

Local Planning Authority (SMDC) correspondence with the agent

15th August 2022

Hi Arne

Thanks for your email. I can clarify as follows:

- The large building to the north of the site is where the riding school is located. There are various stables to its east that are in varying states of repair / condition. Those buildings do not form part of the agricultural unit and constitute a separate planning unit established under the original riding school application.
- The land to which the application relates is wholly in agricultural use, forming part of holding number CPH: 37/063/0336.
- The applicant's land holding extends to 141 acres but has no existing buildings (other than a handful of small brick buildings adjacent to the yard area where the buildings are proposed).
- The applicant's farming business was established on 30th May 2021, the applicant having previously worked on his fathers farm since childhood. He purchased this site / holding so that he could have his own farm.
- The applicant currently has a head of 25 cattle with intentions of increasing that number to 300+ calves. An application for a beef rearing unit is in the process of being prepared and will be submitted in the coming months. The applicant also produces haylage / fodder on the land. The land holding is capable of producing in excess of 1000 bales, some of which I observed on site during my recent site inspection. Photos can be supplied. The business is therefore not 'hobby farming'.
- The applicant has a large range of agricultural implements that are currently lying in the open on the site. These include 3 tractors, a loader, 2 x bale trailers, muck spreader, 3 x mowers, 2 x tedders, 1 x vacuum tanker, 2 x balers and chain harrows. The above list of implements, which can be readily observed on site, are also not the product of 'hobby farming', nor indeed is a 141 acres land holding!

I understand from the applicant, via his discussions with Cllr. Worthington, that you wish for some screening to be incorporated into the design in order to soften its impact on views from the valley and to neighbouring properties. This can be readily accommodated. The land has not been materially built up as you suggest. The applicant has applied a hardcore surface to what was already a hard surfaced area. The embankment beyond is readily capable of being planted with new trees / hedgerows, and there is also scope to scrape back some of the recently applied hardcore too in order to accommodate planting. Please see attached photographs. How would you wish to deal with this? We can either submit a revised plan showing landscaping, or can ask you to impose it as a planning condition. Please advise as soon as possible.

I also attach a photograph of the site notice which was erected on Monday 8th August.

I look forward to hearing from you in respect of the above matter.

Rob Duncan MRTPI
Director
Rob Duncan Planning Consultancy Ltd.



4th August 2022

Hi Rob

Sometimes it is obvious a farm is an agricultural enterprise all as variously set out in Part 6. At Westwood Hall Farm I don't think it is automatically obvious. There is an approval 83/12549/OLDDC for a change of use of part of farm to riding school. 87/00173/OLD was for an agri bldg

But it appears possibly that both the above are merged into entirely equine / riding school use now. There seem to be numbers of horses accommodated in other adj bldgs as I cld see their heads out over the stable doors...

I did see a small group of about a dozen Dexter cattle but these can be a hobby or even pets and of course I don't know whose they are...

We are looking for evidence to confirm that the requirements of Part 6 are in place:

- That the site is agricultural land so used for the purposes of a trade or business
- That the site is within an agricultural unit occupied as a unit for the purposes of agriculture...

And from this to deduce that a bldg of this size and form is "reasonably necessary for the purpose of agriculture within the unit"

I can perhaps helpfully add that I am particularly concerned if we can accept the bldg in principle under Part 6 that a bldg of this size in this position could be very prominent to the valley and other surrounding points and as proposed, close to the edge, the position may not be readily screen planted – the ground appears to have been made up in level by import of heavy rubble / hard core which won't be suitable for planting.

Arne

4th August 2022

Hi Arne

Further to receipt of the Council's confirmation that their prior approval is required I note the comment set out therein that: **It is noted that there is no substantive information to verify that the application land is used agriculturally for the purposes of a trade or business as part of an agricultural unit. Accordingly planning permission may be required for the development.**

What information do you require to verify this? Please confirm without delay as we're already now behind on the intended build schedule.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Kind Regards

Rob Duncan MRTPI
Director