

**ITEM NUMBER: 5a**

<b>4/02270/19/FUL</b>	<b>Demolition of existing storage building and construction of new stable block and access</b>	
<b>Site Address:</b>	<b>Land On Featherbed Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead HP3 0BT</b>	
<b>Applicant/Agent:</b>		<b>Mr Davenport</b>
<b>Case Officer:</b>	<b>Jane Miller</b>	
<b>Parish/Ward:</b>		<b>Bovingdon/ Flaunden/ Chipperfield</b>
<b>Referral to Committee:</b>	<b>Called in by Councillor Riddick</b>	

**1. RECOMMENDATION**

That planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions

**2. SUMMARY**

- 2.1 The application seeks permission for the demolition of an existing storage building and construction of a new stable block and access within the Metropolitan Green Belt.
- 2.2 The proposal is considered to preserve the openness of the Green Belt and would not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. Furthermore, the proposal would not have a significant impact on the appearance and character of the surrounding area, residential amenity of the surrounding properties and highway safety. The proposed development therefore complies with the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), Policies, CS5, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and saved Policy 81 of the DBLP.

**3. SITE DESCRIPTION**

- 3.1 The application site is a rectangular plot of land of approximately 1.06 hectares in area (2.62 acres) located on the north side of Featherbed Lane within the Metropolitan Green Belt area.
- 3.2 Beyond the site lies a mixture of residential dwellings either within the Metropolitan Green Belt or the urban boundary of Hemel Hempstead. Featherbed Lane comprises large detached dwellings many of which have previously been extended. The north and west of the site backs onto residential properties off Sheethanger Lane except for a field to part of the western boundary.

**4. PROPOSAL**

- 4.1 This application seeks permission for the demolition of an existing storage building and construction of a new stable block.
- 4.2 The stableblock comprises: three stables, a tack room, hay store, feed room, WC, store, and tractor and equipment store.
- 4.3 Amended plans were requested to include:
- reduction in size/scale of stables

- relocating the stableblock away from central position and closer to north west corner of site in accordance with Saved Policy 81.
- Further revised plans relocating the stableblock to avoid the root protection area (RPA) of the Oak Tree – TPO in line with the Tree Officer’s comments.
- Access area and amended location plan.

4.4 The application form originally received from the agent states the site area as 0.9 hectares, however the planning officer measures the site at approximately 1.06 hectares, and the agent has since confirmed that their architect measures the site at 1.07 hectares.

4.5 It should be noted that the chicken shed and more recent extension to the existing storage building has been dealt with under a separate retrospective planning application under reference 19/02959/FUL – refused, and does not form part of this application.

## 5. PLANNING HISTORY

5.1 Planning Applications (If Any): 19/02959/FUL (refused)

## 6. CONSTRAINTS

Parking Accessibility Zone (DBLP): 4

Special Control for Advertisements: Advert Spec Contr

CIL Zone: CIL2 / 3

Former Land Use (Risk Zone): Sheethanger Lane Landfill, Felden, HH

Green Belt: Policy: CS5

LHR Wind Turbine

Parish: Hemel Hempstead Non-Parish

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Green (15.2m) & Red (10.7m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (Hemel Hempstead)

EA Source Protection Zone: 3

Town: Hemel Hempstead

T1 Oak (Quercus robur) Adj E boundary; 17 fr SE corner

## 7. REPRESENTATIONS

### Consultation responses

7.1 These are reproduced in full at Appendix A.

### Neighbour notification/site notice responses

7.2 These are reproduced in full at Appendix B.

## 8. PLANNING POLICIES

Main Documents:

National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019)

Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2006-2031 (adopted September 2013)

Dacorum Borough Local Plan 1999-2011 (adopted April 2004)

## Relevant Policies:

NP1 - Supporting Development  
CS1 - Distribution of Development  
CS5 – Green Belt  
CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design  
CS12 - Quality of Site Design  
CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction  
DBLP81 – Equestrian Activities  
DBLP99 – Preservation of Trees & Woodlands

## Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

Accessibility Zones for the Application of Car Parking Standards (2002)  
Roads in Hertfordshire, Highway Design Guide 3rd Edition (2011)

## 9. CONSIDERATIONS

### Policy and Principle

- 9.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (2019) paragraph 145 states that a local planning authority should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt. Exceptions to this include: b) the provision of appropriate facilities (in connection with the existing use of land or a change of use) for outdoor sport, outdoor recreation, cemeteries and burial grounds and allotments, as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
- 9.2 Policy CS5 – Green Belt (2013) states that The Council will apply national Green Belt Policy to protect the openness and character of the Green Belt. Within the Green Belt, small scale development will be permitted i.e. (a) building for the uses defined as appropriate in national policy, provided that it has no significant adverse impact on the character and appearance of the countryside; and (ii) it supports the rural economy and maintenance of the wider countryside.
- 9.3 Equestrian activities are controlled under saved Policy 81 of the DBLP, which states that small scale facilities will normally be permitted in the Green Belt, provided they meet a range of criteria including:
- (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 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) Care 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.

Furthermore, under Policy 81, proposals should not result in subdivision of fields into small paddocks with stables and fencing in each area.

- 9.4 The proposal for a non-commercial single storey stable block for three horses is considered small scale and is supported by the Core Strategy CS5 and the NPPF which allows small-scale buildings for uses defined as appropriate in national policy. Equestrian facilities being one such use, subject to an assessment of its visual and spatial aspect. The scheme, as amended, is considered to comply with Policy 81.
- 9.5 The principle of development is therefore acceptable subject to compliance with the relevant national and local policies.
- 9.6 The key considerations in this application are the development's:
  - a. Impact on the Green Belt;
  - b. Effect on the character and appearance upon the immediate area;
  - c. Effect on the residential amenity of neighbouring properties; and
  - d. Impact on Highway Safety.

### **Introduction to Considerations**

- 9.7 The application is for the demolition of the existing storage building and the construction of a new stable block and access. The facility is to be used by the owner and his family for personal use only for the keeping of their three pet horses, and not to be used for commercial purposes. A condition will be added to the decision notice in this respect.
- 9.8 The original application was submitted with the description '*The Demolition of Existing Stables and the Erection of a New Stable*'; however, it was apparent during the planning officer's site visit that the description was incorrect and that there was no existing stable on site. There was however a small existing open sided field shelter/storage structure, not suitable for keeping horses, in the north west corner of the site. Historic maps indicate that a shelter of this size was present in 1983.
- 9.9 Further, it was also noted that the recent extensions to either end of the above mentioned storage building and the chicken coup along the western boundary of the site had not been granted planning permission. Subsequently the planning department received a retrospective planning application (19/02959/FUL) for these more recent structures, which has been subsequently refused. These unlawful structures do not form part of this planning application.
- 9.10 Following the site visit, the planning officer therefore asked that the description be altered to reflect that the proposal is not for a replacement stable and that the agent

should remove the unlawful structures from the site plan, leaving only the original field shelter. It should be noted that, as the application has been amended during its considerations, the planning statement (as original) attached to this application now contains some incorrect information.

