

REPORT TO THE SOUTHERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

Date of Meeting:	12 th July 2012		
Application Number:	S/2012/0175/Full		
Site Address:	Land adjacent Broxmore Drove Cottage, Salisbury Road, Sherfield English, Romsey. SO51 6FQ		
Proposal:	Erection of a stable building, horse walker and parking area, using existing access.		
Applicant / Agent:	Southern Planning Practice		
City/Town/Parish Council	Whiteparish Parish Council		
Electoral Division	Alderbury and Whiteparish	Unitary Member	Cllr Richard Britton
Grid Reference:	Easting: 427198.59		Northing: 123099.39
Type of Application:	Major		
Conservation Area:	Cons Area: - NA		LB Grade:- NA
Case Officer:	Mrs. Becky Jones		Contact Number: 01722 434388

Reason for the application being considered by Committee

Cllr Britton has called the item to committee on the grounds of the scale of development, visual impact on the surrounding area, relationship to adjoining properties, environmental/highway impact, Parish Council objections and concern that Test Valley Borough Council maintain strong opposition on landscape impact grounds.

1. Purpose of report

To consider the above application and to recommendation of the Area Development Manager that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to conditions.

2. Report summary

The main issues in the consideration of this application are as follows

1. Policy principles for equestrian development in the countryside
2. Scale, design and impact on the character of the Special Landscape Area
3. Loss of agricultural land
4. Impacts on neighbouring amenities
5. Ecology, drainage and waste management (impact on Area of High Ecological Value)
6. Equestrian Welfare
7. Highway safety

3 letters of objection. 2 letters of support.

Objections from Whiteparish Parish Council and Test Valley Borough Council Landscape Officer.

Support from Wiltshire Council Public Protection, Environment Agency, Landscape and Highways.

3. Site Description

The site comprises 9.56 hectares of land to the south of the A27, west of Sherfield English. It is accessed via an unmade track off the A27 which forms a boundary between Test Valley BC and Wiltshire Council. The track is a right of way (public footpath). Between the track and the A27 is a substantial tree belt. From the site looking south, the land rises towards the south up to a small ridge and tree belts can be seen in the distance to the south, east and west. There is a timber gate and a short section of close board fencing on the north east boundary, separating the site from a drainage ditch and an adjacent barn. A metal gate on the north east corner provides a right of access to other farmland. The east, south and west boundaries comprise post and rail fencing and hedgerows. Land to the south is used for the keeping and grazing of horses.

The dwelling, a timber garage block (which are both in Test Valley BC) the existing parking area and a pair of stable buildings are sited close to the north boundary and the existing ménage lies between the two areas of the site. Work on the development has commenced, the fence has been erected, the horse walker installed and the paving has been laid. The proposed stable building would be sited on the lowest part of the site, to the east of the ménage.

Neighbouring properties on the north side of the A27 include: Brocklands, East Lodge and Westlyn to the north opposite Broxmore Drove Cottage and Boundary House to the east. To the south east lie two agricultural buildings. To the east are dwellings and a stable building at Broxmore Farm.

4. Relevant Planning History

Application	Proposal	Decision
S/2009/0423	Retrospective application for change of use of land to equestrian use and erection of stables, kennels and store	Approved
S/2011/0695	Erection of stable building, installation of horse walker and creation of parking area.	Withdrawn

The site is partially within Test Valley BC and applications for a replacement dwelling & garage and a conservatory were approved in 2006.

5. Proposal

The applicant is seeking retrospective consent for replacement stables, a horse walker, a temporary section of 2 metre high fencing and a parking area. The development is stated to be for personal use and is not an equestrian business. One groom is currently employed on site. Existing stables to the south of the dwelling would be demolished and the proposed stables would be linked to the cottage via a walkway past the ménage.

Stables: The “L” shaped stable building would measure about 5m in height, 22m wide and 38m long. It would house up to 13 horses, with feeding areas and storage. It would be set into a slight slope as the land rises to the south, with the south end being about 1.4m below ground level. Walls would be clad in timber and a composite brown material would form the roof. A report on the need for the development is submitted by the Equine Consultancy Group and outlines the national showjumping, showing and scurry driving competitions undertaken by the horses, ridden by local riders.

