

<b>4/01430/19/FUL</b>	<b>DETACHED AGRICULTURAL BARN</b>
<b>Site Address</b>	<b>LONG LANE FARM, LONG LANE, BOVINGDON, HEMEL HEMPSTEAD, HP3 0NE</b>
<b>Applicant</b>	<b>Mr &amp; Mrs Hunt</b>
<b>Case Officer</b>	<b>Nigel Gibbs</b>
<b>Referral to Committee</b>	<b>The recommendation is contrary to the response of Bovington Parish Council</b>

## **1. Recommendation**

1.1 That planning permission be granted.

## **2. Summary**

2.1 The site is located within the Green Belt and is subject to two previous planning permissions for a barn for specialist equestrian purposes in an area of the site's yard previously featuring longstanding buildings. The current application involves a building higher than the approved 2018 permission.

2.2 Set against the grant of Planning Permissions 4/02911/16/FUL and 4/01812/18/FUL as the fallback position /starting point the proposed barn is considered to be compatible with the Green Belt and there is no other harm, including the residential amenity of nearby dwellings in Long Lane.

2.3 Overall the proposal would accord with the aims of Policies CS1, CS5 , CS9, CS11, CS12, CS29 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

## **3. Site Description**

3.1 Long Lane Farm is located on the south eastern side of Long Lane to the south west of the junction with Water Lane and Bovington Green. The site features a long established dwelling closely fronting the road and an elongated access to the farmyard behind featuring a range of old and modern buildings serving the animal livestock agricultural unit.

3.2 There were a cluster of very dilapidated buildings within the northern corner of the farmyard. These adjoined the rear gardens of the farmhouse and nos 1, 3 and 5 Long Lane Cottages to the immediate north west with a dividing hedge.

3.3 Under Planning Permission 4/02911/16/FUL the LPA approved an oak-framed tiled and timber clad barn to replace existing buildings. However there was non compliance with the approved plans. Construction work stopped following an enforcement investigation, with the resultant subsequent removal of the building's north western gable end closest to Long Lane Cottages which was considered unacceptable. The building's north western end elevation was subsequently temporarily modified with a false timber hipped end supported by scaffolding. This was to demonstrate/ simulate the now proposed north western hipped end/ roof feature.

3.4 The grant of Planning Permission 4/01812/18/FUL with a height of 7.01m was considered to an acceptable alternative to 4/02911/16/ FUL. The granting of application 401812/18/FUL was on the basis of 149 sqm floor area with a height of 7.01m This compared with a 202 sqm floor space and height of 8.05m for the 2016 approved 'L' shaped building which was further away from the boundary closest to Long Lane.

3.5 In the consideration of these earlier applications the Agent has previously confirmed that the original structures at the site formed a piggery, ceasing in about 1975. Since then the buildings were used as stables but were becoming increasingly dilapidated until experiencing extreme storm damage in 2013. The 2016 supporting statement confirms 'the resultant debris have been cleared but the remaining buildings have little practical use as the roof areas leak and the walls have become unstable'. The Agent confirmed the structures 'can be accurately described as redundant agricultural buildings'.

#### **4. Proposal**

4.1 As in the case of Application 4/01812/18/FUL the current application has been submitted in response to the enforcement investigation resulting in the cessation of building works again due to the height exceeding the approved 7.01m. As a consequence of the enforcement investigation works have again ceased at the site pending the consideration of the current application.

4.2 The current application involves a building with a ridge level 7.65m maximum. In the consideration of the application there has been a need to request revised drawings due to the need to clarify the dimensions. Therefore there has been fresh consultation with Bovingdon Parish Council and neighbours regarding the revised plans. This is referred to as the Revised Scheme in the Representations at Annex A.

4.3 The building would accommodate a hay/ carriage store, feed store, a covered carriage store and tack room with a toilet. This is to serve as a store and workshop for horse driven heritage carriages which are the Applicants hobby, providing weatherproof and safe accommodation for the carriages and associated equipment. The size is necessary to accommodate the various specialist equipment, room to work and to provide tack and feedstuff storage. Horses may also occupy part of the new area. The toilet would benefit the farm which lacks this external facility.

