

Highway Development Management Consultation Response

Planning Application Ref: PL/2025/09378

Site Address: Parcels of agricultural land owned by Manor Farm, Kempsford in Marston Meysey Village.

Proposal: Change of use of agricultural land to allow use for temporary campsite (including caravans) in association with Fairford Royal International Air Tattoo (for up to 28 days annually).

Date of Consultation Response: 15/12/2025

I refer to the above planning application dated 28/11/2025 seeking permission for a change of use of agricultural land to allow use for temporary campsite (including caravans) in association with Fairford Royal International Air Tattoo (for up to 28 days annually).

The site is located on either side of a C classified section of public highway subject to a speed limit of 60mph, north of the village of Marston Mesey. On the northern site PROW footpath MMEY1 directly crosses the field, this would require a temporary diversion in order to facilitate the layout submitted for the campsite, the Countryside Access Team would be required to be consulted in this regard.

The application seeks to provide a large campsite and from the Traffic Management Plan submitted for the RIAT it would appear that one of the sites is already utilised as a car parking facility which is detailed in the report as the Green off-base car park and part of the identified green route to the site for visitors. There are two parking facilities detailed in this area with the larger off-base car park seemingly accommodating some 5,800 vehicles.

From the plans submitted it would appear that the proposals would utilise existing field access points, as they have previously been used to access the vehicle parking in prior years. It would be acceptable to utilise these access points for the northern camping proposals. South of the main road, there is an existing point of access identified which is also a field access, it is unclear if it is intended to have an additional access to the 'Green field at this point opposite, there is a note about 'speedbump? move further from road? Bridge?' is this intended to have traffic calming/pedestrian crossing/footbridge structure?

The south field access would be considered to be intensified by the proposals and as such it would be required to demonstrate visibility splays commensurate with the speed on the road and on a setback of 2.4m. Given that the existing field access to the south has an unconsolidated surface, it would be required to surface this as per the other accesses to prevent loose materials entering the public highway.

The indicative site layout details 54 bell tents for glamping and 466 10x8m camping plots on the north field, the south field has 239 10x8m plots. There are only 130 vehicle parking spaces detailed which I assume are for the bell tents, it is unclear if there is sufficient space for parking within each camping plot, this should be clarified. The camping plots are not designated for a specific use, these could be tents/caravans/campervans, as such the access points with the public highway would require a swept path analysis to ensure that two-way movements through each access point would not impede the flow of traffic on the public highway through unnecessary or unachievable manoeuvres. It is noted that it is proposed to limit the number of caravan pitches to 50, however, safe and appropriate access should be demonstrated.

The total number of plots proposed for camping and glamping are 759, this has the potential to reduce vehicle attraction to the site which previously allowed for some 5,800 vehicles, working on a basis of 1 vehicle per plot. Though I would query where the additional 5000 vehicles usually accommodated by this parking would be located as the Traffic Management Plan for the event seems to rely on this temporary parking facility.

It is recognised that the proposals would include camping over multiple nights and therefore I have made the assumption that the existing site use would generate a maximum of 5800 vehicles, equating to some 11,600 two-way vehicle movements per day, the limited number of pitches and parking over the two fields could potentially generate more than one trip per day to access facilities/amenities off-site but this would be considered a reduction over the existing generation.

The proposed access visibility, with particular reference to the south field, is required to be demonstrated, therefore this needs to be submitted with the application and this is to include clarity on the note on the indicative site layout as mentioned above, as well as clear pedestrian routes through the site and crossing the road.

In addition to this, parking provision and a comparison of existing and proposed use, as well as the implications of removing the 5800-space parking facility is required to be clarified. Once this information is received then I will be in a position to make further comments and recommendations with regard to the application.

If you have any queries regarding the above advice, please contact:
HighwaysDevelopment@wiltshire.gov.uk