

APPLICATION NO.	P14/V2540/FUL
APPLICATION TYPE	FULL APPLICATION
REGISTERED	6.11.2014
PARISH	DRAYTON
WARD MEMBER(S)	Stuart Davenport
APPLICANT	Mr P Caudwell
SITE	Land East of Drayton, Drayton Road, Drayton, Abingdon, OX14 4HA
PROPOSAL	The erection of a new farmyard complex comprising a 4000 tonne grain store, straw barn, workshop and two smaller grain storage buildings. There will be a concrete apron area and weighbridge, with a new access track and entrance. The proposal also includes a landscaping scheme.(as per updated transport plan received on 29 January 2015 and as amended by agents email dated 16/02/2015 and revised landscape proposal Fig 6A landscape Proposal REV A)
AMENDMENTS	None
GRID REFERENCE	448511/194461
OFFICER	Charlotte Brewerton

SUMMARY

This planning application was presented and debated at the planning committee dated 22 April. During the debate it was identified that the proposed works had not been assessed by officers against the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan 20/20. Consequently, the planning application was deferred to allow officers the opportunity to assess the proposed works against the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan 20/20. In addition, Councillors requested further clarification on highway, soil contamination and mineral matters.

The application previously came to planning committee on 22 April as it is classed as a major application and has received 4 objections from local residents.

Whilst the Parish Council are not objecting to the application in principle, they do have some concerns with regard to the scale and size of the development and whether this is the correct location. This view is also shared by the 4 objections received from local residents.

The main planning considerations in the determination of this planning application are:

- The principle of development
- The impact upon the surrounding character & landscape
- The impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Transport Issues
- Drainage Issues
- Archaeology Issues

It is the opinion of Officers that the principle of a new farmyard agricultural complex within a countryside location is acceptable. The amalgamation of 3 sites in the district to 1 larger site in order to be in compliance with farming legislation and to consolidate operations to have a more effective and efficient business in this countryside location meets the three sustainability tests as specified in the NPPF.

Whilst the proposed works will create a larger operation rather than having it split between 3 sites its design, scale, layout and landscaping are considered to be appropriate. Furthermore an EIA is not required for this type of development identifying that there would be no significant harm on the surrounding environment.

The Highways Liaison Officer has had ongoing negotiations with the agent and is now satisfied that the proposed access and egress would have limited harm to the surrounding highway network and the drainage, soil deposition and archaeology impacts are acceptable.

Officers are therefore recommending this application for **approval**.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The application site lies to the east of Drayton Village boundary situated in a parcel of open countryside set back from the Drayton Road (B4016) by approximately 80m. The surrounding landscape forms part of the Lowland Vale character area and is within an area designated for landscape enhancement.
- 1.2 The village of Drayton is located approximately 300m from the proposed development site. A row of ribbon development leading out of Drayton along the B4016 is situated approximately 200m from the access road and 300m to the nearest building.
- 1.3 When travelling along the B4016 open views of the site are possible as the hedgerow along this road to the south has deteriorated. A footpath runs along the east of the application site and through the centre of the red line area but not through the location of the buildings as proposed. There is a small stable building currently on the eastern edge of the site and a number of horses graze the land. The site is considered to have an agricultural use.
- 1.4 There is a scrap/breakers yard located to the north of the site approximately 90m from the site.
- 1.5 At present the applicant has grain storage for 100 tonnes at its Sutton Courtenay site, 400 tonnes at Appleford, 1600 tonnes in Drayton and 500 tonnes in rented accommodation in Steventon. The units at Drayton are needing to be relocated due to the provision at Barrow Road for new homes as part of the 20/20 Drayton Plan.
- 1.6 The buildings at Sutton Courtenay and Appleford no longer meet the Grain Assurance Scheme given their current condition and would require considerable investment to bring these up to standard for storage. Given the need to relocate buildings from Drayton and the substandard buildings at Sutton Courtenay and Appleford the applicant considers that the most economical solution is to amalgamate the sites into one place of operations.
- 1.7 A location plan can be seen **attached** at Appendix 1.

