

**Our Ref:** NRH/TAP/WS1035  
**Your Ref:**

**E-mail:** haywardn@rpsgroup.com  
**Direct Dial:** 01793 816956  
**Date:** 12 July 2006

Head of Development Services  
Salisbury District Council  
Planning Office  
61 Wyndham Road  
Salisbury  
Wiltshire  
SP1 3AH

By post and e-mail

For the attention of Mr T Wippell



Dear Mr Wippell

**Application for Erection of Fishing Hut (Retrospective) at Great Durnford Manor, Great Durnford, Salisbury  
Planning Application Ref. S/2006/1201**

I am writing on behalf of my clients, Mr & Mrs G M Sumner, of Lake House, Wilsford-cum-Lake, to object to the above planning application. My clients' property and estate lies on the west side of the River Avon, opposite the fishing hut.

My clients object to the proposal in the following terms:

1. The fishing hut was erected, without planning permission, in March 2006. My clients drew this to the Local Planning Authority's attention and a planning application was subsequently submitted by Mr d'Arcy Irvine, the landowner. My clients are grateful that the Council responded promptly when the infringement of planning control was brought to its attention. However it is considered that there are other potential breaches of planning control which are not covered by the application.

It appears that the applicant has created a new access roadway with parking area to serve the hut. A "banjo" style loop immediately behind the hut has been provided to enable vehicles to visit and service the hut. This is shown on the attached photographs at Annex 1 to this letter. The photographs also shows part of the access roadway in front of the hut; it appears to have been provided solely to serve the hut and the creation of the turning loop indicates evidence of the intention to use the hut for permanent and commercial usage.

The applicant had informed my clients by letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> May that there was a pre existing track and that it had merely been repaired and reseeded enabling it to blend into the landscape. It may have been the case that an informal grassed track existed at least in part alongside the river. However resurfacing and improvement works

have clearly taken place in recent months and the access roadway is very visible, with no sign of any significant grass growth. My clients have lived at Lake House since 1992 and deny that there has ever been a trackway, at least in its current location. Indeed the attached ordnance survey map extract (2006) shows no evidence of such a track (Annex 2). At the very least engineering works appear to have been carried out to form a more robust and useable surface presumably to enable the hut to be serviced whilst in use as a corporate fishing facility. My clients consider that planning permission should be sought for the completed works including the provision of the parking area.

2. Secondly, my clients believe that a septic tank has been installed to serve the hut. Estate staff who are employed by my clients saw the tank on site prior to its installation in early March this year.

However, it is noted that question 13 on the planning application form relating to the disposal of surface water and sewage has not been answered. Additionally blue plastic water pipes have been observed being laid in the trackway. Question 14 on the planning application form relating to water supply has also not been answered. A copy of advertising literature from Roxtons who are marketing the fishing at the Great Durnford Estate on a commercial basis is attached at Annex 3. This material states that "the lodge will be fully kitted out for riverside comfort" and is marketed as a venue for "riverside dining". The septic tank and water services which have been installed would appear to confirm the marketing information that the hut is fully serviced.

3. The applicant's agent states in a letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> June 2006 accompanying the application that the proposal conforms to advice in PPS7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas which supports farm diversification. However it is noted from the planning application form Certificate A regarding land ownership has been signed. This makes it clear that the application site is not part of an agricultural holding. The applicant cannot therefore reasonably rely upon guidance in PPS7 relating to farm diversification in support of the application.
4. The applicant has sought to justify the hut to my clients on the basis that it is a flat-pack, temporary structure to provide shelter for fishermen.

However it is clear that the hut is in reality a permanent structure constructed on a purpose built concrete base with water and septic tank services provided. The laying of the access road and turning loop/parking area goes further to indicate its permanent nature. The Roxtons promotional material supports my clients contention that the hut is serving a corporate fishing enterprise which is wholly inappropriate in planning and environmental policy terms.

5. PPS7 makes it clear at paragraph 1(iv) that new building development in the open countryside away from existing settlements, or outside areas allocated for development in development plans, should be strictly controlled; the government's overall aim is to protect the countryside for the sake of its intrinsic character and