirements could change over time and that land allocated for such purposes should not be released without compelling justification.

Other Members acknowledged these concerns but noted the need to consider the current planning policy context and the weight to be given to housing delivery. It was observed that the application would contribute to housing supply, including affordable housing provision, and that there was limited evidence of active demand for either the community use building or the employment land. Some Members considered that a refusal based on the loss of these uses could prove difficult to defend at appeal.

Debate also considered the relationship between the proposed housing and the football club's existing operations. Some Members expressed concern that, despite mitigation measures, future complaints from residents could place pressure on the club and potentially constrain its activities and future growth. Examples were cited of existing lawful activities elsewhere subsequently becoming the subject of complaints from nearby residents. Other Members, however, noted that the football club was an established lawful use and that prospective residents would be aware of its presence when purchasing or occupying properties in the area.

The Chairman called a recess at 17:03. The meeting reconvened at 17:06.

Further discussion took place regarding the proposed mitigation measures, including acoustic barriers, lighting controls and other design features. Questions were raised about the long-term maintenance and enforceability of these measures and whether responsibility for their upkeep could ultimately fall to future residents or management companies.

Members also considered ecological evidence. Cllr Hocking highlighted concerns that parts of the ecological survey work were now out of date and argued that approving the application in those circumstances would set an undesirable precedent. In contrast, officers had advised earlier in the meeting that updated ecological checks and any necessary further surveys would be secured through planning conditions.

During the debate, Members referred to relevant development plan policies relating to design quality, amenity and environmental considerations. While several Members stated that they were finely balanced in their views, concerns regarding the quality of the proposed development, the loss of community and employment opportunities, the potential impact on residential amenity, and the adequacy of the supporting evidence ultimately led many to state support for the motion.

Cllr Hocking incorporated ideas from Members during debate as amendments to his motion to refuse and therefore clarified that the motion was to refuse the application due to poor quality design; impact on residential amenity; lack of natural daylight for some units; loss of employment land; loss of a potential community facility; inadequate evidence of marketing and for change of use; and for ecology reasons due to the ecological survey being out of date. Cllr Zoe Clewer continued to second the motion. The motion was put to the vote and it was,

Resolved

That planning permission for PL/2021/04084, be REFUSED, for the following reasons:

1. The Council has given substantial weight to the provision of housing in accordance with Policy HO7 of the NPPF. However, the proposed residential development on land west of Roger Way would result in the unjustified loss of a site identified within the wider Old Sarum development framework for employment-generating purposes. In the absence of any up-to-date marketing strategy, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that sufficient and robust evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the site is no longer required to support employment opportunities, economic activity or the wider economic objectives of the Old Sarum development, nor that all reasonable opportunities to retain the site for employment use have been fully explored and exhausted. The Council further notes that significant residential growth has been permitted and is proposed elsewhere within the wider Old Sarum area, which will increase demand for local employment opportunities and reinforces the importance of safeguarding land identified for employment-generating uses. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims of Core Policies CP35 and CP36 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and Policies S4(2)(a)(i) and E2 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026) which seek to safeguard land and premises required to support economic growth and resist the unnecessary loss of employment opportunities. The adverse effects of the proposal are therefore considered to substantially outweigh the benefits of the proposal, including the provision of housing, in accordance with Policy S4 of the NPPF.

2. The Council has given substantial weight to the provision of housing in accordance with policy HO7 of the NPPF. However, the proposed conversion of the ground floor of Block C within the Old Sarum Local Centre from a consented doctor's surgery/community facility to residential accommodation would result in the loss of a planned community facility space that formed an integral part of the infrastructure envisaged to serve the Old Sarum development. In the absence of an up to date marketing or consultation with the local community, the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that satisfactory evidence has been provided to

demonstrate that all reasonable opportunities to secure either the approved healthcare use or an alternative community use have been exhausted, nor that the loss of the facility would not diminish the ability of the Local Centre to meet the current and future needs of the community. The proposal would therefore undermine the vitality, functionality and long-term sustainability of the Local Centre and result in the unjustified loss of a community facility space. The proposal is consequently contrary to the aims of Core Policy CP49 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and Policy HC6 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026). The adverse effects of the proposal are therefore considered to substantially outweigh the benefits of the proposal, including the provision of housing, in accordance with policy requirements of S4 of the NPPF.

3. The Council has given substantial weight to the provision of housing in accordance with Policy HO7 of the NPPF. However, by reason of its layout, siting and relationship with the adjoining Salisbury Football Club and surrounding development, and the associated requirement to mitigate the likely impacts of that adjacent use, the proposed development at Roger Way would fail to secure a satisfactory standard of residential amenity for future occupiers and would give rise to an unacceptable relationship between sensitive residential uses and an established sporting and community facility. The Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed mitigation measures would adequately overcome the likely harmful effects arising from noise, artificial lighting, activity and disturbance associated with the continued operation and possible future expansion of the football club, the future operation of which may be prejudiced by this proposal. Furthermore, the mitigation measures incorporated into the design of the dwellings closest to the football ground have resulted in restricted fenestration, limited outlook and reduced opportunities for natural daylight within habitable rooms. These shortcomings further demonstrate the difficulties in achieving an acceptable residential environment in this location. In addition, the introduction of residential accommodation within the ground floor of the Local Centre directly adjacent to a parking area would result in dwellings with a limited level of amenity. The proposal would therefore fail to achieve a high standard of design and place-shaping or create a well-designed place that responds positively to its context and provides appropriate living conditions. Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to the aims of Core Policies CP49 and CP57 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and Policies DP3, HC6, P3 and P4 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026). The adverse effects of the proposal are therefore considered to substantially outweigh the benefits of the proposal, including the provision of housing, in accordance with the requirements of Policy S4 of the NPPF.