Walker: The horse walker would be about 2m high and 11m wide. It would have a metal frame, with composite panels and cement sheets for the roof, enclosed with a galvanised steel mesh.

Access: The access is via the existing track to Broxmore Drove Cottage and a short extension would lead from the access track to the stables, over TVBC land. Access has also been maintained through the gates for a local farmer. The parking and turning area has been constructed from block paving, north west of the stable building. Block paving was proposed as it was considered suitable for drainage over the clay soils

Drainage: A new sewage treatment plant is proposed with rainwater harvesting tanks for water supply. A non mains drainage assessment has been submitted (in accordance with Circular 3/99) and there are no mains drainage in the vicinity. Manure would be stored to the south east of the stable and removed regularly by a local farmer.

Landscape: Amended plans propose hedgerow replacement planting to the north boundary between the existing drainage ditch and the existing close boarded fence, which would remain as a temporary enclosure until the hedge is re-established. A section of about 50metres of hedge was removed, and the applicant suggests that this enabled clearance of the ditch to prevent flooding elsewhere on site. The committee slide shows that the remaining hedge to the east falls across the ditch. The existing hedgerow to the east boundary would be retained with repairs to some of the gaps. A landscape plan has been submitted. The close board fence is considered to be permitted development.

6. Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (which has superseded PPS7 and PPS25)

Saved policies of the Salisbury District Local Plan:

G2 General Principles for Development

D2 Design

C2 Countryside and C6 Special Landscape Area

C11 Areas of High Ecological Value

C8 Loss of hedgerows

C19 Protection of agricultural land (Grades 1,2 3a)

R1C Outdoor recreation facilities

South Wiltshire Core Strategy:

Core Policy 22 Green Infrastructure and Habitat networks

7. Consultations

Whiteparish Parish Council

Object on the grounds that the proposal contravenes Local Plan Policy C6 and R1C.

Public Protection

No objection subject to a condition regarding stable waste disposal

Environment Agency

No objection, subject to an informative regarding stable waste disposal and watercourses and non mains drainage.

Highways

No objection.

WC Landscape Officer

No objection to amended scheme, subject to conditions

TVBC Landscape Officer

Objection on landscape impact grounds

British Horse Society

No objection to grazing land to horse ratio

8. Publicity

The application was advertised by advert, site notice, and neighbour consultation which expired on 8th March. Third parties objected on the following general grounds:

- Building too large, urban features in the countryside,
- visible from public areas, intrusion, out of scale
- should be sited closer to property
- large hedgerow removed, impact on hedge roots,
- access and parking area and close board fence not in keeping,
- commercial scale and nature of proposal, future commercial use of site? Full time groom is an employee
- highways safety issues with use of A27, danger from horse boxes and extra use of site, danger to riders and drivers.
- impact on pond and watercourses from stable waste run off. Soil dumping – impact on wildlife and visual amenity. Smell, flies, noise and disturbance from events.
- arrangements as stated could change in the future.

1 letter of support from **Seadown Veterinary Group** – comments regarding use of the land for grazing and number of animals being acceptable for the size, given appropriate management.

British Horse Society – 2 letters of support. Comments regarding use of office, grazing and equipment suitability for number of horses, non-commercial use.

9. Planning Considerations

9.1 Policy Principles for equestrian development in the countryside

The National Planning Policy Framework sets out up to date guidance for considering the application. Neither the Salisbury District Local Plan nor the South Wiltshire Core Strategy nor the NPPF contain any specific policies for *equestrian* development.

Policy C2 and C6 of the SDLP set out the criteria for new development in the countryside. Development must maintain or enhance the environment and the siting and scale must be sympathetic with the landscape. High standards of landscaping and design are expected, using materials which are appropriate to the locality. Policy C8 addresses replacement of lost hedgerows and C11 seeks to protect nature conservation interests within the AHEV.

