



Dear Sirs,

RE: Planning Application PL/2024/11341

Address: Trickys Paddock, Brickworth Road, Whiteparish, SP5 2QG

We write to you in relation to the above application which was lodged with Wiltshire Council on the 11th December 2024.

From reviewing the supporting documentation which was lodged with this Application, it is our understanding that this application is to extend the current planning application to facilitate an additional pitch to allow for 1 mobile home and 1 touring caravan. Please see below our objections upon the following grounds:-

I. Occupancy

- a. Please clarify which Mr James Gammell is making this application – clarification as to if it is Senior or Junior and this should be reflected in the application and the appropriate amendments should be made.
- b. November 2020 Mr Gammell Snr had planning permission granted to account for two pitches which up to 4 caravans; including both 2 static caravans and 2 touring caravans or 4 touring caravans. As of current there is 2 touring caravans on the land and one motorhome. This has been the position for several years. Neither touring caravans are placed within the pitch as first proposed and accepted, nor do they move.

Planning was granted to the family upon the grounds that these pitches will be more than substantial for the family to grow and develop. There is in total two families upon the land, Mr Gammell Snr and his Wife, who we believe are currently residing in the motorhome and Mr Gammell Jnr and his wife and children, whom we believe to be currently residing in the two touring caravans. They still have room for one more caravan or to obtain two mobile homes. By requesting for a third pitch it leaves us to wonder what additional family will be joining the site. In the planning granted following an appeal in November 2020, a part of the reason that Mr Gammell Snr had planning granted was because of his reliance upon Mr Gammell Jnr as a carer; this included his family by way of his daughter in law. In the years which we have lived at our property we have only ever known it to be Mr Gammell Snr and Mr Gammell Jnr as the two families. A clarification for the reasons behind

a third dwelling is requested as this may be an attempt to run a commercial business by renting out a pitch.

- c. There is a condition upon the land in which upon the departure of Mr Gammell (snr) and his wife the land is to cease being used and restored as a field. Clarification on this condition would be appreciated, especially given there is a lack of certainty as to which Mr Gammell this applies to.

2. Highways

As I am sure the Council are aware, the A27 is a 60mph road and it is not a straight road. It has various bends, the first bend occurring from Tipplefield Farm to Trickys Paddock and again from Firlands Lodge to Richmond Farm/Business Park. As a 60mph visibility splays need to be considered by not only the Council but also Highways.

Not only are there various farms, a total of 4 along the A27 but also there are commercial premises. It is important to note that Tipplefield Farm is a working farm since the new owners took occupation and there is an agricultural machinery repair business located on the premises; as such there are large, slow moving which regularly enter and leave the premises.

We have growing concerns as to the current height of the laurel hedges and the obstruction which the front hedge causes, namely due to the fact it is not maintained. It is important to note that should an accident occur, which could have been easily avoidable with the correct Highway splays being enforced for hedging, then this will open up a floodgate as to liability and extensive legal action.

There is major concern as to why the Council discharged the condition for hedging where point 48 of the Appeal Letter should be looked at. The email from Paul Galpin to Joe Richardson dated 14th October 2020 should also be considered in which, and I quote:-

I recommend no highway objection be raised subject to the following conditions:

1. ***A Visibility condition, as per S/2008/708, relating to the comments of the Inspector in respect of appeal decision APP/Y3940/A/12/2188911 dated 6 September 2013 S/2012/1307 that was allowed on appeal. These comments state:***

'I attach herewith an extract from the Appeal Decision on S/08/0708 from which you will note that the Inspector considered that it would not be unreasonable to require a 'y' distance of 160m to be available. I would therefore require the hedge to be set back in order to provide and maintain a visibility splay of 2.4m x 160m in the westerly direction. The 2.4m distance should be measured along the centre line of the access, back from the edge of the carriageway. The hedge should of course be planted to allow for its mature growth to be clear of the splay.'

2. ***The development hereby permitted shall not be first brought into use until the first ten metres of the access, measured from the edge of the carriageway, has been consolidated and surfaced (not loose stone or gravel). The access shall be maintained as such thereafter.***

REASON: In the interests of highway safety.

3. Character

The Land falls under the 'Farley Forest Heathland Mosaic' Landscape Character Area (LCA). Already the land has become out of keeping and out of character with the area. Work on the land has been incredibly slow; from the tarmac drive which has created an eyesore in itself to the large commercial gates and frontage.