4. The Council has given substantial weight to the provision of housing in accordance with policy HO7 of the NPPF. However, the ecological surveys and supporting information submitted with the application are no longer up to date and does not provide an accurate assessment of the site's current ecological baseline, the presence of protected and priority species, or the impacts of the proposed development upon biodiversity interests. In the absence of up-to-date ecological evidence, the Local Planning Authority cannot be satisfied that the development would avoid unacceptable harm to biodiversity, protected species and ecological networks, or that appropriate mitigation and enhancement measures have been identified. The proposal is therefore contrary to Core Policy CP50 of the Wiltshire

Core Strategy and Policies N2 and N6 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2026). The adverse effects of the proposal are therefore considered to substantially outweigh the benefits of the proposal, including the provision of housing, in accordance with policy requirements of S4 of the NPPF.

Informative(s) to Applicant(s)

1. The applicant is advised that, notwithstanding the reasons for refusal, the proposal would require mitigation in respect of phosphorus impacts upon the River Avon Special Area of Conservation. In the event of an appeal or any future planning application, the Local Planning Authority would expect suitable nutrient neutrality mitigation to be secured through a planning obligation and/or other approved mitigation mechanism before planning permission could be granted.

2. The documents and plans considered in reaching the above decision are as follows:

DWG No: 103 Site Location Plan Date Received 20.04.21

DWG No: 162.100 Rev E Proposed Planning Layout (Area A & F) Date Received 09.07.26

DWG No: 149.002-1 Rev B Existing and Proposed Ground Floor Layout Block C Date Received 11.05.26

DWG No: 149.001 Rev C Proposed Site Layout Block C (Area G) Date Received 11.05.26

DWG No: 162.107 Rev C Site Enclosure Details Date Received 11.05.26

DWG No: 162.105 Rev C Affordable Housing Layout Plan Date Received 11.05.26

DWG No: 162.111 Noise and Light Mitigation Plan Date Received 11.05.26

DWG No: 162.120.1 Rev A House Type: Alnmouth Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Plot 35 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.121.1 House Type: Ashdown Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Plot 4 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.122.1 House Type Ashdown Crn Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Plot 6 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.122.2 House Type Ashdown Crn Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Plot 2 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.123 House Type: Ashdown FG Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.124 House Type: Barnwood Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.124-2 House Type: Barnwood Alt Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Plot 7 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.125.1 House Type: Charnwood Proposed Floor and Elevations Plans Plots 31 and 32 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.125.1 House Type: Charnwood Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan Plot 8 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.126.1 Rev A House Type: Proposed Danbury Floor Plan and Elevations Plan Plots 23 and 25 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.128.2 House Type: WU1BF Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan Plots 29 and 30 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.128.1 House Type: WU1BF Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan Plots 9/10 and 27/28 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.129.1 House Type: Redhill Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan Plot 12 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.129.2 House Type: Redhill Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan Plot 34 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.130 House Type: Haldon Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan Plots 18,37 and 39 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.131 House Type: Rendlesham Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan Plots 21 and 41 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.132 House Type: Ennerdale Proposed Floor and Elevations Plan Plot 42 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.231.2 Triple Carport Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.231.1 Single Garages Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Plots 7 and 8 Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.231.3 Double Garages/Double Car Ports Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.232-1 Timber Cycle Sheds Proposed Floor and Elevation Plans Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.110 Rev B Proposed Street Scenes Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.104 Rev C Proposed Parking Plan Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.102 Rev C Materials Key Plan Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: 162.103 Rev C Proposed Bin Storage and Collection Plan Date Received 03.03.26

DWG No: GL211301G Proposed Landscaping Plan Date Received 03.03.26

River Avon Nutrient Calculator Rogers Way Date Received 01.08.25

River Avon Nutrient Calculator Block C Date Received 01.08.25

Biodiversity Net Gain Statement Dated Date Received 28.08.24

Ecological Impact Assessment undertaken by GE Consulting Date Received 28.08.24

Nutrient Neutrality Assessment undertaken by Betts Hydro Date Received 12.03.25

DWG No: P23-295 SK106 Rev P02 Impermeable Area Plan Date Received 28.08.24

DWG No: P23-295 SK100 Rev P3 Levels Strategy Sheet 1 of 2 Date Received 28.08.24

DWG No: P23-295 SK101 Rev P2 Levels Strategy Sheet 2 of 2 Date Received 28.08.24

Environmental Lighting Impact Assessment Report Date Received 12.06.25

Supporting documents:

- [PL.2021.04084 - Committee Report, item 49. PDF 1 MB](#)
- [PL.2021.04084 - Aerial Plan, item 49. PDF 1 MB](#)
- [PL.2021.04084 - Location Plan, item 49. PDF 1 MB](#)
- [Presentation Slides, item 49. PDF 4 MB](#)
- [Additional information from applicant - Persimmon Letter Sept 2026_Redacted, item 49. PDF 203 KB](#)