Policy R1C (ii) states that new outdoor recreation facilities will be allowed provided there is be no significant adverse impact on the surrounding landscape or nature conservation value of the area, there is a satisfactory means of access, the local highway network is adequate and appropriate services can be made available. The proposal must not be dependent on the construction of large buildings or other structures and there must be no adverse impact on residential amenity or other recreational users.

The NPPF still requires development to be in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise and there is also a presumption in favour of

sustainable development under Section 14. However, where the local plan is absent, silent or out of date, permission should be granted unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the framework as a whole or
- Specific policies in the framework indicate development should be restricted.

Para 28 encourages LPAs to support sustainable rural leisure developments that benefit businesses and communities in rural areas and which respect the character of the countryside. Para 118 states that LPAs should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts) adequately mitigated or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. Para 178 encourages co-operation across administrative boundaries.

In conclusion, the NPPF does not provide specific guidance for equestrian development. Therefore, the proposal would be acceptable in principle and must be determined in accordance with the development plan, including the saved policies of the SDLP, and other material considerations.

9.2 Scale, design and impact on the character of the Special Landscape Area

Policy C2, C6 and R1C set out the main criteria for the development. The site is designated as part of the Special Landscape Area because its landscape qualities are of local importance. The Local Planning Authority therefore has a duty to ensure that such landscape is protected from development which would adversely affect its visual quality. Broxmore Drove is situated on the south east fringe of Wiltshire within the Landford Forest Heath Mosaic landscape character area (Salisbury District LCA 2008). The landscape is considered to be in good condition with high landscape character sensitivity resulting from the rural wooded character interspersed with fields, bounded by hedgerows and mature trees. Visual sensitivity is considered moderate as views are limited by the woodland mosaic and mature hedgerows.

The landscape officers of Wiltshire and Test Valley councils have been consulted, and whilst most of their concerns have been addressed by the applicant, three differences remain:

- a) The siting of the stables, away from the main dwelling and existing stable block
- b) The use of paving for the parking area
- c) The removal of an existing hedge, and a desire to remove the existing fence to enable its successful replacement.

Their comments are set out in Appendix 1 and their differences are discussed. The views expressed below are the conclusions of the case officer.

9.21 Siting

The change of use of the land from an agricultural use to the grazing of horses was previously considered by the case officer for S/2009/423 unlikely to detrimentally affect the visual amenities of the surrounding countryside, "Particularly as the site has little impact on the wider landscape." Additionally it was considered that the impact on the visual amenities of the area from horses grazing the land would certainly be no greater than if the land was used for the grazing of farm animals.

The current application also includes the erection of new stable, parking and horse walker structures. To the north of the site is a woodland tree belt and the whole site is relatively secluded from the public view, being generally surrounded by trees, sloping contours and

hedges. The stable building is sited on the lowest part of the land. The WC landscape officer considers that the submitted plans demonstrate that the stable is not situated in a visually prominent position, and in fact, is sited on low lying ground in relation to the surroundings. The site is not clearly visible from the A27, any of the nearby properties to the north or east, and is not visible from the public footpath to the north due to high hedges adjoining the track. Furthermore, the structures do not exceed 5.6m in height. It is therefore difficult to argue that the siting and scale would not be sympathetic with the landscape (Policy C6) or that there would be a significant adverse impact on the surrounding landscape (Policy R1C). Please refer to the illustrative sections and committee photo slides.

The existing stable buildings by the cottage are to be removed, and this could be suitably conditioned. This would help address the TVBC concerns about the relationship between the existing and replacement buildings. The resultant group of buildings (the cottage in the west, the ménage, and the stable/walker in the west) seem to form a visually logical (albeit large) linked complex which is not out of place in a rural area where there are isolated groups of buildings. It is arguably preferable for such a large number of horses (13) not to be sited so close to the dwelling and neighbouring properties opposite the cottage. Officers have also considered that had the proposed buildings been for agricultural use, their visual impact may have been much greater. A cow barn or grain silo or drying barn for example could be much taller, with a concrete or tarmac yard.