2.0 PROPOSAL

- 2.1 This application seeks planning permission for a new farmyard complex on agricultural land to the east of Drayton. The proposal consists of one grain storage building capable of storing 4000 tonnes, which will measure 11.2m in height, one straw barn measuring 18m deep, 36.5m long and 7m in height and one workshop and sprayer storage building which will measure 20m deep, 35m wide and will stand at 7.6m to its ridge.
- 2.2 These buildings will surround a concrete apron yard area complete with weighbridge. A new access is proposed off the Drayton Road (B4016) with a passing place set back to

allow 2 vehicle movements at any one time.

2.3 Updated landscape plans have been submitted after discussions with the Councils Landscape Consultant. This now includes additional tree and hedgerow planting as per the submitted plans.

2.4 Top soil excavated from the site to accommodate the new buildings will be deposited on the field adjacent to the development site (to the north) to fill in the undulating nature of this field.

2.5 A temporary footpath diversion is required.

2.6 Extracts of the application plans can be seen **attached** at Appendix 2.

3.0 **SUMMARY OF CONSULTATIONS & REPRESENTATIONS**

3.1	Drayton Parish Council	<p>No Objection support the site in principle, but have considerable reservations over the size and scale of development and its industrial nature, traffic movements to and from the site and noise generation. Freeing site in Sutton Courtenay could open up the site for more housing?</p>
3.2	Archeology	<p>Objection (8 Dec 2014) The application site is within an area of considerable archaeological potential with significant archaeological monuments within the vicinity. In line with Paragraph 128 of the NPPF and Local Plan Policy HE9 we would recommend that a predetermination archaeological field evaluation is undertaken.</p> <p>No Objection (18 Feb 2015) The evaluation did not reveal any significant archaeological features and therefore no further archaeological investigation will be required. As such there are no archaeological constraints to this application.</p>
3.3	Highways	<p>Objection (8 Dec 2015) No Transport Statement provided to outline the volume of large farm vehicles expected to visit the site and a lack of drainage design incorporated with the application. The proposed permanent diversion of footpath 192/16 is not considered necessary or acceptable.</p> <p>No Objection (18 Feb 2015) Having assessed the transport management plan submitted in January 2015 there are no objections to the scheme subject to conditions.</p>

	<p>No Objection (27 Feb 2015) We can confirm that the measures identified in the Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted to County Highways are now considered sufficient to discharge the suggested planning condition.</p>
3.4	<p>Health & Housing - Env. Protection Team No Objection Subject to the details of construction and the sound attenuation measures specified in the accompanying acoustic report.</p>
3.5	<p>Drainage Engineer (Vale of White Horse District Council) No Objection Drawings nos RK-1728-5.R2 and R9 now indicate a Suds drainage system and a means of foul drainage as previously requested. However, details of the road/yard drainage, SW outfall to the north-east and the land drainage system serving the proposed septic tank are still required. Such foul and surface water drainage details should be submitted for approval prior to devt commencing.</p>
3.6	<p>Landscape Architect (Vale of White Horse DC) No Objection (10 March 2015) The amended plan Fig 6a Rev A, Landscape Proposals showing woodland planting along the western edge of the access road and to the north of the buildings should, in time, help to soften the impact of the large scale buildings. Fig6b shows proposed tree and hedgerow planting along the B4016 and along the eastern boundary of Drayton village. If the woodland planting and the extra trees and hedgerows are implemented the development would be acceptable within this landscape setting.</p>
3.7	<p>Neighbour Object: 4 letters of objection raising the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Character and appearance of open countryside – prominent and harmful, • Size of the complex will increase traffic to this part of Drayton and cause congestion and traffic problems, • Development should be located where there are already farm buildings, • blind corner and junction would cause traffic dangers, • industrial scale, • located in open countryside, scale and massing would cause unacceptable harm to the landscape on the edge of the village, • Has a full appraisal of the applicants land holdings taken place to determine the most suitable site? • ideal location to dispose of all the spoil produced from the development? • Concerns over the noise increase from traffic movements late at night,