- 9.11 The agent confirmed that the existing lawful storage building will be removed if the current application is granted and a condition will be added to the decision notice in this respect.
- 9.12 The initial plans were considered unacceptable, with concern over the siting and size/bulk of the stable block, however following negotiations with the Agent, amended plans were receiving during the course of the application. Later revisions were sought following advice from the Tree Officer in respect of a TPO on an Oak Tree and to include provision for access.
- 9.13 Amended plans reduced the overall ridge height of the stable block by 700mm, and then a further 150mm, except for the equipment store. Hence the height of the structure is approximately 4.56 metres (eaves 2.2m), rising to a height of approximately 4.86m (eaves 2.4m) at the tractor and equipment store to accommodate the machinery/tractor height.
- 9.14 The planning officer relayed to the agent that a lower monopitch roof would be preferable. The agent responded that the height was developed on two basis, firstly to meet the appropriate height standards of the Equine Business Guide offering entrances 2.1m in height as is the stated minimum with a pitched roof allowing for sufficient head room of over the 3m minimum headroom, and secondly that given the high quality design standards in the area, his client is looking to achieve an appealing and above average design. The plans retained the proposed dual pitched roof. The agent also highlighted, as he had during the site visit, that on the neighbouring land to the east of the site, understood to be the property known as The Hive, there is a significant structure used for the storage of tractors and construction equipment.
- 9.15 The L-shaped stable block has a floor space of approximately 190 square metres. This includes three stables - each individual stable internally (measures approximately 4m width x 4 m depth); a tack room (5m x 2.9m), feed room (3.7m x 3.5m), hay stores (5.7m x 5m), and a tractor and equipment store (approximately 6.5m x 5.5m) all of which are considered reasonable facilities/resources for the day to day care and keeping of horses.
- 9.16 The applicant currently owns an Irish Sport 15-3; Conamara 14-2; and an Irish Pony 12-2.
- 9.17 Please note that the internal floor space of individual stables at 4m x 4m is smaller than that stated in the original planning statement received i.e. 4.6m x 4.6m. The Agent has advised that that the dimensions accord with the required standards for keeping three horses on site as stipulated in the Agro Business Consultants Equine Business Guide. The guide is 3.7m x 3.7m (horse); 3.7m x 4.3m (large horse); 3.7m x 3.0m (pony); 4.6m x 4.6m (foaling box).

- 9.18 By comparison, the British Horse Society guidance for the minimum stable size for a horse is 3.65m x 3.65m. Large horse 3.65m x 4.25m; ponies 3.05m x 3.05m); doors 1.25m wide; roofs high enough to provide adequate ventilation, there should be a reasonable clear space 0.6-1.0m to the roof above the withers of a horse in its normal standing position.
- 9.19 The proposed stables at 4m x 4m are therefore just above the minimum recommended for a horse.
- 9.20 Ventilation is required for the storage of hay etc. and the Agent has advised that whilst not open, the storage area will benefit natural ventilation from being a wooden structure.
- 9.21 In terms of materials the proposed stable block would be constructed externally using the following schedule of materials:
- Reclaimed plain clay roofing tiles
  - Natural timber weatherboard cladding (i.e. untreated, allowed to oxidise)
  - Oak posts and frame (as weatherboard)
  - Soft red facing brick plinth (Durham Red Multi Stock from EH Smiths at Bovingdon)
- 9.22 The foundations will be a reinforced concrete raft, due to the proximity to tree roots, designed by PCDS of Chesham.
- 9.23 It is understood that the site has historically been used for grazing 2/3 horses. Saved Policy 81 seeks to ensure the availability of sufficient grazing in relation to the number of animals. Notwithstanding the short fall on grazing land, as it is noted that the site at approximately 1.06 hectares (2.62 acres) falls slightly short of the recommended one acre per horse, the applicant is satisfied that that the area is large enough to graze this three horses and additional feed will be provided as necessary.
- 9.24 According to the site location plan there is an existing fence running across the site from east to west, with a gap for movement, such fences can be erected under permitted development. Additional fencing will be controlled by way of condition.
- 9.25 The agent has provided a map showing the rights of way for equestrians in the area in accordance with Saved Policy 81(a).

### Green Belt Impact Assessment

- 9.26 As stated above the provision of a small-scale outdoor recreation facility is not considered to be inappropriate development in the Green Belt in accordance with paragraph 145 of the NPPF, as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
- 9.27 In visual terms, it is not considered that the proposed stable and hardstanding would be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The structure would be sited close to but below the existing boundary and tree line, in a natural dip in the land whereby the stableblock would be seen against the backdrop of the substantial mature trees and fencing which line the boundary to the north-west deemed less visible from the

access point. Further, with the exception of the access gate, mature Trees and hedgerow line the boundary with Featherbed Lane reducing the visibility from the highway to the stables thereby minimising any significant harm.

- 9.28 Having all the essential store rooms under one roof within the stable block is considered less impactful on the character of the area and better aesthetically than the use of multiple temporary storage containers / open air storage of equipment. The facility will also enable secure storage of all resources and equipment including the tractor which if stored on site results in less impact on the highways. The position of the structure also increases natural surveillance over the site.
- 9.29 It is understood from the agent that the tractor and trailer will be used to transfer feed / bedding etc. around the site including from the access gate to the stables, keeping vehicles movements to a minimum and that no hard surface track is therefore necessary on this site. Any additional surface would impact the openness of the Greenbelt and will be addressed within the landscaping condition.
- 9.30 Additionally, the high quality of materials to be used, including a new oak frame with untreated weatherboard cladding are considered appropriate for an equestrian facility, blending into this semi-rural Green Belt setting and give it a less substantial visual appearance.
- 9.31 The stable block has a floor space of approximately 190 square metres, the additional hard standing at the access is approximately 10m x 3.6m. The choice of material used for the access to be conditioned to reduce its impact. It is also preferable to have an area of hard surfacing by the access versus and road/track leading all the way to the stableblock in terms of openness of the Green Belt.
- 9.32 In respect of the yard, it is accepted that a hard surfaced apron will be required immediately in front of the stable. However, such hard surfacing, which is a reasonable requirement associated with a stable block, would have no impact on the openness of the Green Belt, due to its obvious lack of height and its siting immediately adjacent the stable block. Furthermore, a condition requiring, prior to occupation of the stables, full details of both hard and soft landscape work will be added to the decision notice. This will include details of all external hard surfaces within the site, including the yard to avoid unnecessary hardstanding and to preserve the openness of the Green Belt.
- 9.33 In spatial terms, it is considered that the new stableblock and access would not be harmful to the openness of the Green Belt. The site is just within the Green Belt boundary and except for an adjoining field along part of the western boundary closest to Featherbed Lane and the access, the site is immediately surrounded by, and positioned within an existing established low density area of built structures. These are mainly substantial detached residential dwellings within generous plots along Sheethanger Lane to the north and Featherbed Lane to the south. The agent advises that there is also a significant storage structure to the east at neighbouring property, understood to be known as The Hive.
- 9.34 It is accepted that 'openness of the Green Belt' comprises both a visual and spatial element (*Turner v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government*

[2016]). Case law (*Samuel Smith Old Brewery (Tadcaster) v North Yorkshire CC* [2018]) has established that “whether the development would ‘preserve’ the openness of the Green Belt” does not mean that a proposal can only be regarded as ‘not inappropriate in the Green Belt’ if the openness of the Green Belt would be left entirely unchanged; rather, the verb ‘preserve’ should be understood in the sense of “keep safe from harm” – rather than “maintain (a state of things)”.

- 9.35 Overall, for the reasons stated above, it is considered that the proposed development preserves the openness of the Green Belt.
- 9.36 The second element which needs to be considered is whether the development would conflict with the purposes of including the land in question within the Green Belt.
- 9.37 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF state that the Green Belt serves five purposes:
- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
  - To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
  - To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
  - To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
  - To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 9.38 Full consideration has been given to the above points. The proposal would not result in the unrestricted sprawl of a large built-up area, would not result in neighbouring towns merging into one another; would not be at odds with safeguarding the countryside from encroachment due to the stable block being located at the rear of the site near the boundary in accordance with Policy 81, and that such a facility is expected within the countryside; there are no historic towns in close proximity to the application site; and would not prejudice the recycling of derelict and other urban land.
- 9.39 In conclusion, this proposal for a small scale stableblock for private use is considered to fall within the list of development stated as not inappropriate in the Green Belt in paragraph 145 of the NPPF. Furthermore, the development would preserve the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.
- 9.40 Overall, therefore, the proposal is considered to accord with Saved Policy 81, Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy and the NPPF.

#### Effect on Appearance and Character of Area

- 9.41 Dacorum's Core Strategy Policy CS12 (Quality of Site Design) states that development within settlements and neighbourhoods should integrate with the streetscape character and respect adjoining properties in terms of scale, height, bulk and materials. Chapter 12 of the Framework emphasises the importance of good

design in context and, in particular, paragraph 130 states permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to improve the character and quality of an area.