9.22 Paving and access:

The existing track access, which is also a public right of way, has been used as a vehicular means of access to the adjacent woodland and farm fields. Therefore the use of the access by equestrian vehicles is considered to have no additional detrimental visual impact and the proposed use of paving for the parking area would provide suitable drainage and is visually more sympathetic than tarmac or concrete. The siting of the paving is on low lying ground and when viewed on site, it is not visually prominent within the landscape.

9.23 Replacement hedge and removal of fence:

The close board fence is considered by WC and TVBC officers to be permitted development under Part 2 Class A of the GPDO 1995, as submitted plans show it to be 2 metres in height. The removal of a hedgerow was however unauthorised and Policy C8 seeks its replacement. Therefore, as the fence itself would be permitted development and could be resited without planning permission, it is not unreasonable for it to remain in situ for a temporary period of 5 years, whilst the hedge is re-established. The TVBC landscape officer considers that the fence is too close to the ditch to plant a hedge successfully. However, the photo indicates that the existing section of hedge to the east is growing across and in the ditch and that there is room beside the fence to plant. A landscape plan has been submitted in order to strengthen and enhance the existing landscape elements, replace and repair damage. The condition must require replacement planting should the hedge die or be damaged within 5 years.

Overall, it is considered that the impact of the proposal on the countryside and the Special Landscape Area is not sufficiently harmful to the visual amenities of the area to warrant refusal on landscape impact grounds. The siting, scale and materials proposed would be acceptable for the proposed equestrian use. Furthermore, the application would not seem to pass the NPPF test against granting permission: *“any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in the framework as a whole.*

9.3 Loss of Agricultural land

The grazing land included within the red line of the application is Grade 3 in agricultural value. This is not the best and most versatile agricultural land which Policy C19 seeks to protect from development. Moreover, this change of use would not result in an irretrievable loss of agricultural land. The use of this land for the keeping of horses is therefore compatible with the aims of the saved Salisbury District Local Plan Policy C19.

9.4 Impact on amenities/neighbours

The site can only be glimpsed through the tree belt adjacent to the A27. It can't be seen at all from the east and the Broxmore Farm complex. Three objections have been received, one from a Romsey resident, and two are from occupiers of dwellings located about 60 metres west from the site entrance. The site is comparatively isolated and well screened, and therefore, the development is unlikely to have any significant impact upon the amenities of the dwellings in the locality. A condition should be attached to ensure that waste is properly managed on site, to prevent any smell nuisance. Therefore, residential amenities would not be unduly disturbed in accordance with Policy G2.

To the north of the buildings is the public footpath, but given the siting of the buildings about 35 metres south of the footpath, their low height, and the dense hedge which lines the boundary with the footpath, it is considered that the development would not have a detrimental impact upon the character of the public footpath or the amenities of persons using the public footpath.

9.5. Ecology, drainage and waste management

Policy C11 seeks to ensure that harm to wildlife in the Area of High Ecological Value is minimised and lost habitats are replaced. NPPF Para 118 states that LPAs should aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and if significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts) *adequately mitigated* or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused. One of the main areas of concern for the two local planning authorities concerns the removal of a section of hedgerow. Whilst the removal of the hedge was unauthorised, the applicant has agreed to a planning condition to plant a replacement hedge and eventually remove the fence once the hedge is established. This is considered to be acceptable mitigation for the scheme, in compliance with the NPPF, Policy C8 and Policy C11.

A non mains drainage assessment has been submitted to demonstrate the need for and suitability of a sewage treatment plant for the site. The Environment Agency and Public Protection officer have raised no objections to the development, subject to informatives requiring the applicant to obtain an Environmental Permit and storage of manure in relation to watercourses and neighbours. This also addresses some third party objections.

An informative has been added relating to demolition of the existing stables and potential for bats.

9.6 Relationship between site area, stable size and number of horses

It has been suggested by consultees that the stable building is too large for the site. The British Horse Society recommends a ratio of 2 horses per hectare on permanent grazing land (or 1 to 1.5 acres per horse). However, the BHS has stated that as stabling is being provided for the development, the ratio can be less. The area of grazing available is 21 acres to 13 horses, and no objection is raised by the Society to the ratio. Seadown Veterinary Group has also written in support, stating that the horses are in good condition and health. As three of the animals are small (ponies and a donkey) they have less impact

on the grazing than a horse. Two of the competition horses are only grazed for a couple of hours each day, and a further 8 animals are housed at night. The vet considers that with proper management of the land, the grazing area is more than adequate for the number and type of equines kept at the property.

