

| | Online Comments |
|-----------------|--|
| Application No: | 19/10043/FUL |
| | <p>PLANNING APPLICATION 19/10043/FUL – SALT STORE AT HIGH POST</p> <p>We would respectfully request that when considering this application, you also take into account Planning Application 18/09327/FUL which seeks permission to build two factory units immediately adjacent to and sharing road access with the Salt Store. We consider that the effect of the two applications will, when taken together, have a far greater impact on the surrounding area than that they would if considered individually.</p> <p>Durnford Parish Council wishes to object to the above application on the following grounds.</p> <p>This site was originally developed on a greenfield site despite being contrary to existing Wiltshire County and Salisbury District Council policies and in the face of refusal by Salisbury District Council and objections from local parishes and residents. It was conceived as part of a strategic review and proposed rationalisation of Wiltshire Council salt storage facilities in about 2006/7. It seems that that review was seriously flawed as two of the new sites are already deemed unsuitable for use thereby requiring the extensive increase in the size and operations of the High Post Depot.</p> <p>Traffic.</p> <p>There is no Traffic Plan with the submitted plan so we have to utilise that submitted with the original proposals and extrapolate. It is concerning that the Design and Access Statement highlights “Increased intensity of use of the site”. There is some confusion as to how many vehicles operate out of the site as the initial proposal states seven vehicles but there is only garaging for six. As their calculations were based on seven, we will use that figure. Calculations used in the original application are flawed and seriously underestimated the flow of traffic in and out of the site (the plan averaged 0.8 movements per day whilst also stating that there would be a minimum of 1 visit to the site per day which is 2 movements...). Using the applicants own figures in para 4.4.2 of the Planning Policy Statement there would be nearly 2200 traffic movements in and out of the site annually – or 6 per day, every day of the year. If the site is expanded to house 10 vehicles (an increase of approximately 40%) with additional staff and the amount of salt rising from 1500 to 2500 tonnes (an increase of approximately 66%) there will obviously be a similar increase in vehicle movements – potentially an extra 1000+ movements per year. This is obviously not the whole case as the majority of vehicle movements will be condensed onto the 5 winter months when conditions are at their worst. The previous application had a condition that a Traffic Management Plan be written which was to include the statement “to ensure that Heavy Goods Vehicles do not use the Woodford Valley.” This condition does not appear to be quoted or recognised in the current plan. Study of the Risk Analysis plan considers site access to be “high risk” which does not give locals much confidence. It also identifies lack of parking on the site as an Amber Risk.</p> <p>Buildings, Planting and shielding.</p> <p>The site is within the 132 Salisbury Plain and West Wiltshire Downs but the Landscape and Visual Assessment whilst stating that “The special character of the landscape in this area is worthy of being preserved” it does not consider it “appropriate” to carry out an assessment for this development due to its scale. In addition, the Assessment quotes building heights that seem to be at variance with those on the Design and Access Statement. Further, in the reports Landscape</p> |

Character Type Sensitivity section it states under Landscape Quality that there is “the presence of new housing development” which is in fact well over a mile to the south. It also states the presence of “long, open views to the south and west”. Logic dictates that where there are views out there are equal views in!

The new Salt Storage Building is utilitarian and ugly. The planting scheme for the original development is inadequate and currently fails to shield the store in any way. In para 4.4 of the new Design Access Statement it states that “Other than the alterations to the yard hardstanding, no other external or soft landscaping works are proposed.” This despite the new salt store building coming forwards almost to the front of the site thereby losing the blending effect of the trees to the east and becoming more conspicuous. Nothing short of the planting of a belt of mature trees and bushes would begin to provide sufficient cover to conceal the bulk of the existing buildings and even then, would fail to conceal the factory style lighting. The original Design Access stated “The siting of the buildings within the site context will be an important element in achieving planning approval. Their scale and massing has been kept to a minimum to reduce their impact against the local distant environment.” It also states that “larger mass and height of building on site becoming more prominent in the local landscape”. The new proposals go against ethos of merging into the background completely. The Theoretical Visibility map is inaccurate as it allows for a building up to 8 metres high whereas the main Salt Storage building is in excess of 9 metres high. It also fails to take into account the sites visibility from local footpaths Durn20, Durn22, WFor8, WFor9 and others.

Light Pollution.

Currently the lights in the Store seem to be on every night irrespective of the time of year or weather conditions. The industrial units in the High Post Business Park are well shielded by high fir trees on their western boundary so there is little direct light pollution. However, the Depot is not shielded so the lights are visible from all across the Woodford Valley and beyond the A360 to the west. There is nothing in the application to suggest that there would be any improvement in that situation. The lighting plan is contradictory as it says in Note 3 that lights will only “operate when the facility is not in use” but in Note 9 it states that “For the majority of the year only the security lights be on, these are Photo cell and time clock controlled and provide illumination for the security cameras”. There are also more lights on the new buildings than the old.

General Points.

This proposal does little to benefit the local area as none of the local network of small roads is gritted.

There is no evidence of any financial benefit to the local area.

The A345 and other local roads were impassable during the last major snowfalls. How do the gritter drivers get to work in bad weather conditions?

The junction of High Post Road and the A345 has a record of road traffic collisions, what improvements will be made to reduce or at least contain this?

If the proposed adjacent factory units are built will both sites be able to properly dispose of surface water etc?

The Risk Assessment plan key does not fully match the symbols on the plan itself. For example, see Amber 03 on the plan which is Red 03 on the key and Amber 07 which is Green 07 on the key etc.

| | |
|----------|--|
| | <p>CONCLUSION.</p> <p>This area of Wiltshire is under constant pressure for inappropriate development, the Energy Storage Facility (luckily refused by Planning Committee and Planning Inspector), Naish's twin factories and this scheme are all submitted with little or no real consideration for the quality of the countryside and those who live or come to enjoy the peace and tranquillity that exists here. It is ironic that there is much quoting of the quality of the landscape and its character whilst attempting to justify imposing a "larger mass and height of building" on to it. We again request that you do not consider this application in isolation and that you do not allow the increase in industrial development in a rural environment.</p> |
| Name: | Robert Foster Durnford Parish Council |
| Address: | Club Cottage Middle Woodford Salisbury SP46NR |
| Date: | 28 November 2019 |