- 9.42 The scale, design and materials of the stable block proposed are considered acceptable for its use and in keeping with the character of this semi-rural site within the Green Belt.
- 9.43 The stable block is also set far back into the site, towards the north-west corner, approximately 103m from the road. As such, it would not be viewed from clear public vantage points along Featherbed Lane until right at the site and therefore has no impact on the character and appearance of the locality.
- 9.44 It is acknowledged that dual pitched roofs can be acceptable for stableblocks for example a stable block at Badgerdell House, in Chipperfield, (granted under planning reference 4/00824/16/FUL) has a dual pitched roof, height of 5.2m rising to 5.7m (eaves 2.7m).
- 9.45 Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would be generally sympathetic and in keeping with the surrounding area, respect adjoining properties and would therefore result in no significant adverse effects on the character and appearance of the area. This accords with the local and national policies mentioned above.

#### Effect on Residential Amenity

- 9.46 The NPPF outlines the importance of planning in securing good standards of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings. Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan (2004) and Policy CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013), seek to ensure that new development does not result in detrimental impact upon neighbouring properties and their amenity space. Thus, the proposed development should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way of visual intrusion, loss of light, privacy and disturbance.
- 9.47 We have received letters of objection from adjacent neighbours in respect of the proximity of the stables to their dwellings and concerns with possible loss of privacy and disturbance. There is concern from Oakwood that, if there are people of site most of the day, the owners of Oakwood would suffer lack of privacy on the NW side, to their kitchen and master bedroom, as well as excessive noise.
- 9.48 Approximate measurements of adjacent dwellings to the stable block using DBC mapping system: Oakwood: 28m to stable block (19m from Oakwood to the site boundary); Felden Lawns 36m to stable block (directly across Felden Close garden) (30m from Felden Lawns to site boundary and 12m from boundary to stable); Chaileys: 45m to stable block. The Ordnance Survey mapping system and submitted site plans show Chaileys adjoining the site, however the site plan for

planning reference 19/02587/FUL shows that the land adjacent to the north-west corner of the site is part of Felden Lawns rather than Chaileys which is understood to be correct. Additionally two new dwellings have recently been granted to the rear of the property known as Felden Close under planning reference 19/02587/FUL. Plot A 29m to stable block (21m to the boundary), and Plot B 30m to stable block

- 9.49 Approximate measurements of adjacent dwellings to the south of the site access using DBC mapping system: One access to Highfield House is opposite the site access (27m from access to Highfield house), and 60m from access to entrance at Highlands.
- 9.50 In May 2020, having not received any comments from earlier consultations, the planning officer contacted the Environmental Health Officer in respect of residents' concerns of noise and disturbance. The Environmental Health Officer response included '*I have no concerns regarding this development site. I did not provide a response in the first instance as it had not presented concerns to ECP. We have a number of stable premises across DBC that since my tenure here have rarely caused issue, if at all. I am unaware of stable block causing issues regarding noise from horses*'.
- 9.51 The ECP also stated that the agent's statement '*identifies the site will be used to stable 3 horses and as such doesn't represent substantial development. It appears quite modest in size and scale. It also appears appropriate for the siting of this use in a rural setting, as is typical of stabling facilities*'.
- 9.52 In respect of loss of privacy it is considered that there is an adequate separation between the single storey stableblock and neighbouring residential dwellings. It should also be noted that Saved Appendix 3 of the DBLP concerns the layout and design of residential areas and therefore there are no privacy standards in respect of stable blocks, which by their very nature would have a more intermittent use. In that respect it is also worth noting that, whilst there was previously no stable block on site, the site has been used for grazing horses.
- 9.53 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would result in no significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties when considering a loss of daylight, sunlight, loss of privacy or disturbance. It is therefore considered that the proposal accords with Policy CS12.

### Access and Parking

- 9.54 The site is entered/exited via an existing gated access point off Featherbed Lane to the south-west as shown in the Agent's planning statement. Alterations are proposed to the access which will enable vehicles and trailers to pull fully off the highway before opening up the access gate and thereby avoiding blocking Featherbed Lane. The altered access with new hardstanding area approximately 10m x 3.6m is shown on drawing 2772.02 G.

- 9.55 The planning officer clarified to the Highways Officer that the application is not a replacement stable block but the demolition of an existing storage building and construction of a new stable block. HCC were also advised that whilst the land has previously been used for horses there are currently none on site.
- 9.56 The highways officer requested further details in respect of the usage of the access. The agent's email response stated: Deliveries of bedding and feed would occur once a month. The delivery vehicle would drive into the site and turnaround to egress in a forward gear. The tractor would collect bedding and feed from the gate and take them to the stables. Regarding equestrian husbandry, the applicants would visit the site twice a day. However, the applicant lives close to the site and most of these journeys would happen on foot.
- 9.57 HCC as Highway Authority has considered that the proposals would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway network. The development is unlikely to result in a significant change in the number of vehicles using the site, particularly as the plans are the replacement of an previous use and low level of vehicular movements proposed (one delivery vehicle movement a month and occasional vehicle movements by the applicant, although most visits by the applicant to the stables would be on foot). HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds to the application, subject to the inclusion of a condition regarding the provision and retention of the vehicular access and gates, as well highway informatives.
- 9.58 Hertfordshire Highways asked for a Construction Management plan which was subsequently received from the Agent. HCC's response states: *'The general details as laid out in the Construction Management Plan are acceptable. HCC as Highway Authority would recommend that the proposed improvements to the access are made prior to the construction of the stable buildings'*. This will be specified in the conditions.

## **Other Considerations**

### **Trees and Woodlands**

- 9.59 The stable block was re-positioned from its original rear centre position within the plot further towards the north west corner of the site, hence closer to the existing boundary / tree line and thereby considered to integrate more into the rural landscape thereby according with Saved Policy 81 (b).
- 9.60 However, there is a TPO Oak Tree on site situated on the western boundary. No response was received from the Trees & Woodlands Department to the formal consultations of 12.12.2019 and 12.02.2020. The planning officer further contacted the Trees and Woodlands Department in April 2020 for clarification over the position of the structure and concern for the root protection area (RPA) of the Oak Tree (TPO) overhanging the western boundary (understood to be sited within Oakwood). Following discussions with the tree officer and agent, the planning officer requested and received an amended plan moving the structure 5m to the east away from the root protection area of the Oak Tree ensuring the 15m minimum is met. The agent

also confirmed that the foundations will be a reinforced concrete raft, due to the proximity to tree roots, designed by PCDS of Chesham details of which will be conditioned.

- 9.61 Further, the Tree Officer confirmed that as the proposal involves fairly minor ground works, and that the 15m RPA can be maintained that would be sufficient and no tree survey would be required.
- 9.62 The Tree Officer also commented that Oak leaves are poisonous to horses, so the stable owner will also have to apply for crown lifting works. He went on to confirm that the Trees and Woodlands Department would not refuse but that it might be sensible to think about granting repeat works under one application when received.
- 9.63 Following concern from neighbours that the applicant has removed trees from the site boundary, the planning officer contacted the Tree Officer for clarification. On the 28.04.2020 the Tree Officer advised that trees which have been removed were not protected and therefore no breach has occurred. He also confirmed that several conversations with the Planning Enforcement Officer had occurred previously in this respect, and that the Trees and Woodlands department did not consider appropriate further protection in respect of trees on the site as they consider that the boundary trees were not prominent in wider views of the landscape.

#### Contamination / Noise and Odour

- 9.64 No objection in respect of land contamination from the Council's ECP team.
- 9.65 No formal response received in respect of noise and odour, however following concern from neighbours the planning officer contacted the Environmental Health officer again in April for clarification. Full comments can be seen below, however the response confirmed that they have no concerns regarding this development in respect of noise, and added that storage of horse manure may present an odour issue, but given the size of the site footprint this could be organised in such a way as to store away from residential properties or managed. Should there be future unacceptable noise or odour disturbance this could be dealt with through the appropriate environmental legislation.

#### Letters of objection from local residents and from planning consultants

- 9.66 The Council has received many letters of objection and concern to this proposal from local residents and interested parties, plus two reports received from planning consultants on behalf of local residents. Firstly from James Holmes Aitchison Raffety and secondly, from David Lomas MSC Planning Associates – these will be attached as Appendix C to this report.
- 9.67 I have summarised the objections/concerns and responded below:

##### Green Belt Policy

- 9.68 Proposal not compliant with Green Belt Policy – See main body of report.

