

PDC814
FOR DECISION
WARD(S): SPARSHOLT

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE

23 JULY 2009

TONYMOTO, DOWN FARM, DOWN FARM LANE HEADBOURNE WORTHY –
CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURAL TO MOTORCROSS (FOLLOWING
TEMPORARY PERMISSION) AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE DRIVING, AUTO
JUMBLES, COLLECTORS FAIRS AND PAINTBALLING - 09/00591/FUL

REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING MANAGEMENT

Contact Officer: Neil Mackintosh

Tel: 01962 848244 E mail: nmackintosh@winchester.gov.uk

REFERENCES:

W01024/05 Temporary change of use from agriculture to motocross – granted permission 31 March 2004 (See Annexe A)

ENF05/82 – Enforcement notice served 01 May 2009 requiring the landowner to;

1. Permanently cease all activities on the Land in connection with its use as a motorcross site.
2. Permanently remove from the Land all portacabins, booths, equipment, plant, vehicles, signs and all other paraphernalia associated with the use of the Land as a motorcross site.
3. Demolish all bunds in the approximate position shown hatched blue on the attached plan to ground level and remove all resultant material from the Land.
4. Restore the Land to its former appearance as an arable field.

An appeal against this Notice has been lodged and officers have requested that this matter should be heard at a Public Inquiry.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

This application is reported to Committee because of the number of representations received, at the request of South Wonston, Littleton and Harestock, and Crawley Parish Councils, and at the request of Councillor Godfrey. These requests are appended in full to this report. (Annexes B, C, D and E)

Motocross activity has been taking place on the site for the past five years with the benefit of a temporary planning permission. This permission expired on 1st April 2009 and no such activity has taken place since then.

During the five years of the permission the Council has received many complaints about noise and these were mainly directed to the Environmental Protection Team. The applicant has made efforts to reduce the noise emanating from the site by raising the height of an earth bund running along the northern boundary of the site but this did not appear to overcome the complaints received from local residents, mainly in South Wonston and Littleton.

The applicant proposes to increase activity on the site by introducing additional sports and events, none of which are likely to cause additional concern. However, it is likely that noise impacts from motocross activity would be comparable to those over the last five years and this is not acceptable in planning terms.

RECOMMENDATION:

That the application be refused for the reason set out at Paragraph 9 of this Report.

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE PLANNING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE

23 JULY 2009

TONYMOTO, DOWN FARM, DOWN FARM LANE HEADBOURNE WORTHY – CHANGE OF USE FROM AGRICULTURAL TO MOTORCROSS FOLLOWING TEMPORARY PERMISSION AND OFF-ROAD VEHICLE DRIVING, AUTO JUMBLES, COLLECTORS FAIRS AND PAINTBALLING.

REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING MANAGEMENT

DETAIL:

1 **Site Description**

- 1.1 The application site is approximately 22 hectares in area and is located to the east of the Three Maids Hill Roundabout and A34 intersection. Vehicular access to events is by means of a one-way system from the intersection via Down Farm Lane, with visitors exiting close to the mini-roundabout at the bottom of Christmas Hill, close to the same intersection. (See Annexe H)
- 1.2 The site is surrounded by earth bunds and is visible only from the road bridge over the A34 and the public footpath passing Down Farm. The access drive to the application site is also the access to this farm and is shared with the public footpath linking South Wonston and Worthy Down with the Andover Road.
- 1.3 Within the bunds the site has been laid out as four distinct areas. Closest to the entrance is a large expanse of hoggin which is used as the pits and start area with small, temporary buildings acting as reception, recording etc. To the south of this area are two distinct motocross track areas (A and B), with varying sizes of jumps, separated by an earth mound which, it is understood, is used by spectators. A smaller, third track (C) lies to the north west of the site, closest to Worthy Down, and, under the terms of this application, would be mainly used for the quieter activities, such as off-road vehicle training.
- 1.4 Outside the bunds, adjacent to the A34, is a small copse which it is proposed to use for paintballing.
- 1.5 The nearest house to the application site is Down Farmhouse, which is within the control of the applicant. On the other side of the A34 intersection, 350m from the site, is Three Maids Bungalow, which is part of the Littleton Stud. The village of Littleton is approximately 1.25km to the south west of the site.
- 1.6 The housing at Worthy Down is less than 1km to the north of the site with South Wonston being approximately 1.5km away, also to the north (See Annexe G –1:25,000 OS extract)