3.8	Minerals and Waste	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • blot on the landscape and totally undermine the look and feel of a village that is already facing significant housing developments. • safety concerns given the road access proposed. • Incorrect that Drayton parish Council have agreed to the site, • not a straight replacement 2.5 times larger than existing sites elsewhere, • 11.4m tall building will dominate the landscape and adjacent footpaths and bridleways, • Grade II listed building near to the site (approx 325m & 352m), • Fans will prevent those living nearest from enjoying their properties, <p>mitigation landscaping is located in an area that does not belong to Mr Caudwell.</p> <p>No objection</p> <p>Officers consider there to be insufficient justification for the mineral deposits within the application site to be safeguarded from the proposed development. Provided there would be no movement of excavated material off site or bringing of fill material on to the site, these would be engineering operations taking place within the overall site. As such they would not constitute either mineral working or waste disposal.</p>
-----	---------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

4.0 **RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY**

4.1 None

5.0 **POLICY & GUIDANCE**

5.1 **National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

5.2 **Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2011 policies;**

DC1 - Design

DC5 - Access

DC6 - Landscaping

DC7 - Waste Collection and Recycling

DC9 - The Impact of Development on Neighbouring Uses

NE11 - Areas for Landscape Enhancement

NE9 - The Lowland Vale

HE9 - Archaeology

5.3 **Draft Vale of White Horse Local Plan 2031 Part 1**

The draft Local Plan Part 1 is not currently adopted policy and this emerging policy and its supporting text has limited weight as per paragraph 216 of the NPPF. Greater regard therefore is to be given to the NPPF in line with paragraph 14 and where relevant, the saved policies (listed above) within the existing Local Plan.

1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development

7 – Providing supporting infrastructure and services

33 – Promoting sustainable transport and accessibility

35 – Promoting public transport, cycling and walking

37 – Design and local distinctiveness

39 – The historic environment

- 40 – Sustainable design and construction
- 42 – Flood risk
- 43 – Natural resources
- 44 – Landscape
- 46 – Conservation and improvement of biodiversity

5.4 **Design Guide** (March 2015)

5.5 **Drayton Neighbourhood Plan 20/20**

6.0 **PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

6.1 The main planning considerations in the determination of this planning application are:

- The principle of development
- The impact upon the surrounding character & landscape
- The impact upon neighbouring amenity
- Transport Issues
- Drainage Issues
- Archaeology Issues

6.2 **Principle of development**

The NPPF has a presumption in favour of sustainable development provided that it is of a high quality design, efficient use of the land and in a sustainable location. In addition the economic role of the NPPF seeks to allow development which improves the viability of business and continued economic stability throughout the district.

6.3 Furthermore, economic growth in rural areas should be supported by the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise both through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. The NPPF advises that support should be given to promote the development of agricultural rural businesses which respect the character of the countryside.

6.4 During site assessments it has been explained that the existing premises in Drayton have to be relocated due to the sites not meeting the necessary modern standards and consequently being developed for new homes as part of the 5 year housing land supply in the district. These new dwellings seek to sustainably provide for the village of Drayton as noted through their Neighbourhood Plan 20/20.

6.5 In respect to the proposed works it will ensure the business remains competitive by modernising and consolidating the operations thus establishing economic benefit to the surrounding area in a more sustainable manner in accordance with the Neighbourhood Plan 20/20.

6.6 The amalgamation of the three sites in sustainability terms is beneficial in that all the units will be on one site. Whilst the units are to be large in scale and height the use of the site is already agricultural in nature, albeit on a very minor scale for the grazing and stabling of horses, but the provision of agricultural units that are set back from the road, within a countryside setting and with a landscaping scheme in place is considered acceptable in this instance.

6.7 Officers are satisfied that the proposed location of the new agricultural units within the countryside is wholly acceptable in NPPF and Neighbourhood Plan 20/20 terms meeting the needs of the locality, business development and landscape enhancement in a sustainable manner.

6.8 Character and Landscaping

Policy Background

- 6.9 Policy DC1 of the Local Plan permits development which would not have a harmful impact upon the character and local distinctiveness of an area and in terms of its layout, scale, mass, design and detailing would not detract from the positive contribution its character has in the wider surrounding area. Policy NE9 of the Local Plan states that development in the Lowland Vale will not be permitted if it would have an adverse effect on the landscape, particularly on the long open views within or across the area.