A report has been submitted by the Equine Consultancy Group, and covers the issues of equine routine and turn out, health and welfare, and explains the use of the office, hay store, feed room, and rest room in relation to the number of horses on site.

9.7 Highway issues

The site is in a rural area of land, however, given that the land and buildings will be used solely by the applicant for their own enjoyment and not for commercial purposes, there are no objections to the proposal in terms of highway safety or sustainability.

10 Conclusion

Equestrian development is an acceptable form of leisure or business development in the countryside. In this case, the proposal is for private use whilst providing employment for one groom and ensuring the welfare of competition and leisure horses. The NPPF encourages LPAs to support sustainable rural leisure developments that benefit businesses and communities in rural areas and which respect the character of the countryside. If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or compensated for, then planning permission should be refused.

However, in this case, it is considered that there would be no undue disturbance to neighbouring properties, the site is well screened by natural landforms, tree belts and hedges, the lost hedgerow could be replaced through condition and the applicant has agreed to remove the close board fence (although permitted development) once the hedge is re-established. The paving, which is in situ, provides drainage and is not visually harmful due to its siting on low lying ground. Highway safety and the amenity of users of the public footpath would not be detrimentally affected, and subject to appropriate conditions relating to waste management and treatment of foul waste, ecological interests in the AHEV would not be harmed.

11. Recommendation:

Planning Permission be GRANTED for the following reasons:

The proposed equestrian development would be an acceptable form of leisure development in the countryside and is for personal use only. There would be no undue disturbance to neighbouring properties, given the screening and separation of the site in relation to residential dwellings and the proposed stable waste management plan. (Policy G2).

There would be no visual harm to the character of the Special Landscape Area as the site is well screened by natural landforms, tree belts and hedges and the single storey buildings are positioned

on the lowest part of the site. The siting of the buildings physically relates to the ménage and cottage and the existing stables would be removed. The proposed materials are acceptable. (Policy C2, C6, R1C and CP22).

The former hedgerow on the north boundary would be replaced and the existing close board fence would be removed once the hedge is re-established. The paving, which is in situ, provides drainage and is not visually harmful due to its siting on level, low lying ground (Policy C8, C11, C6, R1C and CP22).

Highway safety and the amenity of users of the public footpath would not be detrimentally affected (Policy G2). Ecological and nature conservation interests in the Area of High Ecological Value would not be harmed, provided the waste management plan is adhered to and the sewage treatment plant is installed (Policy C11).

And subject to the following conditions:

1. The erection of the stable building shall not commence on site until details and samples of the materials to be used for the external walls and roofs have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity and the character and appearance of the area.
POLICY- C6 Special Landscape Area

2. The erection of the stable building hereby approved shall not commence on site until a scheme of hedgerow planting has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with plan ref 021-Sullivan-SP-36711-A2 Rev B. The details shall include:

- (a) indications of all existing hedgerows to the north and east of the proposed stable building,
- (b) details of any to be retained, together with measures for their protection in the course of development;
- (c) details of proposed species, planting sizes, planting densities and planting position in relation to the temporary close board fence and drainage ditch;

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development, provision of a replacement hedge on the north boundary and the protection of existing important landscape features.

POLICY- C6 Special Landscape Area and C8 Hedgerows

3. All soft landscaping and hedgerow planting comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the first occupation of the stable building or the completion of the development whichever is the sooner. All shrubs and hedge planting shall be maintained free from weeds and shall be protected from damage by vermin and stock. Any plants which, within a period of five years, die, are removed, or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

REASON: To ensure a satisfactory landscaped setting for the development, replacement hedge planting and the protection of existing important landscape features.

