From: Hannah Cameron
Sent: Tuesday, September 12, 2023 9:55 AM
To: Forrest, Gavin <Gavin.Forrest@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: PL/2023/05363 - Dreamlea

Good morning Gavin,

Thank you for coming back to me. I have now seen the comments online and address each of the identified points in the email trail in turn below in red:

The key points we discussed:
1. Errors on the application and drawings – I am not aware of any errors, if there are any specific things that need to be addressed, please let me know so I can arrange for these to be rectified.
2. Application site map is misleading as there are two possible areas the red line is around. a. An area which is just the layout of the statics, grass area, mobile, cars, parking and dayroom – this area falls into Flood Zone 1 but abuts up to Flood Zone 2 b. An area as above but also includes the remainder of the menage which is in Flood Zone 2. The submitted SLP and Block plan are not misleading, the red line clearly shows the proposed development area.
3. The application does not show the remainder of land which potentially is in ownership of the applicant(s) which is the remainder of the field down to the river Key – an updated SLP has been provided, including a blue line.
4. The owner of the land is Ms O Ritchie and not Mr J Ritchie – the land changed hands in February 2023. She owns all of the site, the stables etc. and the field to the river – the land is in the Applicant's wife's name Mrs O Ridgely and the land is owned to the river boundary.
5. The planning permission for the stables has conditions on which includes buildings etc. which are now in the application site hence these conditions cannot be complied with which puts the stables in breach of planning – this new application would override the current permission in so far as it relates to the application site. New conditions could be imposed on any grant of planning permission. The stables will continue to be used privately by the applicant who has two horses on site and there is suitable space for stabling and storage using the stable building as the applicants do not propose to have an intensive equestrian use.
6. There is no indication as to how access will be for the stables once the site is developed – presumably will be shared and there is a portable WC on the site which is apparently conditioned to the stables – the stables, which are for private use only and will continue as such, would continue to be served by the existing access. If desirable, the portable WC can be removed from the plans.
7. Should there therefore not be a revised application for the stables or better still the application site should include all of the stable block and land which was part of the stable application – the application has not included the stable block as this is not proposed to change, should you have any concerns about this, I would be happy to discuss how we can overcome them. But it would not seem necessary for the stables to form part of this application.
8. I was shown photographs of the flooding in January 2023 which came up to the site edge – this is a worry. The application site falls within Flood Zone 1.
9. Foul sewage – lack of information. Where is the nearest public sewer – if within 30meters should the foul not be connected into this – have Thames Water been consulted – we are not aware of any public sewer nearby and therefore propose to serve the development with a package treatment plant.
10. Where is the water supply and electricity – the electricity supply isn't currently on site but the applicant has arranged for this connection to be made. Water will also provided on site.
11. Package Treatment Plant is shown in an area that vehicles could drive over – PTP are apparently not designed to be driven over – how will the water be discharged and where to! How will the vehicles needed to empty it get into the site as there is a limitation on turning into the site! If further

details are required of the PTP we would be happy to provide more information, or for this matter to be conditioned.
12. Where is the information on discharge/flows generated from and off the statics, stables and day room – the stables and day room building are existing and will continue to be managed in accordance with the existing arrangements. The proposed run off generated from the caravans will be minimal can be accommodated by soaking away using the existing permeable site surfacing. There are no new impermeable areas proposed.
13. Highways own the ditch and entrance but shown on the application map as within red line – the SLP correctly shows the proposed development site and its access to the highway, it is acceptable for highways land to be included in the red line.
14. An application for a caravan site at The Bell was refused in 2016 due to the access out onto the highway – what is different between these two applications – this is not relevant given the site referred to has a different access. Highways have confirmed the access is suitable to serve the proposal.
15. The applicant and Ms Ritchie potentially have family land ownership in and around the area. They apparently have been living on land in the ownership of Mr J Ritchie in Blunsdon – this is not correct.

I think the key points around this application is the inaccuracies on the application and lack of information. Please clarify what the inaccuracies are considered to be. Should further information be requested, we would be happy to provide this.

A cramp site which could be bigger as they own the adjoining stables, remainder of the menage and field – the site is not cramped and provides an appropriate level of space for the pitches. Any future development is not a relevant consideration in the determination of this application.
Access onto the highway and moveability around the site for large vehicles needing to come on to empty foul system, deliver caravans, feed stuff for horses, empty the Portable WC etc. The access is safe and suitable to serve the proposed use, any visits by larger vehicles will not be frequent and are already expected in association with the equestrian use. There is ample parking and turning space on site for the occupants and any visitors on the existing hardstanding.
Being within and abutting up to Flood Zones which strong evidence to prove that flooding does happen in the area – have the Land Drainage Team been consulted on this one as they have knowledge of the flooding in the area particularly down Newths Lane. The site falls solely in Flood Zone 1.
Any 'stopping' up the land not to take flood water will result in either flooding further back or sending water to Cricklade even faster. No new impermeable areas are proposed as part of the development.

1. Size of the site and lack of dedicated play space for children – it seems very cramped – bearing in mind the applicants may own additional adjoining land this could be provided. There is ample space on site for the children to play in the proposed gardens and within the fields should they choose to, the applicant does not wish to have large garden areas.
2. Access in and out onto the B4553 and speed limit and having safe walking route to the bus stop – cutting back and trimming of hedges would help but not sure how a footpath would be achieved - but would a virtual path work! 30mph speed limit needed. The access itself is safe and the public footpath PURT27 provides a link just south of the site to the western end of Purton Stoke, avoiding the B4553 (a map is provided in the submitted Planning Design and Access Statement).
3. Parking up of commercial vehicles – limit the number of vehicles on site at any one time. I note the spaces for vehicles and indicated as cars not vans but where will visitors park? The existing hardstanding provides additional parking and turning space on site. Save for the applicants own vehicles, it is not proposed to have other commercial vehicles on site.

4. Storage space on site or at the stables - The stables will continue to be used privately by the applicant who has two horses on site and there is suitable space for stabling and storage using the stable building as the applicants do not propose to have an intensive equestrian use.
5. Drainage and ensuring no pollution gets into the River Key – the on site foul drainage will be appropriately managed by a PTP, further details can be provided or conditioned.
6. Location of the Day room is very close to the road and will have road noise and pollution. The day room is separated from the road by an existing hedgerow. The day room will be appropriately insulated and is considered to be in a suitable location to serve its purpose.
7. Site boundaries need to reflect the rural location and remain as field boundaries of hedges and not be hard fencing – the site boundaries are proposed to comprise of new native hedge planting and post and rail fencing, these are considered to be entirely appropriate for the rural surroundings.
8. Illumination on the site needs to be controlled with no spillage from the site. No external lighting is proposed as part of this application. External lighting could be appropriately controlled via condition if considered necessary.

Should you require any further information, please do let me know. I would be grateful if we could arrange a time to discuss the progress of this application.

Kind regards,

Hannah Cameron MRTPI
Director
HC Planning Ltd