9.69 Previously Developed Land (PDL) and Very Special Circumstances (VSC) have not formed part of the assessment as the principle of development on this Green Belt site for a small-scale non-commercial equestrian facility is considered appropriate development as it preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict the purposes of including land in the Green Belt.

Incorrect address

9.70 In the absence of an existing land parcel for this site, the site address was initially set up during the validation process using the nearby land parcel for Highlands. Highlands should not have been used as part of the wording for the site address and this was remedied when the planning officer became aware of the issue.

Description

9.71 The Council received comments that the description of the development proposals was incorrect. This matter has been covered in the main body of the report.

Site notice

9.72 The application was re-allocated to the current planning officer at the end of November 2019 following the departure from DBC of the original officer. The current planning officer put up the site notice near the access gate on the same day as her site visit on the 21.11.19. No further site notices were put up, this is in line with our usual procedure.

Boundary Fence, tree and hedgerow removal, and ecology, GB should be protected

9.73 The following issues do not form part of the considerations for this stable block and access application, however we understand that many trees, shrubs and hedgerows have already been cut down on the site by the current owner and we have received many letters from concerned neighbours in this respect and any possible effect on wildlife, flora and overall biodiversity. The tree officer was contacted for comment and he has confirmed that the trees are not protected, and therefore no breach has occurred. He also confirmed that there have been previous discussions on this subject, which I understand began prior to the current application and that the Trees and Woodlands department did not consider appropriate further protection was required in respect of the trees on this site it was considered that the trees were not prominent in wider views of the landscape.

9.74 There have also been many letters of objection in respect of the residential type boundary fence which was erected on the boundary prior to this application. One objection was received stating that the residential featherboard fencing around half of the perimeter blocks the field from Oakwood, which makes it unlawful as affecting the openness of the field and its role in preventing urban sprawl.

9.75 The agent has confirmed that 1.8m high fencing has been erected under permitted development on the northern boundary between the site and residential curtilages to safeguard amenities. Further, the post and wire fencing along the southern boundary by the road will be retained. The agent intends to erect electric fencing within the field to create paddocks, details of which will be required for approval by a landscaping condition.

9.76 To confirm, the fencing which was erected prior to the application, does not form a material consideration as part of this proposal.

#### Oak Tree (TPO)

9.77 There is an Oak Tree overhanging the western boundary of the site, which I understand stands within the gardens of Oakwood. With concern in respect of the Root Protection Area the planning officer contacted the Tree Officer and subsequently amended plans were requested and received moving the Stable block clear of the Oak Tree's root protection area (RPA).

9.78 Several of the objectors have highlighted that Oak Trees – Acorns are toxic to horses. As mentioned above, the Tree Officer addressed this with the advice that the stable owner will also have to apply for crown lifting works. He went on to confirm that the Trees and Woodlands Department would not refuse but that it might be sensible to think about granting repeat works under one application when received.

#### Subdivision of land

9.79 During my site visit I noted that there is a fence across the site, with an open access point. It is not unreasonable for an equestrian use of the land to wish to have separate areas, many paddocks are subdivided.

9.80 Policy 81 states that proposals should not result in subdivision of fields into small paddocks with stables and fencing in each case. A landscaping condition will be added to the decision in respect of any additional fencing/enclosure.

#### History of site / use of land

9.81 Some letters of objection have commented that horses have never been on this site, and other have questioned the amount of time that it has been used for horses, or that the land is agricultural and not equestrian use, including the objection received from James Holmes, Aitchison Raffety on behalf of a local resident.

9.82 However whilst it is acknowledged that there is no existing stable block, just a field shelter, the agent stated within the planning statement that the landholding is currently utilised for equestrian husbandry. The agent later advised by email that the previous owners rented the land to a local family who used the site for equestrian purposes, "*Our client purchased the land on the 9<sup>th</sup> November 2016 and the rental agreement for the tenant ran until April 2017. This tenant used the land for equestrian purposes in excess of 5 years*". The agent further advised that they have spoken to the previous tenant who has advised that the site was used for equestrian purposes for at least 10 years before his tenancy started.

9.83 Further, it was confirmed to the planning officer by a local resident that the paddock had been rented for years.

9.84 The planning officer has viewed historical aerial maps (years 2000, 2006, 2010, 2016) which show no evidence of agricultural use, whereas ploughed areas associated with crops can clearly be identified at the nearby farm to the east.

9.85 The land was used for horses before and horses now and therefore there is no material change of use of the land to consider. A change of use from Agriculture to

Equestrian does not form part of this application and we have not received a LDE application in respect of use, however equestrian is considered an acceptable use of land in this area, and would be lawful after a 10 year period as stated by the agent.

- 9.86 If the proposal does represent a material change of use from agriculture or a nil use to a leisure/equestrian use, which is not considered to be the case, then that would still not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt in accordance with para 146 of the NPPF. The movement of horses around the site has no difference in terms of its impact on the openness of the Green Belt, whether grazing the land or as an equestrian use associated with the stables.

#### Receipt of amended plans

- 9.87 Comments have been received that the agent has been allowed to keep submitting revised plans and given special treatment. However, negotiations between planning officers and agent/applicants, and receipt of revised plans and additional information is a natural part of many a determination process, deemed necessary to achieve a scheme which can be considered acceptable. It is also not unusual for an application to run beyond the original determination period especially on a complex site such as this.
- 9.88 In respect of this planning application the revisions were requested by the planning officer. The changes includes reducing the bulk of the structure, re-positioning the structure closer to the boundary considered to further comply with Saved Policy 81. Later, following advice from the Tree Officer we asked that the structure be moved away from the Root Protection Area of the nearby Oak Tree which is protected by a Tree Protection Order. The officer also asked for more details of the access / gate area prior to determination, which would otherwise need to be conditioned to be submitted and approved by the LPA at a later date.

#### Size of Site

- 9.99 It is understood that the site has historically been used for grazing 2/3 horses. Saved Policy 81 seeks to ensure the availability of sufficient grazing in relation to the number of animals. Notwithstanding the short fall on grazing land, as it is noted that the site at approximately 1.06 hectares (2.62 acres) falls short of the recommended one acre per horse, the applicant is satisfied that that the area is large enough to graze this three horses and additional feed will be provided as necessary.
- 9.100 One of the neighbours commented that the proposed access hard surfacing would reduce the size of the grazing area. However, this reduction is very minimal in the context of the land overall. Furthermore, from a Highways safety perspective it is important that vehicles visiting the site are able to pull fully off the highway, hence as drawing 2772.02 G shows the position of the new gate has been moved back into the field 10m and an area of hardstanding introduced adjacent to the Featherbed Lane. The new fencing surrounding this area has been revised as to retain as much grazing area as possible.
- 9.101 It is understood from the agent that the tractor and trailer will be used to transfer feed / bedding etc. around the site including from the access gate to the stables, keeping vehicles movements to a minimum and that no track is therefore necessary on this site.

#### Size of Stable Block

- 9.102 Objections that the equestrian facility is inappropriate because of its scale, bulk and massing; detrimental to the openness of this Green Belt site; that the scale of the building seems to conflict with the stated intended use; described as grossly disproportionate to the size of the field; and is inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- 9.103 In terms of the size of the equipment store the agent advised it will be used to house the minimum requirements for the upkeep of a stable including tractor, post-driver, grass cutting, turning and bailing equipment. This storage on site would avoid the need for a track. Comments in respect of the size of individual stables/facility – please see above.

#### Concern over future application for residential development

- 9.104 There has been much concern that the applicant will in future apply for a change of use to residential, and that the position, shape and size of the stable block is more akin to a residential development; that the pitched roof would allow for a loft conversion into bedrooms.
- 9.105 It is important to note that each case must be taken on its own merits, and we cannot take into consideration what may have happened in the past, and what may or may not happen in the future. This application, is for a non-commercial, small scale single storey stable block in the Green Belt, which in principle is not deemed as inappropriate development as long as the facilities preserve the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it. This planning application reference 4/02270/19/FUL has therefore been assessed accordingly using the current relevant planning policy.

#### Odour

- 9.106 Covered in main body of report.