POLICY- C6 Special Landscape Area and C8 Hedgerows

4. The existing 2 metre high close board fence on the north boundary of the site (as shown on plan ref 021-Sullivan-SP-36711-A2 Rev B) and the pair of stable buildings to the south east of the dwelling (as shown on plan ref 028-OSULLIVAN-LP-36781-A3) shall be removed within 5 years from the date of this approval.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity, to ensure the successful re-establishment and prosperity of the hedgerow on the north boundary and in the interests of providing a suitably landscaped setting for the development.

POLICY- C6 Special Landscape Area and C8 Hedgerows

5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking or re-enacting or amending that Order with or without modification), no gates, fences, walls or other means of enclosure, other than the temporary fence shown on the approved plans, shall be erected on the site (denoted by the approved red line) without the prior consent of the Local Planning Authority.

REASON: In the interests of visual amenity.

POLICY- C6 Special Landscape Area and C8 hedgerows

6. The stable building hereby permitted shall not be occupied until the approved sewage treatment plant works proposed have been completed in accordance with the submitted and approved details.

REASON: To ensure that the development is provided with a satisfactory means of drainage and in the interests of neighbouring amenity.

POLICY- G2 General Principles for Development

7. Erection of the stable building shall not commence on site until details for the storage of manure and soiled bedding (including the location of such storage) and its disposal from site (including frequency) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Before the development is first brought into use, the works for such storage and disposal shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and shall subsequently be maintained in accordance with the approved details. No storage of manure and soiled bedding shall take place outside of the storage area approved under this condition.

REASON: In the interests of public health and safety, in order to protect the natural environment and prevent pollution.

POLICY- G2 General Principles for Development and C11 Area of High Ecological Value

8. The development hereby permitted shall only be used for the private stabling, grazing and exercise of horses and the storage of associated equipment and feed, and for purposes ancillary to the residential occupation of the dwelling known as Broxmore Drove Cottage. It shall at no time be used for any commercial purpose whatsoever, including for livery, or in connection with equestrian tuition, competitions/events or leisure rides.

REASON: To protect the living conditions of nearby residents and to ensure that existing highway safety arrangements are not compromised.

POLICY- G2 General Principles for Development

9. The development shall be in accordance with the following drawings and plans:

Wilts/17/IE/003, Sections, dated 25/4/12, received 3/5/12

02 WCR Ltr 010512 Letter from Southern Planning Practice 3rd May 2012, received 3/5/12

Report on the Nedd or Stabling and Ancillary Equine Related Development, Equine Consultancy Group, 3rd May 2012, received 3/5/12

Personal Statement, received 23/1/12

Design, Access and Planning Statement, Southern Planning Practice, received 23/1/12

WPL Diamond DMS Sewage Treatment Plant details, 10/1/12, received 13/1/12

Monarch Equestrian Consort Plus, Horse Exerciser Details, 2/11/12, received 13/1/12

WILTS/17 IE Jan 2012 Assessment of Non Mains Drainage, Southern Planning Practice, received 23/1/12

028-OSULLIVAN-LP-36781-A3 dated 19th Jan 2012 Location Plan (and red line) received 24/1/12

021-OSULLIVAN-SP-36711-A2 B 18th April 2012, Site Plan and Section, received 3/5/12
026-OSULLIVAN-PR-36711-A2 A 2nd May 2012, Section and 3D views of stable and horsewalker, received 3/5/12
025-OSULLIVAN-PR-SB-36711-A1 B dated 2nd May 2012, Elevations of stable building and horsewalker received 3/5/12

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Informatives:

1. This decision has been taken in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, Salisbury District Local Plan saved policies G2, D2, C2, C6, C11, C8, C19 and R1C and the South Wiltshire Core Strategy Core Policy 22 and Appendix C.
2. In compiling the waste management plan, the applicant should note that stable waste should not be stored or burnt adjacent to neighbouring properties. Any manure including that mixed with straw once removed from the building can be stored in heaps, provided they are further than 10 metres from any watercourse. There is no requirement to construct a purpose made store. Manure must not be spread within 10 metres of any watercourse and application rates must not exceed permitted levels if the site lies within a nitrate vulnerable zone. Manure heaps should not be stored closer than 50 metres from a licensed abstraction or private water supply source.
3. The applicant's attention is drawn to the informatives and requirements in the letter from the Environment Agency dated 17th February 2012. An Environmental permit may be required for the non mains foul drainage. Contact 03708 506506.
4. The applicant is advised that the LPA has no records of any planning history for the menage.
5. The applicant should note that under the terms of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, it is an offence to disturb nesting birds or roosting bats. You should note that the work hereby granted consent does not override the statutory protection afforded to these species and you are advised to seek expert advice if you suspect that the demolition of the stables would disturb any protected species. For further advice, please contact the district ecologist at Wiltshire Council.