2 **Proposal**

- 2.1 This application is for full and permanent permission to operate the site for motocross activities and to widen the range of activities available, compared to the historic situation, to include further leisure facilities for both corporate and private customers. These are off-road vehicle driving, including 4x4's, buggies and quad bikes, auto jumbles, collectors fairs, fundraising and paintballing.
- 2.2 It was necessary for the Council to assess whether an Environmental Impact Assessment was required in connection with this application and it has been determined that it was not. In coming to this conclusion officers have considered the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 and the supporting Circular 02/99. Although the development falls within Schedule 2 of the Regulations it is not considered likely to have a significant effect on the environment, within the meaning of the Regulations. (See Annexe F).

3 **Relevant Planning History**

- 3.1 **W01024/05** (03/02954/FUL) – Temporary change of use from agriculture to a motocross field - granted 12 May 2004 – expired 01 April 2009.
- 3.2 This permission was the subject of 12 conditions (see Annexe A), in particular these controlled the days and hours of operation and required a scheme for limiting the transmission of noise off the site.
- 3.3 **W01024/06** (06/02031/FUL - Variation of planning permission W01024/05 to allow the addition of paintballing and corporate activities including 4WD – withdrawn August 2006

4 **Consultations**

4.1 **Enforcement**

- 4.2 *“The Enforcement Team is aware of a large number of complaints made over the last 4/5 years in South Wonston and Littleton about noise from the motox site”*
- 4.3 *“Attempts were made to try to mitigate the noise impact by increasing the height of the bund that runs along the rear (northern) boundary, but it is evident that this has done little to overcome the noise problems”*
- 4.4 *“Unless the current application satisfactorily addresses the noise issue, then I would have to recommend refusal of the application”*

4.5 **Environmental Health**

- 4.6 *“Overall, I am of the view that this application is likely to result in noise impacts comparable to those over the last five years. The key question for the*

Planning Committee is 'Are such noise impacts acceptable'. If they consider that the impacts over the last five years have been unacceptable these proposals are unlikely to see any improvement going forward and, therefore, refusal of the application may be warranted".

- 4.7 As noise disturbance has been the main reason for objection the Environmental Protection Officer's comments are reported, in full, at Annex G.
- 4.8 Engineers: Highways:
- 4.9 *"This proposal seeks a permanent consent to use the application site for motocross activities; to expand the use of the facilities so that both A and B tracks can be operated simultaneously and to extend the number of recreational and leisure activities available on the site"*
- 4.10 The Engineer analysed data contained in the Highways and Transport Consultants report, submitted by the applicant, together with Traffic Accident figures and consulted another engineer with past knowledge of the site. He concluded that, although there would be a slight increase in trips, this would not be harmful. Also, that the greater majority of traffic visiting the site will use Down Farm Lane between the site's entrance and the A34 junction and also egress onto Christmas Hill to the A34 junction. He said that;
- 4.11 *"Mindful of the above, I do not envisage sufficient demonstrable harm will occur to users of the highway network to successfully sustain a highway reason for refusal at appeal"*
- 4.12 Engineers: Drainage:
- 4.13 Aware of no drainage problems occurring during the temporary consent so no reason to object to permanent occupation.
- 4.14 Economic and Cultural Services
- 4.15 *"It is difficult to understand what, if any, tourism/economic benefits are generated by this motocross facility for the local economy. Our experience of big motocross events at another site in the district was that over half of those booking visitor accommodation stayed outside the Winchester District, and very few actually spent time off the site exploring the area, which meant very little visitor spend generated to the local economy"*
- 4.16 *"There is an acknowledged lack of activity for young people, particularly in our rural areas, and this facility would seem to respond to that lack".*
- 4.17 *"The paint balling offer could be very attractive and could enhance the limited range of corporate activities on offer for our conference market in the Winchester District as well as providing new (and reasonably priced) activity for the local leisure market"*