4.4 The previously submitted supporting statement confirmed that the barn is not a commercial operation and is designed to appear 'traditional'. The application was supported by letters from the Traditional Gypsy Cob Association and The British Driving Society. These were provided following the withdrawal of the first application, taking into account the building's importance. These supporting letters confirmed the Applicants longstanding family involvement in carriage driving and the very real need for the on-site accommodation for the horse drawn vehicles with an associated special heritage.

#### **5. Relevant Planning History**

4/01812/18/FUL	PRETENTION OF AN OAK FRAMED BARN TO REPLACE EXISTING BUILDING Granted 26/02/2019
4/02911/16/FUL	PROPOSED OAK-FRAMED BARN TO REPLACE EXISTING BUILDINGS (AMENDED SCHEME).

	Granted 30/05/2017
4/00482/16/FUL	CONSTRUCTION OF AN OAK FRAMED BARN TO REPLACE EXISTING BUILDING Withdrawn 05/04/2016
4/00174/06/FHA	ALTERATIONS TO ROOF TO FORM GABLE END AT REAR Granted 17/03/2006
4/01573/04/FUL	CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING TO BE USED AS CATTLE SHED AND FEED STORE Granted 19/08/2004
4/00489/04/FUL	CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING TO BE USED AS CATTLE SHED AND FEED STORE Withdrawn 05/05/2004
4/00442/03/AGD	CONSTRUCTION OF OPEN FRONTED FODDER/MACHINERY STORE Prior approval not required 31/03/2003
4/00705/01/	PITCHED ROOF AND PORCH Granted 19/06/2001
4/00170/00/4	CONSTRUCTION OF BARN Granted 09/05/2000

## 6. Policies

### 6.1 National Policy Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

### 6.2 Dacorum Core Strategy 2013

NP1 - Supporting Development  
CS1 - Distribution of Development  
CS5 - The Green Belt  
CS8 - Sustainable Transport  
CS9 - Management of Roads  
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design  
CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design  
CS12 - Quality of Site Design  
CS25 - Landscape Character  
CS26 - Green Infrastructure  
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction  
CS31 - Water Management

CS32 - Air, Water and Soil Quality

### 6.3 Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1991-2011

Policies 13, 51, 54, 58, 61, 63, 81 and 113

Appendices 3 and 8

### 6.4 Supplementary Planning Guidance / Documents

Environmental Guidelines (May 2004)

Conservation & Sustainable Drainage (June 2005)

Energy Efficiency & Conservation (June 2006)

Landscape Character Assessment (May 2004)

### 6.5 Advice Notes and Appraisals

Sustainable Development Advice Note (March 2011)

## **7. Constraints**

Green Belt

Former Land Use

Air Safeguarding Area

## **8. Representations**

### Consultation responses

8.1 These are at Appendix A.

### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

8.2 These are at Appendix B.

## **9. Considerations**

### Main issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

- Policy and principle: Green Belt Implications with reference to Equestrian Activities.
- Design.
- Impact on neighbouring properties.

9.2 This is set against the use of the site for agriculture and the site's historical association of equestrian uses with the countryside. For clarification unless horses are used for horse drawn ploughing, equestrian uses fall outside the planning definition of agriculture.

## Policy and Principle: The Green Belt Implications

### National Planning Policy Framework:

#### *Background*

9.3 Under para 145 a LPA should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this include:

- buildings for agriculture and forestry;
- provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation and for cemeteries, as long as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it;
- the extension or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building; and
- the replacement of a building, provided the new building is in the same use and not materially larger than the one it replaces.

9.4 Para 146 confirms that certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate in Green Belt provided they preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belt. These include the re-use of buildings provided that the buildings are of permanent construction.

9.5 Para 143 confirms that as with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

9.6 Para 141 explains that when considering any planning application, LPAs should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

9.7 Also Paragraph 141 confirms that once Green Belts have been defined, LPAs should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to improve damaged and derelict land.

#### *Dacorum Core Strategy Policy CS5 Green Belt*

9.8 This specifies amongst a range of matters that the Council will apply national Green Belt policy to protect the openness and character of the Green Belt, local distinctiveness and the physical separation of settlements.