#### Access to site / increase in traffic

- 9.107 It is acknowledged that Featherbed lane is single track in parts, and we have received objections with concern including for an increase in traffic, safety issues, pollution, mud on road, lack of public transport, lorries already eroding road surfaces and kerbs, commuters are using the lane as a rat run and that there has already been a large development at one end of Featherbed Lane.
- 9.108 Please see main body of report.

#### Second access onto the site

- 9.109 We received a letter concerned that a new unlawful access onto the highway may be created. This does not form part of this application and has not been considered as part of the current application.

#### Visibility and position of stables close to Dwellings

- 9.110 See main body of report.

## CIL Liable

9.111 The scheme is not CIL liable

## **10. CONCLUSION**

10.1 Based on the size and scale of the stables proposed, this proposal can therefore be considered as small scale and appropriate development in the Green Belt. Further, given the siting of the structure and history of the site, overall it is considered that the proposal would preserve the openness of the Green Belt.

10.2 There would be no significant harm to the residential amenities of surrounding properties, the character of the locality, or highway safety.

10.3 The proposal is considered to be acceptable.

## **11. RECOMMENDATION**

11.1 That planning permission/listed building consent be granted, subject to the following conditions:

### **Condition(s) and Reason(s):**

1. **The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.**

Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 (1) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 (1) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2. **Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved plans, the materials to be used for the construction of the external surfaces of the stable block hereby approved shall comprise the following:**

- **Reclaimed plain clay roofing tiles.**
- **Natural timber weatherboard cladding (i.e. untreated, allowed to oxidise).**
- **Oak posts and frame (as weatherboard).**
- **Soft red facing brick plinth (Durham Red Multi Stock from EH Smiths at Bovingdon).**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy 2013.

3. **Prior to occupation full details of both hard and soft landscape works to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include:**

**all external hard surfaces within the site;**  
**areas of hard surfacing adjacent to the stable block and at the access;**  
**other surfacing materials;**  
**means of enclosure / fencing / subdivision;**

**details of any external lighting ;  
trees to be retained and measures for their protection during construction works.**

**There shall be no other hardstanding, tracks, fencing or means of enclosure other than that approved by the Local Planning Authority through the discharge of this condition.**

**The approved landscape works shall be carried out prior to the development first being brought into use.**

Reason: To preserve the openness of the Green Belt and to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to safeguard the visual character of the immediate area in accordance with Policies CS5 and CS12.

4. **Prior to the construction of the stable buildings hereby permitted, the vehicular access and gates shall be provided as shown on the approved plan drawing numbers 2772.02G and permanently maintained. Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.**

Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

Reason: To enable vehicles to safely draw off the highway before the gate(s) or obstruction is opened in accordance with Saved Appendix 5 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan.

5. **The stables hereby permitted shall not be used for any business or commercial use.**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to safeguard the rural character of the area in accordance with Saved Policy 81 of the DBLP.

6. **Prior to any construction works to the Stable Block hereby permitted, details of the foundations shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The foundations shall then be carried out in accordance with the approved details.**

Reason: In the interest of the preservation of the adjacent Oak tree in accordance with Saved Policy 99 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan.

7. **Within three months of the commencement of the development hereby approved the existing storage building will be removed and all arising materials shall be removed from the site.**

Reason: To accord with the approved plans and for the avoidance of doubt in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy.

8. **When not in use, no jumps or equipment shall be stored externally.**

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development in accordance with Policies CS12 of the Core Strategy and Policy 81 of the Dacorum Borough Local Plan.

9. **No external storage, no mobile structures, caravans shall be placed on the land.**

Reason: To preserve the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with Policy CS 5 of the Core Strategy.

10. **The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans/documents:**

**2772.01 rev B site location plan  
2772.02 rev G site plan  
2772.03 rev A floor plan  
2772.04 roof plan  
2772.05 rev B elevations  
2772.DIMS floor plan dimensions  
2772.TPO A plan showing TPO tree relative to proposals  
2772.FG entrance gate and fence detail**

**Construction management plan received 22.05.2020**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

#### **Informatives:**

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. The Council acted pro-actively through positive engagement with the applicant during the determination process which led to improvements to the scheme. 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.

2. **HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES:**

HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:

AN) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway.

AN) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047

3. Highways Informative

AN) Construction standards for amended access: Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and specification, and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) the applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration. Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further information is available via the website. <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/drop-ped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047

**APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES**

Consultee	Comments
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	The general details as laid out in the Construction Management Plan are acceptable. HCC as Highway Authority would recommend that the proposed improvements to the access are made prior to the construction of the stable buildings.
Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)	<p>Location Land on north side of Featherbed Lane, Opposite Whitelocks - Highfield House, Felden, HP3 0BT</p> <p>Application type Full Application Proposal</p> <p>Demolition of existing storage building and construction of new stable block and access</p> <p>Decision Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following condition:</p> <p>1. Amended Access: Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access and gates shall be</p>

provided as shown on the approved plan drawing numbers 2772.02G and permanently maintained.

Arrangement shall be made for surface water drainage to be intercepted and disposed of separately so that it does not discharge from or onto the highway carriageway.

Reason: To ensure satisfactory access into the site and avoid carriage of extraneous material or surface water from or onto the highway in accordance with Policy 5 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).

**HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES:**

HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:

AN) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway.

AN) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence.

Further information is available via the website <https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx> or by telephoning 0300 1234047

**COMMENTS / ANALYSIS:**

The application comprises of the demolition of the existing storage building and erection of stables on land at Featherbed Lane, Feldon, Hemel Hempstead. Featherbed Lane is designated as a classified C local access road, subject to a speed limit of 60mph and is highway maintainable at public

expense.

There is an existing vehicle access into the site from Featherbed Lane, which is to be utilised. The existing access is to be amended through the creation of a handstanding area and relocation of the vehicular entrance gates, which would be set back a sufficient distance to enable a vehicle to stand clear of the highway whilst the gate(s) are being opening and/or closed. The proposed arrangements are considered to be acceptable.

Although not specifically included in the application, if there are any works required on the highway land at the entrance to the site, the applicant would need to enter into an agreement with HCC as

Highway Authority in relation to any works required on highway land:

AN) Construction standards for amended access: Where works are required within the public highway to facilitate the new vehicular access, the Highway Authority require the construction of

such works to be undertaken to their satisfaction and specification, and by a contractor who is

authorised to work in the public highway. If any of the works associated with the construction of the

access affects or requires the removal and/or the relocation of any equipment, apparatus or

structures (e.g. street name plates, bus stop signs or shelters, statutory authority equipment etc.) the

applicant will be required to bear the cost of such removal or alteration.

Before works commence the applicant will need to apply to the Highway Authority to obtain their

permission, requirements and for the work to be carried out on the applicant's behalf. Further

information is available via the website.

<https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/drop>

[ped-kerbs/dropped-kerbs.aspx](https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/changes-to-your-road/drop) or by telephoning 0300 1234047

HCC as Highway Authority has considered that the proposals would not have an unreasonable

impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway network. The development is unlikely

to result in a significant change in the number of vehicles using the site, particularly as the plans are

the replacement of an previous use and low level of vehicular movements proposed (one delivery

vehicle movement a month and occasional vehicle movements by the applicant although most visits

by the applicant to the stables would be on foot).