- 4.18 *“Should the application be permitted we would be interested in seeing a mitigation plan for the negative effects of year-round carbon emissions from the motocross bikes”*
- 4.19 Landscape:
- 4.20 No objection – the site is well contained by landform and vegetation, such that views into the site are limited.
- 4.21 *“There is a view into the site from the road bridge (A272) as it crosses the A34 to the west of the site. There is a noticeable deterioration in the view from this point looking east which tree planting may be able to address. There is also a glimpse into the site from the public footpath to the east of the site but visual impact at this point is minor”*
- 4.22 Environment Agency:
- 4.23 No objection – comments re. foul drainage ie. that the applicant should ensure that the development is designed so that any wastewater arising is disposed of in line with current regulations and guidelines.
- 4.24 Highways Agency:
- 4.25 Response awaited
- 4.26 HCC Rights of Way:
- 4.27 Object – *“It would appear that the proposed access to the site is along part of Headbourne Worthy Footpath No.2.”*
- 4.28 *“Any vehicular access along a public footpath, as well as having an effect on the surface of the path, would constitute a potential hazard to legitimate users and with potentially increased traffic of motorbikes, cars and vans along this path we would wish to see an independent safety audit carried out before any decision on the application is made. In any event, vehicles would need to give way to public users at all times”.*
- 4.29 HCC Ecology
- 4.30 *“The ecological impacts are unknown, as no ecological information has been submitted. I do not necessarily consider that, from an ecology point of view, an EIA is required”*
- 4.31 Littleton & Harestock Parish Council has drawn Members attention to the possibility that the habitat of the Stone Curlew may be adversely affected by the proposal and HCC have been re-consulted;
- 4.32 *“Although the Hampshire Biodiversity Information Centre do not appear to hold records for stone curlew in the area of the site, it is not possible to say what species do occur on and around the site, and what the potential of the site is, without survey and assessment information to support the application.*

It is possible that habitats and species, including protected species such as ground nesting birds, may be detrimentally impacted by the proposal”

4.33 Health & Safety Executive

4.34 “We do not normally comment on such applications”

5 **Representations:**

5.1 An unusually high number of representations have been received in respect of this application, both for and against, and these are still being received at the time of drafting this report. The following is a summary of those representations and the Committee will be updated with regard to any further correspondence.

5.2 The application site falls within the Parish of Headbourne Worthy, who have objected for the following reasons;

- Inaccuracy – requested hours vary within documentation
- Definition of use – extent of increase in activity not clearly defined
- Noise – consultant’s report deal only with decibel levels and not the intrusive, fluctuating noise power and frequency levels
- Vague – ‘leisure facilities’ is too vague a description for alternative events
- Increase in use – simultaneous use of tracks, corporate events etc.
- Over development – unacceptable noise levels, noise monitoring inadequate, originally purported to serve a local need and is now a national facility. Too close to a built up area and access and exit routes are inadequate. Further environmental impact and damage.

5.3 Representations have also been received from three neighbouring parish councils, who have requested that the application be dealt with by Committee.

South Wonston, Littleton & Harestock, and Crawley Parish Councils – object;

- noise and proximity to existing housing – constant, intrusive and irritating sound too close to residential areas – the noise implications of the original proposals were underestimated and attempts at mitigation have failed - there are no proposals to increase or improve sound attenuation for this new and intensified scheme
- damage to countryside character – earth bunds and ramshackle buildings are an eyesore – adverse impact on those enjoying countryside walks, rides etc.
- land should have been restored to agricultural use by 01 April 2009,