Landscape

- 6.10 Drayton's Neighbourhood Plan describes its surrounding landscape as follows: 'Drayton is located in a pastoral/arable landscape with vistas extending westwards along the Vale of the White Horse, southwards towards the chalk downs, eastwards towards the River Thames floodplain, and northwards to the town of Abingdon'. (Para.23)
- 6.11 Furthermore Para. 170 states that 'Being primarily rural in character, the Parish does possess a good complement of green open spaces...including....the land area comprising capped land-fill and mineral extraction sites to the east of the village. The proposed grain store unit is to sit alongside this area and proposes a landscaping scheme to ensure that it complements, upgrades, preserves and enhances these open green spaces whilst providing a rural and agricultural landscape alongside.
- 6.12 Officers are mindful of this area as a site that is in need of landscape enhancement as defined in Policy NE11 of the Local Plan. A scrap yard is located to the north of the application site with land to the east having been quarried and filled in, resulting in open sites that have a reduced character appearance.

Character

- 6.13 Farms do form part of the character of the immediate locality with Gilbourn's Farm being located on the opposite side of the Drayton Road, and Hulgrove Farm, Manor Farm, Sherwood Farm and Brook Farm, whilst not within the immediate vicinity, are located around this area providing an agricultural context to this part of the district.
- 6.14 Drayton is characterised as a large village that has been identified within its 20/20 Neighbourhood plan as being able to accept some new development.

Landscape Assessment

- 6.15 Our Landscape consultant has been in discussions with the agent and Officers are of the opinion that the revised scheme put forward would reduce the overall impact of the farm complex on the surrounding areas.
- 6.16 A green belt of trees is now proposed along the western edge of the site. These are to be between 8-10cm girth, single stalked and guarded until the age of 2-3 years (until they have become established). Indicative plans FIG 6a, 6b and 7 can be seen attached at **Appendix C**.
- 6.16 Those included in the tree belt running along the western edge of the access road are to be planted in accordance with the woodland indicative plan in 12m wide by 10.5m deep grids and are to include Field Maple, Hornbeam, Crab Apple, Wild Cherry, Oak, Whitebeam and small leaved Lime trees along with 1.5m tall hedges interspersed to

create a mixed height screen.

- 6.17 The proposed landscaping along the highway and residential boundary are to include a similar mix of field maple (6 in total with 3 along the highway and 3 along the residential boundary), Hornbeam (4 in total located along the residential boundary in 2 locations), Crab Apple (x2), Wild Cherry (x3), Oak (x3), Whitebeam (x2) and 2 small leaved Lime trees to assist in a diverse native tree screen. An increase in the amount of trees along the western boundary with Sutton Wick Lane, which are to include Oak and Crab Apple, both of which provide a good canopy splay from a fairly young age, will ensure that these long views can be adequately screened from local residents at a relatively early stage of development.
- 6.18 Officers consider that the views from the nearest residential properties will be largely unaffected as these trees begin to embed and grow and that the height of the proposed buildings, at 11.2m tall, will appear adequately screened with varying canopy splays helping to aid the visual appearance and soften the built form from the long views to the west of Drayton.
- 6.19 Increasing the amount and number of appropriate trees at the entrance to the site will also assist in reducing the overall prominence of the grain drying units from the highway and Gilbourn's Farm opposite.
- 6.20 Increased hedgerows, which are to be of a mixed native species, are to be planted along the roadside to help reduce the visual appearance of the site as a whole from the road, assisting and strengthening the already deteriorated hedgerow.
- 6.21 In terms of its screening Officers consider that the increased hedgerows and wide tree belt would reduce the appearance of the built form from the highway and once fully grown there would be limited views of the development from the wider surrounding area. The trees would assist in enhancing the rural green character and aid landscape enhancement to the benefit of the long open views and rural nature of the site.
- 6.22 **Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)**
Environmental Impact Assessment is to protect the environment by ensuring that a local planning authority, when deciding whether to grant planning permission for a project which is likely to have significant effects on the environment, does so in the full knowledge of the likely significant effects, and takes this into account during the application stage. The PPG advises that an EIA should not be a barrier to growth. The 2011 Regulations integrate Environmental Impact Assessment procedures into this framework and should only apply to those projects which are likely to have significant effects on the environment.
- 6.23 The National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) sets out types of development within Schedule 2 that should development exceed a certain threshold then a scoping and/or screening opinion should be carried out to assess the impact the proposed scheme would have on the surrounding landscape.
- 6.24 Having checked schedule 2, the proposed development does not fall within any of the categories of development to warrant a screening or scoping opinion to take place. In terms of its size and scale the proposed scheme therefore does not require an EIA opinion and is considered not to have a significant effect on the environment that would warrant further investigation in this manner.
- 6.25 **Soil deposition**
The proposal seeks to remove top soil and deposit it on the land to the north of where

the farm complex is to be built. Plan BK-1728-21-R1 shows that the material would be spread evenly and the land levels of the adjacent field would not be any greater than the level of the farm. Officers are satisfied that there would be no landscape issues or harm to the surrounding agricultural and rural character from these associated works.

