*I am concerned about this proposed new agricultural storage building. It is very large and will have an impact on the landscape of the Cranborne Chase National Landscape.*

*The planning statement shows some photographs of the type of machinery that will be stored in the new barn, but it also shows them under the steel frame of an existing barn. Where is that barn? What will it be used for if the machinery is to be moved to the new barn?* The barn in the photograph is at East Farm Codford, machinery was temporarily stored under cover in this building. The building has since achieved a change of use to B8 for agricultural chemicals (22-08618-FUL), this use has been implemented and machinery storage is therefore no longer available.

*If permission is granted, the proposed barn must be constructed in accordance with the CCNL Good Practice Note for New Agricultural Buildings and on Colour and Integrating Developments into the Landscape and it must also comply with the Good Practice Note No 7b(i) to ensure it meets the standards of environmental lighting zone E0.* We are content the building has been designed for agricultural purposes and the material colours proposed will integrate with the landscape. We await the comments from the landscape officer.

I have also received the following from the Parish Council,

*Manor Farm Agricultural Building Proposal: Steeple Langford Parish Council (SLPC) Comment.*

*1. At the time of writing there has been no consultation discussion with the applicant; a brief is intended to take place – but after the comment deadline; consequently, SLPC would wish to reserve the option to make further comment/amend existing comment in due course.* As above, I will attend the parish council meeting next Tuesday and we have already agreed to the extension of time previously requested.

*2. SLPC believes that there are three further properties in sufficiently close proximity to the proposed development and its related access that they should be formally notified by Wiltshire Council. Those properties are Charvers, Widdershins and The Malt House. SLPC has made those properties aware of the application.* You have advised that you will be visiting the site to display the site notice and ensure locals are aware and nobody is missed. Locals will also have the opportunity to attend the parish council meeting.

*3. Taking 1 & 2 above in account – it is recommended/requested that the consultation window is extended.* Previously agreed.

*4. This application is related to a previous application - 18/01616/FUL (Creation of new farm access. Decision Date Jun 18) – which is the enabler (track construction) to allow farm vehicle access to the proposed new building. SLPC do not believe the conditions have been discharged as stipulated; if that is agreed by Wiltshire Council – this application should not be approved until those conditions have been reviewed and satisfactorily resolved. Specifically:* We note the highways comments for this current application and are content with the conditions suggested.

*a. Condition 1 – Compliance with the approved plans (Tech Note 1 Rev A (May 2018) – specifically drawing 1079-001 (realignment of existing hedging to support visibility splays) – in the interests of highway safety.* We believe sufficient visibility can be achieved by cutting back the hedgerow rather than removing it. The hedgerow is scheduled to be cut back, once complete we will survey the access and provide revised visibility splay drawings. We could then vary the condition if necessary.

*b. Condition 4 – appropriate surfacing (tarmac) of the access track for the first 12 metres – in the interests of highway safety. (See Fowler Fortescue Discharge of Conditions Construction Statement).* The details of the surfacing have been approved, and this can be implemented prior to occupation of the new building. The farm track is in use to access the farm and negates the need large farm vehicles to access the site through the village. There has been no evidence of water or material migrating from the site over the existing site access.

*c. Condition 8 – hard and soft landscaping. The Landscape Plan and Scheme (Fowler Fortescue – received by Wiltshire Council 7 Aug 18) was approved – but has not yet been discharged by the applicant. (Hedges not laid; copse not planted).* Details have been approved; this planting will be carried out in this planting season.

*5. The applicants Planning Statement (Bourne Valley Associates dated 28 Nov 23) has some assertions that require comment.*

*a. Para 1. States the building would fall under permitted development were it not for the presence of an aerodrome within 3 km. As a point of principle – unless superseded – SLPC reference to The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 No. 596 Schedule 2 Part 6 Class A Agricultural suggests a planning application would have been required on the basis of the footprint of the proposed building (968m2 against a threshold of 465m2).* This statement is correct, the permitted development floor area is now 1,000m2.

*b. Para 2 (Site Context). Whilst the listing of the Grade II listed building 'The Manor House' does not specifically refer to the setting, and other older agricultural buildings are immediately adjacent – the Manor House setting is nevertheless important - as is the wider setting. Notably the proposed development is ~12m from the boundary of the Steeple Langford Conservation Area, 190 m from the Grade 1 listed Church of All Saints, and there are 7 other listed properties within a 300m radius. It is ~160m from the from SSSI of the River Wylye. There is no reference to the Cranborne Chase AONB being coincident with the Dark Skies Reserve. The statement that the proposal is outside the Conservation Area and SSSI – whilst true – does not reflect the full context. That wider setting is considered extremely important by SLPC.* We understand the significance of setting and the weight the LPA will apply to this; However, we believe the siting of this building within the current set of farm building is appropriate. We await the comments from the LPA conservation and landscape officers.

*c. Para 2 also states that there are no nearby rights of way. The road immediately to the east of proposal is de-facto a right which links Steeple Langford to the Bridleway SLAN 2 and Right of Way SLAN 4. This is less of a visibility issue – but is an important access and safety issue. SLPC consider it essential that un-interrupted safe access to SLAN 2 & 4 is maintained via that route.* Para 2 was referring to public footpaths, we note the adjacent road, however farm traffic will not use this to access the site, it will however use the northern part of the road under the A36 to access the agricultural land, as this is the current situation. It is not proposed to increase farming activity, only store machinery on this site to farm the 1,500 acres. This will reduce road miles of agricultural vehicles machinery as currently all vehicles and machinery travel from East farm to work on the land.