- unacceptable environmental impact - intrusion on diversity and natural balance of area, including the habitat of the stone curlew,
 - highways - mud deposited on highway – Christmas Hill egress used by right-turning vehicles from A34 despite ‘No Entry’ signs,
 - unsustainable – carbon intensive development, negative impact in both the waste of limited resources and the increase in carbon dioxide emissions while providing mere entertainment
 - insufficient need – no clear, proven local need, not farm diversification,
 - negligible contribution to the local economy – does not create appreciable local employment or encourage the use of local shops or hotels.
- 5.4 In addition to the objections of local parish councils, the following correspondence has been received (up to and including 13/07/09);
- 5.5 **529** letters received from households **objecting** to the application for the following reasons:
- noise..... 510
 - pollution/impact on environment (other than noise).....182
 - appearance detrimental to area106
 - increased traffic/road safety86
 - dust and mud68
 - encourages illegal riding of trail bikes through area14
 - parking1
- 5.6 **439** letters of **support** received and, in addition, **1142** copies of a standard letter signed by individuals, but address not given;
- the majority state that this has been a good, safe and well-run facility, and that to lose the facility would be a serious loss to the sport,
 - the loss of such facilities leads to anti-social off-road riding,
 - it provides a much needed venue for local people to enjoy their sport and for motocross teams to practice and race,
 - many letters say that participation by youngsters is encouraged and that this site provides for a useful hobby and keeps them off the street
- 5.7 The distribution of the writers of letters of support has been broken down, as follows;
- Winchester District.....34
 Rest of Hampshire.....144
 Rest of South East Region...100
 Rest of UK.....97

International.....	2
No address given.....	62

6 **Relevant Planning Policy:**

6.1 South East Plan:

- CC6(character of the environment)
- NRM5(conservation and improvement of biodiversity)
- NRM10(noise)
- NRM11(energy efficiency)
- C4(landscape and countryside management)
- C6(countryside access and rights of way management)
- TSR2(rural tourism): S5(cultural and sporting activity)

6.2 Winchester District Local Plan Review

- CE5 (landscape character);
- CE10 (nature conservation)
- CE28 (recreation in the countryside);
- RT13 (noisy sports);
- DP3 (general criteria);
- DP11 (unneighbourly uses);
- DP12 (pollution sensitive development)

6.3 National Planning Policy Guidance/Statements:

- PPS 7 Sustainable Development in Rural Areas
- PPG 13 Transport
- PPG 17 Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation
- PPS 23 Planning and Pollution Control
- PPG 24 Planning and Noise

6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance

- Littleton Village Design Statement 2001

6.5 Other Planning guidance

- South Wonston Village Plan 2008

7 **Planning Considerations**

- 7.1 The application before the Committee seeks to continue the motocross and to widen the activities provided on the site, to include off-road vehicle driving, including 4x4's, buggies and quad bikes; auto jumbles; collectors fairs; fundraising and paintballing. None of these additional activities are likely to have an adverse impact upon the surrounding area, as any noise would be

contained within the existing bunds, traffic generation is well catered for and the intensity of activity could be controlled by conditions.

7.2 Principle of development

7.3 Policy CE28 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review (WDLPR) allows for the development of recreation and tourist facilities in the countryside provided that they maintain the open character of the countryside, do not require harmful buildings or structures and provided that they do not conflict with the needs of agriculture.

7.4 Policy CE5 deals more generally with the character of the countryside.

7.5 Policy RT13 deals specifically with noisy sports and states that they will only be permitted where they;

- (i) *are well contained by landform or vegetation, and remote from existing housing;*
- (ii) *incorporate safety features in the design of the proposal, particularly for spectators;*
- (iii) *ensure that ancillary buildings or other structures are small-scale, well screened and relate satisfactorily to the character of the surrounding area. Wherever possible, a suitable existing building should be used;*
- (iv) *include full supporting information with applications to show how the above criteria have been taken into account, including information on the site requirements of the activity; anticipated noise levels from all sources, including machines and public address systems; anticipated traffic levels, including the nature and frequency of spectator events, if applicable; and the need for permanent buildings, structures of hard surfaced areas.*

7.6 *In certain circumstances, temporary permission may be granted for a limited period, to allow the effect of the development on the surrounding area to be assessed. The development of sites within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Sites of Special Scientific Interest and Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation will not be permitted.*

7.7 Policy DP3 deals with general design criteria, including the effect on the character of the area and on adjoining land uses and property.