Design Assessment

- 6.26 The proposed grain store is large in size but it is amalgamating 3 sites into one and freeing up an identified strategic housing site, Manor Farm, for housing development in the village as per the Drayton Neighbourhood Plan 20/20.
- 6.27 The proposed layout around a farm yard formation akin to that of an agricultural complex is considered an acceptable design approach which follows its function in an open rural landscape and is fitting to the pastoral/arable landscape as identified within the 20/20 plan.
- 6.28 The set back of the large farming complex will assist in reducing its visual impact upon the wider surrounding area and the green and non-reflective finish of the buildings will further ensure that it would not be significantly dominating or prominent in the wider rural context nor affect the long open views across the Lowland Vale to a significant degree.
- 6.29 The chosen materials of the proposed farm complex are to include colours that appear dark and non-reflective and so would assist in assimilating the development into the open countryside. The design of the units whilst tall in scale have been designed in such a way to allow adequate ventilation and are appropriate for use as intended for modern agricultural needs of the farm.
- 6.30 To conclude, Officers consider that the development would have little demonstrable harm to the character of the Lowland Vale or the wider surrounding area. Whilst it is likely that the scale of the development would result in some views of the site within the open landscape the design, scale and mass are typical to that of a working farm utilising modern technologies to make the unit efficient, effective and fit for purpose.
- 6.31 Suitable deposition of waste soil and an appropriate landscaping scheme would reduce the overall height and scale whilst also amalgamating 3 units to ensure the business is sustainable and viable in terms of its environmental and social elements of the NPPF.
- 6.32 The overall impact is therefore not significantly detrimental to the landscape character in accordance with Policy.
- 6.33 **Amenity**
Policy DC9 permits development that would not have a harmful impact upon surrounding neighbouring uses in terms of privacy and overlooking, loss of light, noise, vibrations, smells, gases or other emissions.
- 6.34 The site will have limited views from properties to the south and the west, particularly by residents residing in Sutton Wick Lane but these are likely only to be when looking from first floor windows. Given the distance of the farm complex from surrounding properties, approximately 300m from those to the west and south, Officers are satisfied that there would be little adverse impact upon overlooking, loss of privacy or light.
- 6.35 Some nearby residents have raised issues of the loss of a private view and that the building will detract from their views across open countryside from Sutton Wick Lane and surrounding footpaths, however in planning terms there is no right to a private view.