9.9 Within the Green Belt, small-scale development will be permitted: i.e:

- (a) building for the uses defined as appropriate in national policy;
- (b) the replacement of existing buildings for the same use;
- (c) limited extensions to existing buildings;
- (d) the appropriate reuse of permanent, substantial buildings; and

(e) the redevelopment of previously developed sites\*, including major developed sites which will be defined on the Proposals Map

provided that:

- i. it has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside; and
- ii. it supports the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside.

### *Dacorum Borough Local Plan Saved Policy 81: Equestrian Activities*

#### *Background*

9.10 This specifies the following, with the policy partially compliant with the NPPF:

9.11 New commercial equestrian facilities will not be permitted in the Green Belt unless they can be accommodated in existing buildings and there is no adverse impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

9.12 Small scale facilities will normally be permitted in the Green Belt and Rural Area, provided they meet the following criteria:

(a) equestrian facilities should be well located in relation to existing and proposed rights of way for equestrians;

(b) equestrian facilities should be carefully integrated into the rural landscape by siting adjacent to existing buildings or features such as trees, woodlands or hedgerows;

(c) any new buildings should be compatible in scale and design with the countryside setting and ancillary to the overall equestrian use;

(d) the scale of activity should respect the countryside setting and quality of the surrounding area;

(e) opportunities to extend or add links to the bridleway network and improve riders' safety should be taken;

(f) careful attention should be paid to the design, maintenance and management of jumps and other equipment (including the desirability of removing these items when they are not in use); and

(g) availability of sufficient grazing in relation to the number of loose boxes and stable units.

9.13 Proposals should not result in subdivision of fields into small paddocks with stables and fencing in each area.

#### *The Green Belt / Countryside Implications*

##### *Overall Assessment*

9.14 With reference to these policies the proposal is 'Green Belt' compliant in the

following ways:

- The equestrian/ outdoor recreational use is appropriate in the Green Belt,
- It replaces previous longstanding buildings at the site used for agricultural/ equestrian purposes, and
- The proposal is non-commercial.

9.15 In granting Planning Permission 4/02911/16/FUL the report noted the following based upon the submitted information:

'The proposal is 38% over the floor space of the existing buildings and 8% over the existing buildings and those subject to the previous storm damage, being also significantly higher than the existing buildings to be demolished. Therefore as the proposed replacement is materially larger it is contrary to Green Belt policy representing inappropriate development which is by definition harmful.

Therefore it can only be supported if there are very special circumstances which outweighs the harm and there is no other harm. In exercising a measured consideration of the proposal it is reasonable to take into account the following:

- That whilst the existing buildings could not be re used /refurbished due to its existing very poor condition there would be no objection under Green Belt policy to their replacement with one of the same size. This is a robust case of a need to provide a new building -with some additional floor space - replacing very dilapidated buildings of probably immediate post 1945 construction which have gone beyond their reusable condition.
- The extra floor space is due to the Applicants operational hobby requirements with equestrian recreational uses supported in the Green Belt with the height necessary to facilitate the use of clay tiles. The height is not for operational reasons.
- There is no opportunity to provide the necessary accommodation within the limited residential curtilage of the farmhouse.
- The increased floor space. As clarified the proposal represents an 8% increase over all the original buildings as compared to the 38 % over the existing. At 8% development would not be much larger in terms floor space, notwithstanding the additional height. As a comparison the LPA's historic approach to replacement dwellings/ extensions to dwellings a 30% increase is normally an acceptable/ proportionate enlargement in terms of floor space. In this respect as confirmed, the LPA recently granted permission for 54% increase to the nearby Tamarinda. This included two storey front and side extensions. In this case it was assessed that '...given the residential character of the immediate area the proposals are not considered to detract from the character or openness of the Green Belt'
- The proposal will have limited impact upon openness of this part of the Green Belt. This is due to the development's relationship with the established farm complex, being discreet in relation to public views from Long Lane, consolidating their existing footprint. This takes into account the fall-back position of the size/ footprint of the very longstanding buildings to

be replaced. For comparison - whilst each application has to be considered upon its individual merits - it should be observed that again in the case of the development at Tamarinda this is considered to have a much greater impact upon the openness of this part of Green Belt as compared to the proposal. The proposed building's extra height is not an overriding issue in the context of its relationship with established farmyard buildings where there are buildings of similar height. A lower pitched roof incorporating modern tiles would be of lesser design quality and sustainable.