7.8 Policy DP11 deals specifically with uses which would create, consolidate or expand noisy uses and requires that they be remote from existing housing, well screened, have suitable access and are contained within a defined area.

7.9 Policy DP12 refers to pollution sensitive development and may be relevant to this application, as there are allegations of dust pollution.

7.10 Policies in the South East Plan are more general in character but indicate the ways in which Local Planning Authorities should be formulating policies and determining planning applications.

- 7.11 Policies in that Plan, as outlined above, are relevant to the determination of this application. In particular, Policy S5 states *“Increased and sustainable participation in sport, recreation and cultural activity should be encouraged by local authorities”*. Policy NRM10 deals with noise and seeks to *“ensure that noise does not become a significant impediment to achieving a good quality of life for all residents in the region”*. Policy CC6 encourages a local shared vision which *“respects, and where appropriate enhances, the character and distinctiveness of settlements and landscapes throughout the region”*
- 7.12 Noise
- 7.13 This is considered by local objectors to be the biggest problem. Not only have they experienced noise disturbance during the past five years but they see this application as an intensification of the use of the site and consider this to be unacceptable.
- 7.14 The South Wonston Village Plan was published last year as ‘a useful tool in planning for the needs and desires of the South Wonston community’. In its Summary of Important Points and Actions, under Item G, one of 6 actions to make the village a safer and more pleasant place to live is the desire to reduce noise from the motocross site. The Plan questionnaire, in 2006, produced the following amongst its findings;
- 7.15 *How do you find the noise from the motocross? (1 for no sound to 5 for extremely loud)*
 1, 143; 2, 190; 3, 156; 4, 113; 5, 49
- 118 would support further developments if they were proposed for the motocross site, 471 would oppose them*
- 7.16 Both the Environmental Protection Team (EPT) and the Planning Enforcement Team have received complaints, the majority being dealt with by the former. The EPT has logged these complaints, totalling 509 over 4.25 years, and carried out noise assessments on various occasions. Details of these are included in the EPT’s response to this application, which is reported, in full, at Annexe F to this report.
- 7.17 Although the EPT has concluded, in the past, that the motocross activities on the site do not constitute a statutory nuisance, they do have reservations concerning the intensification of use of the site and the proposed means of controlling noise levels.
- 7.18 Objectors refer to the peace and quiet of their homes being disturbed by intermittent noise, which has been variously described as revving, roaring, whining and buzzing by objectors, who find it more annoying than the traffic noise on the nearby A34 trunk road.
- 7.19 Many motocross sites operate without the need for a grant of planning permission from the Council under the “14-day rule” of the General Permitted Development Order. It could be argued that residents near to these sites put

up with any annoyance in the knowledge that it will not happen too often. However, in granting this permission, the Committee would permit not only 12 club race meetings per annum but also up to an additional 28 days at weekends for practicing and use on any Tuesday to Friday between 10am and 4pm, with an extension until 7pm on Wednesdays.