	<p>HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds to the application, subject to the inclusion of the above informatives and condition.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<p>Proposal Demolition of existing stables and construction of new stable.</p> <p>Decision Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Construction Management The development shall not begin until full details of all proposed construction vehicle access, movements, parking arrangements and facilities to restrict the generation of dust and mud from the site proposed during the construction period have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details should be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan/Statement and the approved details are to be implemented throughout the construction programme. Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES: HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:</p> <p>AN) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway.</p> <p>AN) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website <a href="https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx">https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx</a> or by telephoning 0300 1234047</p> <p>COMMENTS / ANALYSIS: The application comprises of the demolition of the existing stable building and erection of replacement stables on land at Fetherbed Lane, Feldon, Hemel Hempstead. Featherbed Lane is designated as a classified C local access road, subject to a speed limit of 60mph and is</p>

	<p>highway maintainable at public expense.</p> <p>There is an existing vehicle access into the site from Fetherbed Lane, which would remain unaltered.</p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority has considered that the proposals would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway network. The development is unlikely to result in a significant change in the number of vehicles using the site, particularly as the plans are the replacement of an existing use.</p> <p>HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds to the application, subject to the inclusion of the above informatives and condition.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>Having reviewed the application submission and the ECP Team 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.</p> <p>01.05.2020</p> <p>I have no concerns regarding this development site. I did not provide a response in the first instance as it had not presented concerns to ECP. We have a number of stable premises across DBC that since my tenure here have rarely caused issue, if at all. I am unaware of stable block causing issues regarding noise from horses.</p> <p>I've re-read the D&amp;A which states the site is</p> <p>"currently used as stable facilities however the current structures are in a state of disrepair and are no longer fit for purpose. As a result, the applicant is having to keep their horses and equipment at a separate location which they have to commute to each morning along the country lanes. The applicant is currently having to store their tractor in the open at Dawes Lane is Saratt of which there has been the attempted theft of".</p> <p>It also identifies the site will be used to stable 3 horses and as such doesn't represent substantial development. It appears quite modest in size and scale. It also appears appropriate for the siting of this use in a rural setting, as is typical of stabling facilities.</p> <p>Storage of horse manure may present an odour issue, but given the size of the site footprint this could be organised in such a way as to be stored away from residential properties or managed. Again very few concerns from this aspect of the site as well, noting small scale.</p>
<p>Trees &amp; Woodlands</p>	<p>24.04.20</p> <p>No mention of TPO trees in the app documents, and no measurements in</p>

	<p>relation to the stable position from boundaries.</p> <p>On a development site, we'd ask for a tree survey / constraints plan / etc. This would show whether the RPA of a protected tree was going to be significantly affected by any encroachment.</p> <p>Is the base / foundation of the proposed stable known? If it's a fairly light-weight structure, potential RPA infringement wouldn't be too bad. A raft foundation, with levels built up, would also help mitigate potential RPA encroachment.</p> <p>28.04.20 Given the size and status of the Oak, it would be beneficial in the longer term to shift the stables slightly away from it. The mention of a 15m cap to a RPA is correct, so this should be the minimum. However, it may be helpful to the stable owner if the stables themselves were slightly further away as the canopy won't adhere to that distance and may grow over / into the structure.</p> <p>Worth noting that Oak leaves are poisonous to horses, so the stable owner will also have to apply for crown lifting works. We wouldn't refuse but might be sensible to think about granting repeat works under one application when received.</p> <p>Other than the above advice, no other issues.</p> <p>28.04.20 (iro whether tree survey required) If this was a big development site, a tree survey would be appropriate. However, this app involves fairly minor ground works so if the 15m RPA can be maintained, that would be sufficient.</p> <p>28.04.2020 Removed trees have gone - no protection, no breach. We were asked via planning enforcement about further protection on the site but my colleague did not consider it appropriate as public visibility is actually fairly low. I had a similar enquiry months before Planning Enforcement asked, and came to same conclusion - the boundary trees aren't prominent in wider views of the landscape.</p>
<p>Environmental And Community Protection (DBC)</p>	<p>01.06.2020 in response to planning officer email</p> <p>I have no concerns regarding this development site. I did not provide a response in the first instance as it had not presented concerns to ECP. We have a number of stable premises across DBC that since my tenure here</p>

	<p>have rarely caused issue, if at all. I am unaware of stable block causing issues regarding noise from horses.</p> <p>I've re-read the D&amp;A which states the site is</p> <p>"currently used as stable facilities however the current structures are in a state of disrepair and are no longer fit for purpose. As a result, the applicant is having to keep their horses and equipment at a separate location which they have to commute to each morning along the country lanes. The applicant is currently having to store their tractor in the open at Dawes Lane is Saratt of which there has been the attempted theft of".</p> <p>It also identifies the site will be used to stable 3 horses and as such doesn't represent substantial development. It appears quite modest in size and scale. It also appears appropriate for the siting of this use in a rural setting, as is typical of stabling facilities.</p> <p>Storage of horse manure may present an odour issue, but given the size of the site footprint this could be organised in such a way as to store away from residential properties or managed. Again very few concerns from this aspect of the site as well, noting small scale.</p>
<p>Hertfordshire Highways (HCC)</p>	<p>Location  Land on north side of Featherbed Lane  Opposite Whitelocks - Highfield House  Felden  HP3 0BT</p> <p>Application type  Full application  Proposal</p> <p>Demolition of existing stables and construction of new stable.  Amendment  Amendment to proposal <a href="https://planning.dacorum.gov.uk/publicaccess/">https://planning.dacorum.gov.uk/publicaccess/</a>  Decision</p> <p>Notice is given under article 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 that the Hertfordshire County Council as Highway Authority does not wish to restrict the grant of permission subject to the following conditions:</p> <p>1. Construction Management The development shall not begin until full details of all proposed construction vehicle access, movements, parking arrangements and facilities to restrict the generation of dust and mud from the site proposed during the construction period have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The relevant details should be submitted in the form of a Construction Management Plan/Statement and the approved details are to be implemented throughout the construction programme. Reason: In order to protect highway safety and the amenity of other users of the public highway and rights of way in</p>

	<p>accordance with Policies 5, 12, 17 and 22 of Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan (adopted 2018).</p> <p>HIGHWAY INFORMATIVES: HCC as Highway Authority recommends inclusion of the following Advisory Note (AN) to ensure that any works within the highway are carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Highway Act 1980:</p> <p>AN) Road Deposits: It is an offence under section 148 of the Highways Act 1980 to deposit mud or other debris on the public highway, and section 149 of the same Act gives the Highway Authority powers to remove such material at the expense of the party responsible. Therefore, best practical means shall be taken at all times to ensure that all vehicles leaving the site during construction of the development are in a condition such as not to emit dust or deposit mud, slurry or other debris on the highway.</p> <p>AN) Storage of materials: The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided within the site on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available via the website  <a href="https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx">https://www.hertfordshire.gov.uk/services/highways-roads-and-pavements/business-and-developer-information/business-licences/business-licences.aspx</a> or by telephoning 0300 1234047</p> <p>COMMENTS / ANALYSIS: The application comprises of the demolition of the existing stable building and erection of replacement stables on land at Fetherbed Lane, Feldon, Hemel Hempstead. Featherbed Lane is designated as a classified C local access road, subject to a speed limit of 60mph and is highway maintainable at public expense.</p> <p>There is an existing vehicle access into the site from Fetherbed Lane, which would remain unaltered.</p> <p>HCC as Highway Authority has considered that the proposals would not have an unreasonable impact on the safety and operation of the surrounding highway network. The development is unlikely to result in a significant change in the number of vehicles using the site, particularly as the plans are the replacement of an existing use.</p> <p>HCC has no objections or further comments on highway grounds to the application, subject to the inclusion of the above informatives and condition.</p>
Environment Agency	No response received.

## APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

### Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
-------------------------	--------------	---------	------------	---------