It has no significant impact on the character and appearance of the countryside upgrading the site. This is due to its location within the historic group of farmyard buildings, consolidating/ reinforcing the long established farmyard layout.

- It supports the rural economy, with the possible future use for agriculture.
- There are no known environmental problems arising from the historical closeness of the farm with the adjoining very long established housing in Long Lane.
- There is no proposed first floor which is subject to an agreed condition.

It is concluded that there are sound very special circumstances which outweigh the harm'.

9.16 In granting the subsequent 4/01812/19 the report observed:

'Set against this background with due regard to overall reduced size of the building as compared with the approved scheme - the fall-back position'- there is a case to support the application. This takes into account that the increased massing on the northern side is not considered to be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt'.

9.17 In considering the current application the fall-back position is the grant of the 2 previous permissions with heights of 8.05m and 7.01m respectively. This takes into account that the 2016 first permission involved a building further away from the boundary closest to Long Lane. It is not considered that the additional height -in comparing the proposal with the 2018 permission i.e. 7.35m to 7.01m as the fall-back position- would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt.

#### Compatibility of the Development with the Character and Appearance of the area: Layout and Design

9.18 The building would be visually compatible with the site's setting in relation to the long established farmyard context and the yard's longstanding relationship with the adjoining residential development in Long Lane.

#### Impact on neighbouring properties/ Residential Amenity

9.19 This is with reference to the expectations of Dacorum Core Strategy Policies CS12 and CS32, Appendix 3 of the Dacorum Local Plan and the NPPF regarding residential amenity. It takes into account privacy, physical impact, sunlight/ daylight, noise, disturbance.

9.20 In the consideration of the 2016 application there were no known environmental



problems arising from the historical closeness of the farm with the adjoining very long established housing in Long Lane. At the time Environmental Health Team's Noise & Pollution Unit previously raised no objections and have reinforced this through both 2018 application and the current submission. It is understood that the hobby workshop purposes will not involve noise generated activity in the repair / maintenance of the cart equipment. It is unknown whether there will be the shoeing of horses through on site farrier works. However, this should be limited.

9.21 In this context with due regard to the 2018 decision as the fall-back position, there are no objections in principle to a building in this location or its use. In approving the 2018 application the report noted that 'although closer to the dwellings in Long Lane, in particular no. 5, the effect of the increased massing would not be detrimental to the residential amenity of these dwellings'. The additional height of 7.65m as compared with 7.01m as now proposed through the current application is similarly not considered to be harmful to the residential amenity of existing dwellings in Long Lane.

Other Issues including Access/Parking /Ecological Implications, Land Contamination, Drainage/ Crime Prevention Security, Lighting

9.22 There are no apparent objections with an EIA not required.

## **10. Conclusions**

10.1 Set against the LPA's support for a new building under the respective 2016 and 2018 planning permissions as the respective fall-back positions, this 3rd scheme is considered to be acceptable within the Green Belt with no objections to its size or its impact upon the adjoining/ nearby dwellinghouses.

10.2 Subject to the imposition of conditions the application is recommended for the grant of permission.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be **GRANTED** for the reasons referred to above and subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

<b>No</b>	<b>Condition</b>
1	<p><b>The building hereby permitted shall only be used for non-commercial equestrian or agricultural purposes and therefore excludes any residential use.</b></p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To safeguard the Green Belt and the residential amenity of the locality in accordance with Policies CS5 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013 and for the avoidance of doubt.</p>
2	<p><b>There shall be no additional floor space formed within the building hereby permitted (and therefore no first floor shall be formed) and no external alterations to the approved design of the building hereby permitted.</b></p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To safeguard the Green Belt and the local environment in accordance</p>