- 7.20 It is fully acknowledged that the previously permitted use of the site for motocross activities did not constitute a statutory nuisance. However, in assessing the merits of this proposal, this not the end of the matter. Whilst noise emanating from the site has stopped short of a statutory nuisance it has clearly had a significant impact upon the amenities of residents in the locality. It is considered that the noise that would be likely to be generated by the proposed use would have a comparable impact to the previous use and this would be materially harmful to the amenities of nearby residential properties. In reaching this conclusion, officers have considered the frequency, direction and nature of the noise emanating from the motocross activities, which are considered to be particularly problematic.
- 7.21 It is relevant to note that, in a recent appeal decision at Berrydown Farm, Farley Chamberlayne (08/00128/FUL) the EPT found that the use of a barn for public functions would not be a statutory nuisance if a noise limiter were to be fitted, to limit amplified music. However, the Inspector determined that the use would harm the living conditions of local occupiers due to noise and disturbance and would be contrary to Local Plan Policies DP3 and DP11.
- 7.22 Dust/Mud
- 7.23 Some of the objectors to this application, including the proprietors of the Littleton Stud, complain that, in addition to noise, dust arising from the site has a significant effect upon their environment/business. The Stud is the nearest business to the site and they state that valuable horses cannot be kept in the fields and buildings closest to the motocross site, not only because of the noise affecting highly strung horses but also because of dust affecting their respiratory systems.
- 7.24 However, the applicants state that it is not in their best interests to allow dust generation as it adversely affects the riders. For this reason the tracks are watered, when necessary, to keep dust levels down. The EPT consider that dust emission could be controlled by planning condition, if permission were to be granted and, therefore, it is considered that a refusal based upon the impact upon the Stud business would be difficult to sustain.
- 7.25 Watering has a side effect, in that objectors complain about mud being taken out on to the road by vehicle wheels. This is not a problem that has been highlighted by the Highway Authority and it is concluded that dust/mud generation could not be substantiated as a reason for refusal. If permission were to be granted a suitable planning condition could be applied.

7.26 Highways

7.27 The application site is conveniently located adjacent to the A34 trunk road and access and egress to this road are considered to be good. This means that visitors to the site are encouraged to use the trunk road and that traffic generation problems are not caused on the more minor roads passing through the adjacent villages.

7.28 A one-way system has been used in the past, with vehicles entering the site via Down Farm Lane and exiting via the mini-roundabout at the bottom of Christmas Hill. This egress point is on to a former main road with good visibility and with safe and convenient access to the A34.

7.29 The only disadvantage of the one-way system is the use of a short section of Down Farm Lane, between the A34/A272 and the farm entrance. This is a narrow road leading to Headbourne Worthy and there is evidence of over-running the highway edges. However, your officers are not aware of any serious accidents along this stretch of road and the Highway Engineer does not consider that the use of this lane by visitors to the site causes demonstrable harm.

7.30 Landscape

7.31 With the exception of two glimpses into the site, the tracks and buildings are well contained by the bunds that have been constructed and the trees and shrubs that have been permitted to remain. Planting has taken place but this has little effect, at present. In landscape terms, it is considered that the bunds themselves do not have a materially harmful impact on the area, in so much as they have very little visual impact from public viewpoints.

7.32 Additional tree planting might be advantageous but this could be dealt with by planning condition and the existing state of the site is not considered to be detrimental to the character or appearance of the countryside.

7.33 Ecology

7.34 The application site and its environs do not have any local, national or international designations as being of importance for nature conservation or the biodiversity of the area. Your officers are not aware of any protected species being present on the site. For these reasons the applicant has not submitted any ecological information with the application.

7.35 The Littleton and Harestock Parish Council draws attention to the fact that the application site lies within the Wonston Downs Landscape Character Area, as defined in the Local Plan Review, and that this states "*The habitats and species of greatest importance in this character area are associated with arable farmland, including the stone curlew*". This bird is a protected species found mainly on Salisbury Plain and in Breckland, Norfolk. However, there have not been sightings reported by objectors or by the landowner.