Appendix 1: Comments from Wiltshire Council Landscape Officer and Test Valley Borough Council Landscape Officer

a) Wiltshire Council

Despite the large size of the stable I do not consider that the development has any far reaching harmful landscape effects on the Special Landscape Area or local landscape character for the following reasons:

The land at Broxmore Drove is enclosed by woodland to the north and south and hedgerows to the west and east. The topography is highest to the south and rolls down to the north towards the house and proposed stable. The combination of topography and vegetation provides visual enclosure to the development allowing only filtered views in winter from publically accessible areas (although these are further limited by the close boarded fence).

The landscape in the immediate vicinity of the house has a strong 'horsiculture' character typified by the stables, post and rail fencing, taped paddocks, menage, brightly coloured

jumps and other associated paraphernalia to do with the keeping of horses. Although the new stable is located away from the existing block it is still visually connected to the house and adjoins the existing menage. In my opinion it sits well within the existing land use.

Landscape enhancement measures

Two of the relevant management objectives described in the Salisbury District LCA for this character area are

Minimise small scale incremental change such as fencing which could change the rural character of the landscape

Retain and manage medium scale pastoral fields with dense hedgerow network and nurture new hedgerow trees

I do not consider the close boarded fence to be an appropriate means of enclosure within this rural landscape context. I recommend that the fence is retained as a temporary means of enclosure and a hedgerow with trees is planted along its length. In the medium to long term, 6 – 9 years the hedgerow will provide a 2 – 3m high natural enclosure and the close boarded fence could be replaced with post and rail.

I recommend that a condition is included for the provision of a landscape plan to be agreed with this authority detailing the proposed hedgerow to the north of the stable and any other appropriate planting e.g. gapping up existing hedges and planting hedgerow trees which will strengthen the visual and landscape context of the development.

Thank you for the additional information in relation to the proposed new stable at Broxmore Farm.

I am satisfied that the applicant has addressed my concerns with regard to the close boarded fence, strengthening and replanting of hedgerows.

The illustrative cross sections and spot heights confirm my original observations that the stable is not situated in a visually prominent position.

My comments regarding the solar panels and their potential to be shaded was an observation not a requirement and I hope that there will be the opportunity to reintroduce them at a future stage if viable.

I cannot comment on the equine report as this is not my area of expertise. However I do think that the applicant has made a full justification for the development but I will leave that for your consideration.

The comments from the applicants agent regarding the surfacing are rather dismissive and I am sure that had I the time to research the issue could demonstrate that there are indeed alternative options to block pavers. However I am happy to accept that they will provide an important drainage function on the site, they do not have a negative influence upon the public realm or the surrounding countryside and I do not raise any objection to their retention.

b) Test Valley

In considering the additional information I would advise the following

Whilst the Equine Consultancy Group report is comprehensive in advising why it is beneficial to have the appropriate amount of stabling to number of horses for equine health and welfare, much of this is general information applying in any case. It does not address the fundamental siting and design issues of this site.

The report does not advise if a greater number of stables are required, why the approach has not been to build a further unit to existing stables or demolish existing stables and build a larger unit in their place. It provides no explanation as to why the stables are so remote from the main dwelling. It does not advise what is to happen to the existing stables.

(Case officer note: the existing stables are stated to be demolished in the supporting documentation. This can be conditioned. It is likely to be reasons of personal preference not to locate the 13 horses so close to the cottage. When walking though the site, there is a logical flow from the cottage and its grounds, past the kennels, through the current stable yard, across the ménage to the site of the proposed stables.)