*d. Whilst visibility of the proposed building from the immediate vicinity is limited, and the Manor House is effectively screened, given its position close to the centre of Steeple Langford in the valley*

*bottom – it will nevertheless be very visible from the Berwick Lane properties, and visible from the slopes and Rights of Way on the downs south of Hanging Langford towards Grovely Wood. The inclusion of some screening in the design is noted and welcomed – but must be sufficient and appropriate.* We await the comments from the landscape officer. We believe sufficient planting is proposed.

*6. The application is in part justified by the need for farm machinery security. The need to protect valuable assets from theft/vandalism is acknowledged. However, the justification of siting the building close to existing farmsteads is misleading as the other agricultural buildings in the immediate vicinity are not residential and are infrequently used. If security is a driver – then an open fronted structure with only lighting as a security measure suggests other measures may be required/considered. It would useful if the applicant expands on what those might be (if any).* Having equipment and stores under cover is the main driver for this, security is a secondary issue, though still important.

*7. Reference is made to LED lighting; however, detail is scant - and given the scale of the building, the security challenge, its location in a dark skies reserve and proximity to a number of dwellings and the centre of Steeple Langford – it is suggested more detail on the LED lighting is required before this application can be approved. The effect of farm machinery and working lights also needs to be taken into account and SLPC would not support a proposal that generates any significant light pollution.* We are happy for any lighting to be approved as part of a planning condition. Though any lighting would be controlled by timers and photo cells.

*8. The storage of a number of large farm machine in the location may present an environmental risk in terms of fuels and oils spillage. There is no mention of where refuelling will occur – and no acknowledgement of any requirement for containment. Any spillage will leech into the immediate drainage and aquifer quickly – and present a risk to the SSSI. SLPC would like to see this detail/risk addressed.* We are not proposing to install any new fuel storage facilities as part of this application. There is currently a fuel tank on the site, and this is controlled by separate legislation, that being the SSAFO regulations (Storing silage, slurry and agricultural fuel oil). These regulations are monitored and enforced by the environment agency.

*9. The statement that "there would be no additional risk of flooding" is challenged. That may be true for groundwater flooding – but run-off flooding has been a consistently problematic issue in Steeple Langford given the capacity and condition of the existing drains. Whilst the majority of the run-off form the proposed building would be into the French Drain – and into two storm water soakaways shown on the drawing (although it is not clear from the statement "the drainage at the site will not be altered form the existing situation" if these are existing or new soakaways), nevertheless the new building, existing buildings and associated concrete apron will directly and indirectly feed rainwater into what is effectively a catchment bowl. That water flows past the Manor House, The Malt House and Widdershins and into the Duck Street drains. During periods of heavy rain (4 Jan 24 being the most recent example), the quantity of water flowing into the degraded drains significantly exceeds their capacity and causes flooding issues with properties and on the highway. With the detail currently available - SLPC believe the proposed building will increase the run-off challenge and exacerbate an already significant problem. SLPC would wish that:*

*a. The drainage design associated with the new building takes account of the challenge of rapid run-off from the vicinity of the proposed building.* We are content that the runoff from the new proposals can be adequately controlled, stored and disposed of by an appropriate SUDS design,

in this case soakaways. And that the proposals will not affect properties within the village. We await the comments from the LPA drainage officer in this respect.

*b. There are improvements to the inadequate open drainage system running down the road from the existing Manor Farm complex to Salisbury Road. It is suggested that the open drainage system should be converted into a covered/closed pipe drain – to reduce the amount of detritus picked up by the current open drain, leading to blocked drain pipes along Duck Street.* This is an offsite issue that is not the responsibility of our client.

*c. Wiltshire Council clear the partially blocked underground drain running down Duck Street.* This is an offsite issue that is not the responsibility of our client.

*d. The drainage challenges in the fields South/South East of the Riverside property (the southern end of Duck St as the road bears South East) are reviewed to reduce the potential for the open drain to become blocked.* This is an offsite issue that is not the responsibility of our client.

*e. The above would not all be directly attributable to the proposed development; the split of responsibility between developer, landowners and local authorities would have to be determined.*

*10. The application/approval for the enabling farm access track (18/01616/FUL) is on the basis of 15 two-way farm traffic movements and 15 two-way light vehicle movements per day. SLPC is content with that detail. However, there is potential for the vehicle storage area to become something more than that – and SLPC would want to understand from the applicant if there are other implications of increased use of the site. If it is to become a much busier working area than it is at the moment – then there may be noise and other pollution issues that need to be considered.* It is not proposing to intensify the use of the site, see 5c above.

*11. Similarly, any other considerations the applicant may have for any other forms of use for that location should be exposed at this stage. This includes the potential to increase the use of the largely redundant existing farm buildings, or indeed their redevelopment (some of which are in the conservation area).* It is not proposed for any other use of the site, the agricultural use will continue. If in the future new development were proposed, then a planning application would be required and be submitted. Every application should be judged on its own merits.

*12. Bottom Line: SLPC's view is mixed. It is recognised there is a requirement to effectively 'garage' farm machinery. However, a number of issues and concerns have been identified – which should be addressed/resolved before approval is granted.*