- 6.36 Officers have assessed that the immediate outlook would not be compromised in terms of the units being dominating or overwhelming of their residential amenity. Increased tree planting along the western boundary of the adjacent field, which is also in ownership by the applicant but does not form part of this application site, will reduce the overall prominence of the proposed development and provide more green features and landscaping to the surrounding open countryside.
- 6.37 Given the distance from these properties, the design, mass, height, scale and layout, the landscaping proposed and the agricultural nature of the surrounding area Officers accept that the long views of these residents would not be demonstrably or significantly adversely affected. This is in accordance with Policy DC9 of the Local Plan.
- 6.38 Our environmental health team have assessed the application and have advised that the acoustic report is adequate and provided all construction details are implemented as per the assessed acoustic report then it is unlikely, that due to their distance and set back, to result in significant harm from noise and vibrations from the grain drying units. This can be conditioned to ensure implementation.
- 6.39 Given that the farm complex is to be for the storage of harvested grains Officers are satisfied that there is unlikely to be any demonstrable harm arising from smells, gases or other emissions.
- 6.40 **Transport**
Policy DC5 of the Local plan permits development that would not have a harmful impact upon traffic safety in terms of access and egress, congestion or environmental problems, circulation, turning, servicing and would not result in congestion of the site or surrounding highway network.
- 6.41 The Neighbourhood Plan identifies at para.155 '*Traffic is viewed as a major issue by Drayton residents and any mitigation of the speed and volume of traffic would be welcome*'.
- 6.42 Oxfordshire County Council objected to the application on transport grounds in January 2015. Neighbour comments raised similar issues to those already noted by the highways officers with regards to the access and egress from the new entrance and the increased nature of heavy goods vehicle movements.
- 6.43 The transport statement has identified that during the harvesting period there would be trip movements of 570 grain trailers between the period of July to October with 280 lorry movements between the months of October to July (selling and distributing period). Hay/straw is harvested in June and August and would be transported by tractor and trailer to the proposed straw barn, which has a capacity for 330 bales. There would be 28 deliveries in June and 2 in August amounting to 56 and 4 vehicle movements. The hay/straw would be sold and distributed in 8 No flatbed lorries during the period from December to February. Throughout the year 300 tonnes of fertilizer would be delivered to site in 27 tonnes loads by articulated lorry. This would amount to 11 loads generating 22 vehicle movements/annum. During the months March and April the fertilizer would be taken out for spreading in 8 tonnes loads by tractor and trailer. This would amount to 38 loads generating 76 vehicle movements. However this figure can be reduced by 20% as that amount of fertilizer would be spread on adjacent land and not be transported on the local roads. Therefore the spreading of fertilizer is likely to generate a total of (76 – 20%) 60 vehicle movements during March and April each year.
- 6.44 The following table provides a summary of the vehicle movements likely to be

generated by the proposed development:

Table 1. Summary of vehicle movements

Activity	Period	No of days	No of loads	Total vehicle trips (in & out = 2)	Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)*
Staff					
2 No permanent	annually	240	N/A	960	3.69
1 No contractor	2 months	44	N/A	88	0.34
Taking out & returning farm machinery	annually	240	N/A	1048	4.03
Deliveries					
Fertilizer	annually	260	11	22	0.08
Harvesting					
Grain	19 th Jul-20 th Sep	92	285	570	2.19
Straw/hay	Jun & Aug	42	30	60	0.23
Distribution					
Grain	Oct-July	212	140	280	1.07
Straw/hay	Dec-Feb	61	8	16	0.06
Fertilizer	Mar-Apr	42	30	60	0.23
Totals	N/A	N/A	504	3104	11.92

- 6.45 The concerns of the Highways Officer have now been overcome with the projected trip movements, visibility splays and access, turning and parking arrangements all deemed to be acceptable.
- 6.46 The Highways Liaison Officer is of the opinion that the type and frequency of traffic likely to be generated by the proposed development would not be new to the local road network as the land to be serviced by the proposed farmyard has been farmed by WF Caudwell & Sons for many years.
- 6.47 Having had further discussions with the Highways Liaison Officer, since noting the issues that the previous Council members raised, the Officer has advised that the proposal is considered to be acceptable on the existing highway network as the speed limit in this area is a maximum only (40mph). Vehicles should adjust their speeds according to the road conditions. He advised that the vision splays proposed by the revised transport statement are acceptable allowing farm traffic to see the road ahead and other road users to see the farm traffic emerging and adjusting their driving speed accordingly. The suggested trip movements do not propose to hinder other users of the highway.
- 6.48 The proposed junction is adequate to enable farm traffic to pull off the road and onto the road without causing severe harm to existing users. Therefore based on this evidence and that there have been no recorded accidents or incidents along this road in a set period Highways Officers are satisfied that the proposal would not cause severe harm, congestion or road safety implications. This is in accordance with the NPPF and the Local Plan Policy subject to appropriate conditions as suggested by the highways officer.