In the Appeal Letter, the Appeal Officer stated that she does not consider a precedent would be set by allowing the Appeal. In the contrary, if that was not the case then why now are we objecting to a planning application to add a third pitch onto the already existing site? If the Council accept this application then a precedent has very clearly been set and this could have a damaging effect.

Further development of this site would result in in undue and detrimental visual impacts on the character of the surrounding Special Landscape Area and it would conflict the policies CP47 (criteria ii, vi and viii), CP51 (criteria ii, vi and vii), CP57 (criteria i, vi and vii) of the Wiltshire Core Strategy.

Whiteparish is also a village which borders the National Park, in accordance with the Wiltshire Core Strategy, section 5.129 in which the south eastern boundary of the area overlaps with the New Forest National Park; CP24 (criteria i and iii) would be conflicted with the permitting of this development.

4. Flooding

We wish to raise concerns as to surface water flooding. Since the development has started on the land, there has been an increase of stagnant surface water along the A27, specifically in front of 'Trickys Paddock'. The run off from rain water has been made increasingly worse since the tarmac drive was put in; extensive issues arise during periods of heavy rain. Neighbouring properties/fields have a drainage system in place by maintaining their ditches.

The tarmac drive has been found to be a "permeable surface"... However there is a lack of drainage for this drive way, because it is not a permeable surface... as such the slop means water runs off and pools along the surface of the main road increasing the risk of highway safety.

Surface water flooding is an issue which the council need to investigate along with the environmental agency and highways given the type of road it is occurring upon.

5. Ecology

It is known that there are several County Wildlife Sites within 1km of the site, therefore we feel as though a full ecology report should be undertaken given the type of land which they wish to “develop” into further pitches.

The Nitrate Budget which has been submitted can be clearly seen to be deficient and as such they should submit a new one.

The hedging which has been planted is an invasive species in relation to the usual English country side hedging. Laurel is species of plant is known to soak out all nutrients and water from the soil. It is also a plant which is known to have dire consequences on causing damage within the ecological system due to the toxins it releases into the ground. This is of great concern given the land neighbours agricultural fields which have various hedge containing mixed English countryside hedging, and the land is worked.

6. Breaches of current Planning Permission

The Current planning application was accepted with various conditions to be attached. It is noted that several conditions have since been discharged; in respect of conditions 5, 6 and 9.

In the Appeal Letter there is a condition which restricts upon a limitation in the number of caravans and a restriction on the size and numbers of vehicles parked and stored on the site. This was imposed within the interest of the character and appearance of the area. The Applicants have been in constant breach of this condition from day one. The number of vehicles exceeds the planning permission; 2 family cars, 1 motorhome, 1 “abandoned” vehicle, 3 work vans, a digger and a lorry which has only just been removed.

The current development does not follow the permitted plans approved, as per condition 1. The site looks nothing alike what was agreed. The commercial gate is of concern with the frontage as it is out of character and keeping with the agricultural land nearby. Neighbouring properties have traditional bar gates which are within keeping of typical farm land.

Condition 7 is constantly being flaunted in regard of commercial activities. A digger and Ivor Williams trailer is stored on the land; along with several different work vans. Commercial waste is burned on the land on a regular basis. There is also a concern that they are running a commercial premises out of their property with buying/selling of building material.

It is important to draw to the attention of the Council that a hard standing has already been erected. The photos supplied within the application are out of date. Below is a picture taken a couple of months ago, circled in blue is a clear concrete base.



It is clear from above that if a third pitch is allowed then it would be upon that hardstanding; this would cause further concern for us as to Privacy. In the past when there have been caravans laid along the boundary, the hedging did not create a screen for privacy and we could clearly see into the caravan which meant they could equally see into us. Whilst we have planted our own hedges; hedging which is traditional to the countryside and will help the ecology of the land thrive, it will take a while to fully grow.

It is most disappointing to receive notice of this application given that when Mr Gammell Snr spoke at the Appeal Hearing, in response to a question to confirm that he had no intention of expanding the use of Trickys Paddock during his residence, he confirmed that he did not and that "you have my word on that".

We, therefore, each object to the Planning Application based upon the grounds detailed above.

Yours Sincerely,

Mr & Mrs Harris and Mrs Thomason.