The changes to the internal arrangements have no impact on the footprint of the building and has done nothing to reduce its size and therefore its visual impact. The Equine Report provides no information as to why so many facilities are still required, such as an office and rest room, for stabling that is essentially for private use.

(Case officer note: again, it is likely to be personal preference to provide these facilities for private use, and the need is driven by the national competition activities outlined in the statement of need report.)

If the existing stables are not to be demolished, then this combined with the new proposals would appear to exceed the capacity of the land which will adversely affect the quality of the landscape.

I also cannot agree that this is the best location on the site when no alternative proposals appear to have been examined around new stables being closely allied to their existing location clustering with other equestrian activity and structures, and therefore minimising the impact on the more open landscape that is shared with Test Valley. As such it would still appear to be additional proliferation of equine buildings in the countryside to the detriment of the local landscape character.

(Case Officer note on alternative proposals: providing the stable for 13 horses closer to Broxmore Drove Cottage is likely to increase potential noise disturbance to the three dwellings located opposite the cottage).

With regard to the close board fence I can see no justification for its retention even as a temporary structure. In terms of security it is not usual to use a 2mt close boarded fencing as stock proof fencing in the countryside. It is wholly out of keeping, and impractical for equine use. There would appear to be no need for such a fence for privacy as a boundary for land to graze horses. The suggestion to plant a hedgerow on the outside of the fence in its current position as mitigation is clearly impractical as the fence is so close to the edge of the bank and ditch, that it would render access to planting impossible without removing said fence. The fence can and should be removed immediately to be replaced with a stock proof fence appropriate with agricultural/equestrian land use, allowing the hedgerow to be replanted which was removed contrary to the hedgerow regulations.

(Case Officer note: Members may agree with this point but the condition could be suitably worded to ensure that if the hedgerow should die or be unsuccessful after 5 years, the hedge planting is replaced. The fence can be conditioned to be removed within 5 years time).

If in the event of an application being successful, this would not alter the predominant land use from equestrian. The close board fencing would still be inappropriate, and its early removal, replacement and replanting should be secured by condition.

(Case Officer note: the hedge is unfortunately permitted development as it is 2 metres in height. However, the applicant has agreed to its removal or suitable replacement within 5 years).

The other main landscape impact as viewed from Test Valley is on the access. The alterations for the access which appear as a consequence of such a large equestrian unit being located remote from the main dwelling, and has resulted in an adverse impact on the rural character of the landscape. The use of block paving and gate furniture is wholly out of keeping for this location. The proposal that this is required to allow the access by farm machinery such as combine harvesters would seem unjustifiable. Such a low level use would be consistent with the use of a farm gate wide enough for the machinery and a grass or gravel track. I would support the approach from WCC to request replacement of the block paving with surfacing more sympathetic, such as re-inforced grass or local stone/gravel both of which can accommodate the need for good drainage, and access.

(Case officer note: officers considers that the block paving does have an important drainage function on the clay soil, and does not have a negative visual impact on the public realm or surrounding countryside as it is sited on flat, low lying ground. The paving is preferable to tarmac or concrete, often seen in agricultural schemes).

The submission of this additional information has not addressed the impacts on the landscape as viewed from Test Valley and as such my objection remains.

(The landscape officer was then advised by the TC case officer that the fence is 2metres in height and that this element is permitted development and doesn't need planning permission).

I would consider there are two further comments in the light of this information.

The fence was constructed by removing a line of an existing hedgerow. As this was carried out without the necessary notification, the hedgerow was removed contrary to the hedgerow regulations. This was a strict offence and the hedgerow should be replanted. In order to do this the fence would need to be removed.

If the planning application is otherwise to be successful it should be subject to a landscape scheme, secured by condition, and in order to integrate this in to the landscape successfully and mitigate any visual harm, it must include the planting of a hedgerow on the line of the fence. In order to do this the fence would need to be removed (also secured by condition) in order to make room for sufficient landscaping.

(Case officer note: Please refer to the committee slide. There is room between the fence and the drainage ditch for the hedgerow to be replanted. The remaining section of hedge straddles the ditch as can be seen on the photo. Please also refer to conditions).