- 6.49 The agent has also submitted a construction management plan detailing access to the site during construction to prevent heavy duty vehicles travelling through the smaller local villages. This is also acceptable to the Highways Engineer.
- 6.50 In terms of traffic generation and impacts to the existing highway network the proposal would result in little detriment to the existing road and its users and is therefore in accordance with the NPPF and Planning Policy.
- 6.51 **Footpath Diversion**
The size of the proposal and nature of the existing site mean that some excavation will be required. It is proposed that the spoil that is to be excavated will be spread on the adjacent field to the north. As a result, the applicant has proposed that the existing footpath (192/16) which crosses this field diagonally would be diverted and it is proposed this would follow the perimeter of the site boundary to the north and west.
- 6.52 The footpath does not appear to be directly affected by the development itself. The proposed diversion of the path is not considered necessary to accommodate the development and could, with little input be re-aligned along its existing route following the moving of the soil and re-profiling.
- 6.53 However, a temporary closure of the path would need to be applied for while the material is deposited and re-profiled [there is capacity to provide a temporary footpath while this work takes place] and then reinstated on its original line. If the movement of material is required to enable the building work to take place the LHA would recommend a temporary closure of the footpath until the material has been moved followed by the reinstatement of the path under a Section 106 agreement.
- 6.54 Officers consider that the movement of the soil is required to accommodate the building works and to ensure that the set down is suitable within the surrounding landscape. Therefore the deposition of the soil on the adjacent field is acceptable.
- 6.55 The minerals and waste officer at OCC has confirmed that the development as proposed does not involve either mineral working or waste disposal. No further permits to remove this soil is required.
- 6.56 **Drainage**
For the purposes of applying the NPPF, “flood risk” is a combination of the probability and the potential consequences of flooding from all sources including from rivers and the sea, directly from rainfall on the ground surface and rising groundwater, overwhelmed sewers and drainage systems, and from reservoirs, canals and lakes and other artificial sources.
- 6.57 Officers have had ongoing discussions with the drainage engineer who is now satisfied that the drainage details are acceptable. Nonetheless some surface water and foul drainage needs to be conditioned to ensure appropriate details are forthcoming prior to development commencing. In terms of increased flood risk however there would be no harm resulting from permitting this development in accordance with the NPPF.
- 6.58 **Archaeology**
The site was considered to be in an area of considerable archaeological interest however on further investigation there was no evidence to suggest that this site would have any constraint to the development as proposed.
- 6.59 This is in accordance with the NPPF and no further conditions need to be added to any grant of approval.

6.60 Other considerations

Some neighbours have raised issues of harm to the setting of listed buildings. However due to the distance of listed buildings from the proposal (approximately 300m) it is considered that there would be no demonstrable harm to the setting or historic character of these buildings in accordance with the NPPF and Local Plan Policy HE4.

6.61 Some neighbours have concerns that the operational development of the site is commercial in its scale and intensity. Given the nature of the amalgamation from 3 sites to one required for the continued economic success of the business its commercial nature to serve the needs of the agricultural unit is justified. Any further commercial operations outside the agricultural use would require further permissions to be sought by the Local Authority.

6.62 Minerals and waste

Under policy SD10, development which would prejudice the working of mineral deposits should not be permitted unless it can be shown that the need for the development outweighs the economic and sustainability considerations relating to the mineral resource.

6.63 Having had further discussions with the Soils and Minerals Officer there are no issues and is satisfied that given the proximity of the site to residential properties in relation to mineral and deposits mining and the low level of the soil to be excavated and removed this site would not be compatible with future mining therefore they would have no objection to the proposed development and that there would be no further permission required to move this soil from the application site to the adjacent site.

7.0 CONCLUSION

7.1 Given the amalgamation of 3 sites onto suitable purpose built premises Officers consider that there is sound economic justification to allow such development within a countryside location. The surrounding area is open countryside but with appropriate landscaping measures and the inclusion of 'green belts' and improved hedgerow boundaries the area, that is in need of landscape enhancement, would become much improved in its overall character and appearance.

7.2 Whilst the scale and mass of the farmyard complex is large the area is well set back from the road and neighbouring properties so that it would not have a significant or demonstrable harm to the site and the surrounding area. There is suitable access onto a sustainable highway network and for these reasons the new farmyard complex is considered to be appropriate in accordance with local plan policy and economically sustainable in accordance with the NPPF.

8.0 RECOMMENDATION

8.1 **To grant planning permission, subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Time limit - full application.**
2. **Approved plans.**
3. **Access, park and turning in accordance with the plan.**
4. **Construction traffic (full).**
5. **Drainage details (surface and foul) (full).**
6. **Slab Levels (approval as built) (full).**
7. **Noise attenuation (external noise).**

Author: Charlotte Brewerton
Contact No: 01235 540546
Email: charlotte.brewerton@southandvale.gov.uk