

FOR THE ATTENTION OF Mr ANDREW THOMAS
REPRESENTATION AGAINST PL/2025/06615

Building at Seagry House, Off Henn Lane and Startley Road, Upper Seagry

Proposed Erection of building comprising 4 flexible B8 storage & distribution and/or Class E(g) Commercial, Business & Services units & erection of building for mixed agricultural and equestrian workshop

THIS APPLICATION SHOULD BE REFUSED ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS:

- **The Principle of Development** – This proposed development does not accord with the Seagry Neighbourhood Plan or the Wiltshire Strategic Plan and on these grounds alone should be rejected.
 1. **The Seagry Neighbourhood Plan** encourages home working and agricultural activity. It gives no support to the creation of a commercial estate in the heart of the parish. As a ‘Small Village’ the Wiltshire Core Strategy provided for ‘Small infill’ development between two existing buildings. Clearly this proposal does not accord with this and so fails the test.
 2. **The Proposed development fails to pass CP43** -The key Policy test for commercial developments has 4 key tests. The development fails to comply with any and therefore does not meet Wiltshire’s Key Planning Policy.
 3. **The existing building is derelict** – The application refers to this building as: “The existing ‘poor condition’ EMPLOYMENT building. This is factually wrong. Nobody has been employed in this building for over a decade and a half (possibly not until the very recent acquisition). The original owner of the site of the existing B8 building has been and is living in Europe. He has not been conducting a storage business at that building. Having visited the largely derelict site 17 years ago it would appear that it has not been in use as a B8 storage facility and no commercial activity has taken place at the site for over a decade and a half. The building on the site, which benefitted from a Certificate of Lawful Use in 2004 for B8 basic storage, in spite of significant objection, is in a state of collapse and is derelict. Containing significant amounts of asbestos it also represents a potential health hazard. The satellite image of the heavily wooded site demonstrates that the old chicken shed had been for many years totally overgrown until the applicant recently took ownership and felled/cutback some trees.



4. The proposed commercial access is not appropriate. The proposal is to convert the site of an agricultural access which was approved in 2004 for grass cutting purposes only. It remains as a narrow green corridor. The proposal is to create a 5 meter wide road capable of handling two 10 meter long and 2.5m wide HGV's side by side. This size and amount of HGV traffic movement will create an unsafe environment for the public of the village and school children arriving from across the catchment area. The existing access to Seagry House would be capable of handling the flow without creating a new access close to adjacent private homes. This proposal fails to meet Policy CP57 and should be rejected.
5. The highway infrastructure is unsuitable – The small country lanes are already over taxed by the amount of traffic using them. The proposal allows for 25 parking spaces, 8 of which are long wheelbase spaces (presumably for the LGV/HGV parking), and an estimated daily movement of 76 employees needing daily transport. In addition there will be all the commercial vehicles necessary to service such a distribution hub. The application seeks Class B8, E(g) facilities. Regardless of the claimed intentions of the applicant the following is relevant to what B8 permits.

Class B8 involves:

- Distribution where properties are used for preparing and handling goods for delivery, acting as logistical hubs.
- Buildings that are typically located in areas designated for industrial and commercial activity to ensure accessibility for logistics.
- Commercial estates that play a critical role in the supply chain.

Given that there is doubt over the continuing validity of the current classification of the chicken shed. A fresh appraisal of the suitability of the site needs to take place taking into consideration all the above points. It seems very clear that the location and infrastructure of the proposed development are completely inappropriate.

It is clear that the Highway infrastructure servicing the location will be unable to safely sustain the amount and size of the traffic such a development would create.

6. The need for such a commercial estate in this location has not been properly established. It must be considered that there is already very substantial warehousing capacity under construction in and around Chippenham. All of these developments are on appropriate highway links with appropriate infrastructure. Just because a landowner has a piece of derelict land in 'open countryside' with a 30+ year old chicken shed on it which has decayed beyond repair, does not entitle the owner to build a very substantial commercial estate on it.
7. The application is in fact for two independent developments rolled in to one. These have been labelled Block A and Block B. Both developments ought to be considered on their own merits and not as one combined application. Block A appears as a largely independent collection of buildings which are identified as: For Seagry Estate with its own access, parking, and a substantial complex of

buildings. The need for this development has not been explained nor properly justified. For such a large building one would imagine that a significant number of full time staff are currently employed to manage Seagry House estate. This has not been stated nor quantified. Planning application 19/04594/FUL in 2019 was for 2 stables and a tack room which have been built and is possibly 150 meters from the proposed new stable block and tack room. No justification is offered for why these additional stables and tack room are required. Seagry House would appear to have ample space within its curtilage to accommodate the Estate needs. Block B is the Commercial estate and ought to be considered on its own merits.

8. The development would require a substantial amount of tree clearance. Numerous valuable deciduous trees have already been removed or pollarded. The proposal is to remove a further 50 trees. This is a violation of nature and habitat and cannot be allowed to happen. As can be seen from the satellite images on the application, this woodland provides an important green habitat and needs to be protected. The proposed access road is also likely to endanger several trees protected by preservation orders.
9. No community engagement. Had the applicants followed National Guidance and carried out full Community Engagement, much time and expense could have been saved by the applicant as it would have ensured that many of the critical issues covered here would have surfaced and been brought to their attention.

Such a development would have a dramatic impact on the character of the area, it would have a major impact on the build form of the village and carry a significant risk to highway safety. I respectfully urge the council to consider all the points raised here in reaching your decision.

Mrs R Taylor - [REDACTED]

23rd Sept 2025