16	38	1	36	1
----	----	---	----	---

## Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
<p>Cobbes Sheethanger Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BG</p>	<p>The two planning applications :</p> <p>4/02270/19/FUL   Demolition of existing stables and construction of new Stable.   Land On Featherbed Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead HP3 0BT</p> <p>and</p> <p>19/02959/FUL   Retrospective application for extensions to stable block and placement of a chicken coup   Land At Featherbed Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead Felden HP3 0BT</p> <p>refer to the same site and "existing stables"</p> <p>However,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There is no cross referencing between the two applications and no mention of each other under 'Related Cases'</li> <li>2) Both Application Forms state the use as "Equestrian" but 19/02959/FUL says that a chicken coup has been added. Does that mean the purpose is no longer just Equestrian?</li> <li>3) The previously unauthorised works in 19/02959/FUL were carried out from 2Sep19-9Sep19. Then 2 weeks later the 4/02270/19/FUL planning application was drafted. The period is so close that it now feels like this is a stepping stone (scope creep) approach to development.</li> <li>4) 4/02270/19/FUL headline is "Demolition of existing stables and construction of new Stable". It makes no mention of the chicken coup but gives the impression that the two existing structures are totally stables.</li> <li>5) 19/02959/FUL does not make it clear whether the works were done to both buildings or just one building. It does say the floor space prior to the works was 8.8 sq.m. and after the works was 58 sq.m. Are these figures the total floor space of both buildings or just one Building (B, the one with the coup)? 4/02270/19/FUL states the current total floor space [of both buildings] is 70 sq.m. That could therefore mean that Building A's floor space is 12 sq.m. (70-58). This would then make the total floor space of both buildings on 2Sep19 20.8 sq. m. i.e. 12 + 8.8</li> <li>6) Given the close timings highlighted in point 3, The proposed increase in floor space from 2Sep19 to the 23Sep19 plans of 4/02270/19/FUL is from 8.8 to 161.3 sq.m. (= 18.3 times the original size) or from 20.8 to 161.3 sq.m. (= 7.7 times the original size). Either way this is a much larger step change than that outlined in 4/02270/19/FUL which was 70 to 161.3 sq.m. (= 2.3 times the stated size)</li> </ol> <p>We strongly object to this planning application.</p> <p>All of our main objections have already been stated by previous commentators.</p> <p>These include the points raised by the independent consultants especially concerning the application not being in compliance with Greenbelt guidelines.</p>

	<p>The massive increase in proposed footprint from the original structures in the pasture (as presented in refused retrospective application 19/02959/FUL). The original footprint must be taken as that which existed before the refused retrospective application' work was done.</p> <p>The strong indicators that this is a disingenuous application with an ultimate aim to gaining residential planning permission through a process of scope creep.</p> <p>Other commentators knowledge that Mr Hobbs has previously used such tactics to gain residential planning permission on greenbelt site. If true, the Planning Department must be aware of this and should be taking firm steps to prevent re-occurrence of this tactic.</p> <p>Factors stated pointing to the non-feasability of stabling 3 horses on this site, including the presence of a horse-poisonous Oak tree, further reduction in grazing land by the latest plans and no indication of where the manure heap will sit in relation to the neighbours and road.</p> <p>Observations from long term neighbours that horses have never been seen in this pasture nor any other relevant activity.</p> <p>Logistical implications including lack of ability to gain access by equestrian vehicles.</p> <p>Current alterations already done to the pasture including residential type fencing and destruction of greenbelt friendly hedgerows are a direct indication of the applicants attitude to greenbelt aesthetics.</p> <p>The obviousness that the placement and size of the new plans indicate to all but the naive that these are more in keeping with residential property than stables.</p>
<p>Sheethanger Lane Felden HP3 0BG</p>	<p>The revised plans just made available on the portal do not address any of the key objections made, nor do they address the extensive list of planning infringements in the original proposal.</p> <p>I submitted my objection to the previous proposal on 18.2.20 with a detailed account of the planning infringements.</p> <p>These seem to have been ignored given the developer was asked to only address the TPO and the access to the site (feedback from our neighbourhood coordinator who has dialogue with the case officer).</p> <p>The only changes are location (worse than before from a Green Belt perspective) and clarification of access from Featherbed Lane. These do not address the planning infringements in any way, shape or form.</p> <p>The plan for the proposed "stables" has not changed. It is wildly excessive for a stables. The garage for the tractor is the size of a double garage no less, which could fit at least 4 tractors. This property plan is undoubtedly a residential footprint and not a stables.</p> <p>Whilst moving it away from the TPO is required, it has been moved to a central location of the plot on the north side boundary, close to residential properties</p>

and effectively in a central position of the plot. This position substantially increases its visibility from Featherbed Lane, notwithstanding its excessive size, scale and design which without question represents a residential dwelling. Visibility has been further increased as the developer has decimated the hedgerow and tree line along the perimeter of the field.

This is inappropriate from a green belt perspective as it adversely affects the openness of the green belt field.

The aims of the Green Belt are very clearly documented. The NPPF details a list of considerations and measures that are defined to prevent inappropriate development and preserve the OPENNESS of the green belt.

In layman's terms, this is designed to prevent 'chancers' building a structure in the centre of a field that adversely affects the openness of the field.

The land in question is currently an open field bound on all sides by hedgerow. It is free of development, the 'dilapidated shed' notwithstanding, and effectively acts as a natural break between two bands of residential development: between Featherbed Lane/Highcroft Road and Sheethanger Lane.

The site, therefore, performs an imperative role in creating a buffer between these two built areas. Despite the disused 'dilapidated shed' and recent unauthorised development (19/02959/FUL), which to date (16.5.20) have not been removed, the site is not 'previously developed land' as defined in Annex 2 of the NPPF. The existing structures cannot be said to function as a 'fall-back' position for a quid-pro-quo replacement.

The total footprint of the development and yard area amounts to nearly 400sqm - quite ludicrous for a field of this site. No account has been made for the track that provides access from the gate to the proposed 'stables', and any such track would significantly increase the developed footprint.

The VSCs (Very Special Circumstances) are not at all substantiated. The developer must believe he has a 'golden ticket' that will allow this to be passed by the Planning dept. In all my years as a Head of Planning, I haven't seen anything so preposterous come across my desk. Whilst now semi-retired, though a current MRTPI and CLMI, I find this application a complete waste of planning department's time, and as such, a sheer waste of tax payers money.

My final point is regarding Highways and access. The access as described is simply not safe, nor compliant with transport policy CS8.

This is quite an arrogant and patronising application to a professional chartered town planner and I am stunned that the Council's planning department have not already refused this with some vigour.

I also include below my objections to the previous revision (though clearly ignored) which are still valid to the revised plans:

1. Local ecology has already been impacted and would be further impacted with this development. Protected species include families of roe deer, and protected birds. Trees and hedgerow have been viciously removed without any consideration of the green belt landscape nor the biodiversity that this has significantly impacted.

	<p>2. The proposed stables has been sited in the NW corner of the green belt paddock, close to neighbouring properties. This would create a noise and smell nuisance.</p> <p>3. The proposed siting is also close to a significantly established Oak tree. Anyone with genuine intent of building a stable for horses would know that you never build a stables near an oak tree due to the toxicity of the acorns. As such, it does strike me, that as with other comments on thesis application that the applicant is seeking to change use to a residential dwelling.</p> <p>4. The siting of the proposed stable is also at the furthest point from the access gate via Featherbed Lane. There are no provisions for access from Featherbed Lane to the stable itself. No road, no parking, no provision for a turning circle for vehicles towing horse boxes etc. The land itself would not support vehicular traffic.</p> <p>5. There are no local public transport access points for workers, given the lack of parking provisions.</p> <p>6. There is no analysis from Highways to support that the site can cope with increased traffic as a result of transporting horses, hay, materials etc., associated with a stables of this size.</p> <p>7. Specific policy on the new development of equestrian facilities taken from the 'saved' policies of the Local Plan, Policy 81 stipulates a number of factors associated with new equestrian facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 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. These stables are proposed as new buildings, not accommodated in existing buildings.</li> </ul> <p>Policy 81 goes on to outline the following criteria for permitting the development of equestrian facilities stating;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- equestrian facilities should be well located in relation to existing and proposed rights of way for equestrians; this is not the case.</li> <li>- any new buildings should be compatible in scale and design with the countryside setting and ancillary to the overall equestrian use; this is not the case, the plans are excessive for the location.</li> <li>- the scale of activity should respect the countryside setting and quality of the surrounding area; this is not the case, trees and hedgerows have been removed, residential fencing has been added and so the applicant has not at all respected the setting.</li> <li>- opportunities to extend or add links to the bridleway network and improve riders' safety should be taken; this is not the case.</li> <li>- proposals should not result in subdivision of fields into small paddocks with stables and fencing in each area; this is also not the case. The site has already been subdivided with fencing to create a visual and physical border, in line with residential planning criteria for such a location.</li> </ul> <p>As such, there are so many reasons why I object to this application.</p>
Undisclosed Felden	We totally object to this planning application. Having spoken to our local residents committee it is clear that the intentions of this property developer is

HP3 0BT

unethical on the proposed GREENBELT land.

Mr. Hobbs is a property developer and not an established equestrian/agricultural farmer. He has previously used similar tactics to end up with residential planning permission on green belt land. He is following the same process here.