	with Policies CS5, CS12 and CS29 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.
3	<p><b>The building hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials specified on Drawing No. DRG 1819/1E.</b></p> <p><u>Reason:</u> In the interests of the visual amenity in accordance with Policies CS5 and CS12 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.</p>
4	<p><b>The development hereby permitted shall be served by a sustainable drainage system at all times.</b></p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure that the development is subject to an acceptable drainage system in accordance with the aims of Policies CS12 and CS31 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013 and to protect groundwater to accord with the requirements of Policies CS31 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.</p>
5	<p><b>The building hereby permitted shall at all times feature a bat roost unit (tubes) integrated within the fabric of the new barn and designed/installed under the guidance of a suitably experienced ecologist.</b></p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To ensure biodiversity benefit in accordance with Policy CS29 of Dacorum Core Strategy 2013.</p>
6	<p><b>Details of all exterior lighting to be installed to serve the building hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The exterior lighting shall be installed and thereafter retained fully in accordance with the approved details.</b></p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To safeguard the local environment in accordance with the requirements of Policies CS5, CS12, CS24 , CS29 and CS32 of the Dacorum Core Strategy 2013and Policy 113 and Appendix 8 of the saved Dacorum Borough Local Plan.</p>
7	<p><b>Subject to the requirements of other conditions of this planning permission the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans:</b></p> <p><b>1819/1E</b>  <b>1819/3D</b>  <b>1819/3E</b>  <b>1819/2B</b></p> <p><u>Reason:</u> To safeguard and maintain the strategic policies of the local planning authority and for the avoidance of doubt.</p> <p><u>NOTE 1: ARTICLE 35 STATEMENT</u></p> <p>Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through early engagement with the agent during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme.</p> <p>The Council has therefore acted pro-actively in line with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38 ) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No. 2) Order 2015.</p>

INFORMATIVES

**Bats**

UK and European Legislation makes it illegal to:

Deliberately kill, injure or capture bats;  
Recklessly disturb bats;  
Damage, destroy or obstruct access to bat roosts (whether or not bats are present).

Contacts:

English Nature                      01206 796666  
UK Bat Helpline                      0845 1300 228 (www.bats.org.uk)  
Herts & Middlesex Bat Group      01992 581442  
Bats : Condition 6

The bat feature should be designed/installed under the guidance of a suitably experienced ecologist.

**Un-expected Contaminated Land Informative**

In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority with all works temporarily suspended because, the safe development and secure occupancy of the site lies with the developer.

**Construction Hours of Working – (Plant & Machinery) Informative**

In accordance with the councils adopted criteria, all noisy works associated with site demolition, site preparation and construction works shall be limited to the following hours: 0730hrs to 1830hrs on Monday to Saturdays, no works are permitted at any time on Sundays or bank holidays.

**Noise on Construction/Demolition Sites Informative**

The attention of the applicant is drawn to the Control of Pollution Act 1974 relating to the

**Appendix A: Representations**

**ORIGINAL SCHEME**

Bovingdon Parish Council

None.

Building Control

No response.

Scientific Officer

Having reviewed the application submission and the ECP records I am able to confirm that there is no objection on the grounds of land contamination. Also, there is no requirement for further contaminated land information to be provided, or for contaminated land planning conditions to be recommended in relation to this application

Noise & Pollution

No objections on noise or air quality grounds.

Hertfordshire Ecology

We have no info for this site, which appears to be on land likely to be of little or no ecological interest. Consequently, I have no reason to believe there are any ecological constraints relating to the above application.

Thames Water

No response.

Affinity Water

No response.

Comments received from local residents/ Response to Site Notice

Tamarinda: Objection

Regarding DRG No. 1819/3B as submitted in the new planning application (Detached Agricultural Barn), please see comments below:

On the SW Elevation Profile - The 'approved' building outline shown is not correct and does not reflect what was built originally.

On the Floor Plan Profile - The 'approved' building outline shown is not correct and does not reflect what was built originally;

- distances to the boundary are inaccurate (the building is closer to the boundary than the plans show).

There is no relationship shown to the existing building (as per DRG No. 1539/3A - SW Elevation Profile - Existing) and the proposed barn (now built) which is misleading as the new barn is higher than the existing buildings. Previous drawings show the new barn to lower than existing buildings, however, this is not the case.

What is the height of the existing building and why is this not reflected on the revised drawings?

The date on DRG No. 1819/3B is not reflecting latest plan submission date (currently shows Sept '18).

