



Laverstock & Ford Parish Council

Incorporating Hampton Park & Old Sarum

3 Pilgrims Way, Laverstock, Salisbury, SP1 1RZ

Tel: 01722 411847

Email: parish-clerk@laverstock-ford.co.uk

Development Management
Wiltshire Council
PO Box 2281
Salisbury SP2 2HX

30 July 2015

Dear Sir

PARISH COUNCIL RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION 15/04004/OUT Part 2 of 2

The Parish Council stated at Part 1 that it OBJECTS to the Planning Application. The Parish Council gave 4 reasons and provided the rationale for each. Some additional supporting statements to those provided in Part 1 are given below. Finally, the Parish Council notes that there are numerous anomalies contained within the Planning Application pack of documents and lists some examples.

FURTHER SUPPORTING STATEMENTS TO PARISH COUNCIL SUBMISSION AT PART 1

The proposed development is at variance to several Core Policies within the Wiltshire Core Strategy:

Core Policy 25 states that new development will only be permitted on the Airfield if it retains and safeguards flying activity from the airfield. The Parish Council has a major concern that the development as proposed will have a significant negative impact on the flying activity for safety reasons. In addition, there are further concerns that noise complaints from residents of the proposed new properties, who undoubtedly will not all be aviation enthusiasts, coupled with safety considerations will lead to severe constraints placed on flying that may well lead to the airfield no longer being viable.

Lack of community involvement in developing the Application and disregard for views of local community

The Open Meeting organised by the Parish Council on 22 July highlighted the following, which are fully endorsed by the Parish Council:

- A major concern regarding an increased probability of flooding in Ford (which occurred as recently as 2014) caused by additional tarmac and concrete associated with the proposed development.
- The rate of increase in the size of the community in the Old Sarum area is already high leading to difficulties in melding the recent developments into one community.

This problem will be compounded by the future development at Longhedge. An additional 320 houses in Area A in the proposed timescale would make this task impossible.

- The lack of information as to the proportion of affordable homes within the proposed development.
- Bus services serving Old Sarum and Ford are inadequate, especially to the latter.
- No strategic transport plan for Salisbury which considers both the current traffic situation around Salisbury and the impact of the housing developments that are currently taking place or have been approved, plus the recent approvals for both ASDA and ALDI.

EXAMPLES OF ANOMALIES CONTAINED WITHIN THE PLANNING APPLICATION PACK OF DOCUMENTS

Old Sarum Airfield Ltd has stated publically that the volume of flying from the Airfield has reduced by 40% since they took over the running of the Airfield in 2007. This is said to allay fears regarding noise complaints. However, the **Draft Conservation Area Management Plan** produced by Feilden and Mawson states at page 7 that 'Some elements of the management plan have already been completed or initiated including *flying activity expanded* and.....'. This latter statement does not seem to be compatible with the publically declared reduction in flying since 2007.

The **Statement of Community Involvement** under 'Consultation Process' at page 5 makes reference to the Airfield Manager attending the regular monthly meetings of the Parish Council. This has been so over the last year. However, apart from any initial statement he may choose to make, he attends as an observer as does any other member of the public. This cannot be considered as Consultation.

The **Old Sarum Community Consultation Feedback** (from 12 Dec 2014) document purports to contain all written feedback inputs (questionnaires, emails, letters etc.). However, letter input from the PC has not been included.

The **Transport Assessment** leaves many question marks against statements made. Some examples:

- Section 1.3.3 'Correspondence has also been received from the Local Parish Council regarding potential mitigation/improvements along Ford Road'. This is incorrect, as the PC had provided no correspondence to the organisation carrying out the assessment.
- Section 7.2 Ford Road
 - ✓ This appears to have looked at only 2 of the 3 access roads to the village. Furthermore, the one that appears to be missing (the continuation of the C287 through to Broken Cross Bridge) contains probably the most difficult corner to negotiate.
 - ✓ A statement is made that there have been only 2 incidents recorded from 2009-2014 between the A345 and the A338. This is based on a database, which records only Road Traffic Accidents (RTA) where an injury has occurred. It is likely that there have been many more where there has been no injury sustained. The PC has submitted a Freedom of Information Request to

Wiltshire Police to ascertain details on all RTAs attended by Police Officers along the 3 access roads over the last 3 years and is awaiting a response.

- ✓ Based on the above, the statement that 'It can therefore be concluded that there are no inherent safety issues or problems' has yet to be proven.
- ✓ Statements on road widths and their ability to accommodate 2 vehicles passing comfortably are questionable. Many of today's cars are over 2m wide (e.g. VW Scirocco 2.08m and Volvo 4x4 2.14m). There are numerous places within the village where the road width is down to 4.8m - or 4.9m along the derestricted part of the C287 west of Merrifield Road (not Close). Given that an HGV can be up to 2.55m wide and a car 2.10m wide, the overall clearance between a vehicle of each type is either 15cm or 25cm in the two cases sited here. The statement that 'a 4.8m width carriageway allows a car and a HGV to pass comfortably' is questionable even in a perfect environment. However, the problem is compounded significantly on the derestricted portion of the road given the speed of the vehicles and the very poor condition of the edges of the road surface and potholes in many places. Furthermore, the additional statement that 'a 4.1m wide carriageway enables two cars to pass comfortably' cannot be correct as there would be insufficient width for even two Sciroccos to pass - and there are instances in Ford, ignoring pinch points, where the road is only 4.1m wide.
- ✓ It is understood that the likely increase in traffic along the C287 at peak times from Area C was interpolated from noting traffic flows exiting/entering Merrifield Road and Green Lane. There are a significant number of retired residents in both of these roads who would be unlikely to travel at peak times. However, the properties in Area C from the **Design and Access Statement** 'will predominately be large family homes' with 'large landscape gardens' and are, therefore, more likely to be occupied by working families rather than by many retired people. The logic of using the figures from the two existing roads in Ford to interpolate traffic flow at peak times at the exit of Area C would appear to be flawed.
- ✓ The assessment of increase in traffic in Ford seems to be limited to vehicles from Area C only; the impact traffic from Area A using Ford as 'rat run' has not been considered. Furthermore, it is not clear whether the implications of the Longhedge development or indeed the additional traffic flow caused by the building of ASDA and ALDI on the London Road have been included within the assessment.

Yours faithfully

Andrew Prince
Parish Clerk