- 7.36 The County Ecology Team initially advised that they were unable to comment on this application because no ecological information had been provided.
- 7.37 They were specifically re-consulted on the matter of stone curlews and have stated that, in the absence of any survey and assessment information to support the application, they are not able to say what species do occur on and around the site. It is possible that habitats and species, including protected species such as ground nesting birds, may be affected by the proposal but there is insufficient information to enable this issue to be adequately considered. In the circumstances, therefore, it would be appropriate to refuse permission on this basis.
- 7.38 Public Rights of Way
- 7.39 The access drive to the site is also, in part, Footpath Number 2 in the Parish of Headbourne Worthy. The County Rights of Way Officer points out that it is an offence to drive over a public footpath without lawful authority and that this shared use with vehicles constitutes a potential hazard to walkers.
- 7.40 The landowner states that he has given authority for vehicles to drive over his land and your officers are not aware of any problems caused by dual use of the access drive during the past five years, when the motocross was operating.
- 7.41 Whilst it is acknowledged that it might not be pleasant for walkers to share their walk with motor vehicles along a length of the public right of way, and to listen to the motocross activity 250 metres or so from the footpath, these are not considered to be planning reasons sufficient for the refusal of this application, bearing in mind the previous use of the site.
- 7.42 There is a perception amongst objectors that the coming of the motocross site has led to the additional, illegal use of restricted byways by motorbike riders. However, this is strongly denied by the applicants, who state that the types of bikes are different as, indeed, are the types of riders. It is unlikely that the use of this site has any bearing on the use of the Ox Drove and similar byways.
- 7.43 The Local Economy
- 7.44 Many of those who have taken the trouble to write in support of this application contend that the local economy benefits from the number of visitors to the site who spend money in local petrol filling stations and shops, and who stay in local accommodation.
- 7.45 However, the Council's Head of Economic and Cultural Services does not share this point of view and believes that motocross has few financial benefits to Winchester. She does, though, appreciate that the application has potential for providing worthwhile interests for young people in the area and she also welcomes the addition of paintballing to the list of activities proposed.

8 **Conclusion**

- 8.1 The motocross facilities provided at Down Farm are appreciated by many riders, and their families, from Hampshire and further afield. They state that this is one of the best motocross sites in the country and its value as a facility is highly regarded. Officers recognise that the site could offer a facility which will be of benefit to the District and beyond. However, this has to be considered along with the impact of the development upon the locality.
- 8.2 The application before the Committee seeks to widen the activities provided on the site, to include off-road vehicle driving, including 4x4's, buggies and quad bikes; auto jumbles; collectors fairs; fundraising and paintballing. None of these activities are likely to have an adverse impact upon the surrounding area, as any noise would be contained within the existing bunds and traffic generation is well catered for. They are unlikely to adversely affect the biodiversity of the area and would be in accordance with the policies of the Development Plan.
- 8.3 However, noise is the main problem that has been reported during the 5-year trial period and the noise impacts from the proposed motocross will be comparable to those already encountered. Although not a statutory nuisance, the noise emanating from the site is likely to have an unacceptable impact on local residents.

9 **Recommendation**

- 9.1 Application Refused for the following reason(s):

1. Development as proposed is contrary to Policies CC6 and NRM10 of the South East Plan and Policies DP3, DP11 and RT13 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review in that the location is not remote from existing housing and the likely noise generated would have an unacceptable adverse impact on the residential amenities of the occupants of nearby properties.

2. In the absence of any ecological information supporting the application, the Local Planning Authority is unable to adequately assess whether the proposed development will have an adverse impact upon the biodiversity of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policies C4 and NRM5 of the South East Plan and Policy CE10 of the Winchester District Local Plan Review.

- 9.2 **Informative:** The Local Planning Authority has taken account of the following development plan policies and proposals:-

South East Plan:

CC6,NRM5,NRM10,NRM11,C4,C6,TSR2,S5

Winchester District Local Plan Review:

CE5,CE10,CE28,RT13,DP3,DP11,DP12

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

10 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN (RELEVANCE TO):

10.1 The report relates to the High Quality Environment outcome for the Sustainable Community Strategy.

11 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

11.1 None

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

Files held within the Planning Department.

APPENDICES:

- A. A copy of the temporary planning permission granted in 2004.
- B. Request from South Wonston Parish Council for application to be dealt with by Committee.
- C. Request from Littleton & Harestock Parish Council for application to be dealt with by Committee.
- D. Request from Crawley Parish Council for application to be dealt with by Committee.
- E. Request from Councillor Godfrey for application to be dealt with by Committee.
- F. Response from Environmental Protection Officer to planning consultation.
- G. 1:25,000 OS extract showing relationship of site to surrounding settlements.
- H. Extract from the planning application showing site layout, access, egress and relationship of site to the highway network.