Application Form - No DRG No. 1819/2 present on this or subsequent application (only 1539/3A). On this drawing, at the NW Elevation, the distance to the boundary of Long Lane Cottages / Tamarinda is not accurate and it is nearer than the plans show.

This application is only seeking to rectify the current unsatisfactory situation, where the barn has been built too close to the boundary on the NW elevation. It is too high and over-bearing given its proximity to neighbouring properties and in relationship to existing buildings.

I look forward to your response, particularly in reference to the height of the existing buildings (see previous emails) as this is inaccurately reflected and in my opinion should not have been allowed to get through planning approval.

#### Fortina, 5 Long Lane Cottages: Support

I cannot understand why this objection is being considered as the only property that this concerns is my own property directly next door to Long Lane Farm and I have no objection whatsoever, in fact this is far better than the building it is replacing. That this actually enhances my outlook greatly.

I hope my comments will be taken seriously and that the applicant's application will now be able to proceed to a satisfactory conclusion.

#### **REVISED SCHEME**

##### Bovingdon Parish Council

Over bearing and inappropriate development in the Green Belt. We also believe that the current construction is not in accordance with the stated location and dimensions.

Please Note: The Parish Council Clerk has also advised the Enforcement Team:

'Several residents living nearby are concerned that the construction work that is currently under way is not in accordance with the current planning permission and from photographs submitted by them, the Committee were supportive of their concerns, hence our comments and the request by the Committee for me to contact the Planning Enforcement Team'..

##### Tamarinda: Objection

Regarding the newly amended planning application as below, I have the following comments:

Ref: 4/01430/19/FUL

The following comments assume that the decision process for this application disregards the current structure that is in place that represents this latest planning application.

The relationship between the existing building (as per DRG No. 1539/3E - SW Elevation Profile ~ Existing) and the proposed building (replacing storm damaged barn) shows the proposed building as 1.3m higher than the existing building and also exceeds the height of the storm damaged building it replaces by 1.35 - 1.65m. Therefore, it is too high in comparison to the existing buildings and the building it replaces given the proximity to all neighbouring gardens and properties.

Properties directly facing the NW elevation of the proposed building will have visibility of a physical area of building that is approx 25 sq/m which is above the height of the hedge at the rear of Long Lane Cottages.

However, the angle of the proposed building in relation to the view from adjacent gardens/properties facing from the north side means the view is onto the NW and NE elevations of the proposed building which materialises into a more substantial area of building and roof on display amounting to approx 130 sq/m.

The proposed building is therefore too overbearing for a green belt location.

The notes (descriptions, measurements, labelling) within DRG No. 1819/1E are not clear enough (too small or too faint) and cannot be accurately read to validate the detail within.

On DRG No. 1819/3B (SW Elevation Profile), the proposed height of the proposed building does not reflect the measurement supplied in other drawings and brings into doubt which is the correct dimension.

Is it proposing 7750mm or 7650mm as in other drawings?

Regarding this amended application, it is only seeking to rectify the current unsatisfactory situation, where the building being proposed has already been built too close to the boundary on the NW and NE elevations. It is too high and over-bearing given its proximity to neighbouring properties/gardens and in its relationship to existing buildings.

Previously approved applications did not have the accurately reflected proposed roof height of the new building taken into consideration against the existing building heights (previously existing buildings were shown as 8.1m in height whereas they are only 6.35m in reality). The newly proposed building was supposed to be lower than existing buildings. However, this is not the case. In addition, the storm damaged building that the new building is replacing was only 6 - 6.3m in height and the newly proposed building height exceeds this by 1.35 - 1.65m.

In summary, the proposed building is too high and this planning application should reflect the building in terms of height that it is to replace while also not exceeding the height of existing buildings on Long Lane Farm.

### 1 Long lane Cottages: Support

I feel as a neighbour at 1 long lane cottages this has been going on far too long now. The overall look will be amazing and will look much nicer than the previous eyesore. The hold up on this being finished is affecting us with all the scaffolding that is hanging around its beginning to look like eyesore especially when I currently have my house on the market. If this does go to the committee I'd be more than happy to speak, would you kindly let me know if it does.