Also, why would you want to build a large stable without any vehicular access for workers, riders etc.? The monstrosity fencing that he has erected is certainly not in keeping with the adjoining paddocks or green belt paddocks.

After looking into his past proposals linked to this application it is evident that he has UNLAWFULLY built structures on green belt land to push his way into the planning process and lying every step of the way. First he unlawfully erected buildings, then when the planning department found out he put in retrospective planning which was refused and now he is amending his application again to push through him developing "so called stables blocks for equestrian use".

Having lived in the area for over 30 years, we all know as residents that there was no stables or "storage building" on the land. He has referenced (complete lie) previously to "existing stables" before retrospective planning was refused. We can all provide photos and previous tenant testimonies that used the land to evidence that previously, before he purchased the land, all that existed was a small dilapidation with no enclosed walls, certainly not a "storage" building of any sort - it wouldn't even qualify as a shed!

So, existing stables or storage building, what is it then Mr.Hobbs, surely as a property developer he would know the difference. As mentioned above, photographic evidence proves that neither stables nor storage building existed. Google Maps prior to his purchase of the land doesn't show these fixtures.

If he was a genuine horse lover with an equestrian/agricultural understanding, surely he would know not to place stables in the middle of the paddock without any vehicular access to facilitate access for riders, stable staff, utilities and parking provision - his original application omits all of this.

As a result of having his related retrospective application (for his unlawful constructions) rejected, his now amended application to site the stable building close to the corner of the plot is still without any considerations of the above and clearly only proposed to appease the planning department - not because it was his original intention.

Again this questions the real genuine intentions of this proposal as already highlighted by many residents objecting to the prior related retrospective planning application, and the objections to this current application to construct a new stable block, now at the corner of the plot.

Our objection is based on how the owner has lied throughout his application, tried to show things existed there when they clearly didn't, unlawfully erected buildings and now is trying to forcefully build a huge stable block with the hope of changing its use down the line to residential buildings.

Such a pity how he has been allowed to get away with destroying the look and feel of the ecology in the process. The land now is out of keeping with the

	<p>character of the area, instead it looks like land primed for residential development.</p> <p>It is such an eyesore from the viewpoint on Featherbed Lane and stands out like a sore thumb, with neighbouring paddocks and farm land still maintaining the look and feel of the green belt location.</p> <p>The beauty and natural habitat in keeping with the greenbelt has been totally destroyed. We have evidenced him chopping down so many trees and building bonfires destroying any naturally occurring habitats of the local species in the area. He certainly has not considered the biodiversity and conservation of the area and lied on his application stating that there is no impact to the local ecology and protected species.</p> <p>What is the point of greenbelt policy when ruthless developers try to find shortcuts and loopholes to circumvent the very policy designed to protect the countryside, it's ecology and wildlife that thrives within it.</p>
<p>Felden Ridge Flauden Lane</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BW</p>	<p>I object to this planning application on the grounds that it does not meet the national planning policy criteria for green belt development.</p> <p>This is a brief comment in addition to the objection we raised in February on the grounds that the application does not meet national planning policy criteria for green belt development.</p> <p>It has now been made known that the application has been made by a property developer, who, far from being an equestrian, apparently has a track record of purchasing small parcels of land, then undertaking a highly questionable and unethical process in order to eventually gain planning permission. Given this knowledge we are very surprised that these revised plans have not already been rejected. It must be obvious that, far from being an equestrian, Mr Hobbs is using this as a deceptive route in order to achieve his real objective.</p> <p>There are many other issues of concern which have been well documented elsewhere, not the least are fears for the local ecology, which must have already been significantly harmed by the removal of so many established trees and hedgerows, as well as the dangers caused by increased traffic.</p>
<p>Whitelocks Featherbed Lane</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BT</p>	<p>We oppose this proposed development which we believe is a disingenuous "foot in the door" application for an intended subsequent application for residential development. It is in no way accurate to describe the proposed development as a replacement for existing buildings or storage. The applicant has already destroyed existing hedgerow and trees, and in doing so we are concerned about a possible intent to create an additional unlawful access into Featherbed Lane. Featherbed Lane is single track at many points and there is already significant damage arising from heavy lorries eroding road surfaces and kerb sides to create passing spaces. There is an existing particular problem with lorries attempting to turn into and access adjacent roads off Featherbed Lane which is likely to be further exacerbated by increased traffic from this development together with the associated additional noise and pollution.</p> <p>We continue to strongly object to this proposal following the latest revisions. We believe this development is contrary to national Green Belt policy and all of our previous objections still stand. These were as follows:</p> <p>We oppose this proposed development which we believe is a disingenuous "foot in the door" application for an intended subsequent application for</p>

	<p>residential development. It is in no way accurate to describe the proposed development as a replacement for existing buildings or storage. The applicant has already removed/destroyed existing hedgerow and trees damaging the ecology and showing no regard for Green Belt land., In doing so we are also very concerned about a possible intent to create an additional unlawful access from the field into Featherbed Lane. Featherbed Lane is single track at many points and there is already significant damage arising from heavy lorries eroding road surfaces and kerb sides to create passing spaces. There is an existing particular problem with large vehicles attempting to turn into and access adjacent roads off Featherbed Lane which is likely to be further exacerbated by increased traffic from this development together with the associated additional noise and pollution. We are concerned that despite numerous previous valid objections the applicant appears to have been encouraged to resubmit proposals. Given that the latest amendments do not substantially address the key Green Belt concerns we hope this application will be refused.</p>
<p>Longfield Bulstrode Lane</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BP</p>	<p>I very much object to this proposal, it is yet another infringement on the green belt, and I worry that it can be the start of an attempt at further residential development.</p> <p>Featherbed Lane already suffers from a lot of excess traffic, for a narrow lane containing many residential properties and a working farm.</p> <p>This developer apparently has a track record of seeking to get approval for residential development on green belt land, by first establishing some kind of agricultural use. This looks like the same thing again.</p> <p>Adjacent to one end of Featherbed Lane, the Council has previously approved a very substantial residential development, and no doubt this does contribute to the traffic, noise and pollution further up the Lane. It seems reasonable that the Council do not allow any further development along the Lane, even if initial proposals appear rather benign. I oppose the application as it seems to conflict with the character of the area.</p> <p>The scale of the buildings seems to conflict with the stated intended use.</p> <p>Currently, there is no evidence that the usage of the land is as stated by the applicant.</p> <p>This seems to be intended as a away to get around Green Belt restrictions, and to act as a precedence for future residential applications on the site.</p> <p>There is already traffic issues in this area, due to the use by commuters of Featherbed Lane as a shortcut.</p> <p>This area is predominantly rural, and this would conflict with such character.</p> <p>The plans will lead to increased pollution, noise and general nuisance.</p>
<p>Felden Edge Featherbed Lane</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire</p>	<p>This application appears to be a 'backdoor' attempt to procure green belt land under one benign pretense, with a view to seeking a change to residential status later. Of primary concern would be that Featherbed Lane is already a very active 'rat run', and with no pavement or other pedestrian walkways on either side of the lane, it is very hazardous to walk along the lane at anytime of the day, but especially during the 'commuter' hours in the morning and evening.</p>

<p>HP3 0BT</p>	<p>The lane is frequently used by hikers, bikers, dog walkers, and local residents enjoying a stroll. I can personally attest to the hazards when walking along the lane.</p> <p>I believe that this application will inevitably lead to more noise and pollution, additional vehicle activity, and is a wanton and unnecessary elimination of green belt land.</p> <p>If this application is approved, even in its present, seemingly 'innocent' guise, it will adversely impact the restricted visibility, access, already around this part of Featherbed Lane. I also believe that, based on the evidence of this developer in other locations, it is intended to be the thin edge of the wedge with respect to grabbing further green belt land for residential development. The nature and layout of existing properties along the lane, including our own, and the clear physical constraints in the lane, mean that further development in this area is to be avoided.</p> <p>I believe that the above objections, are also made more valid by the fact that a major residential development at the A41 end of Featherbed Lane has already taken place; therefore, it would seem very reasonable that the Council limit any further such development in this area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Appears to be backdoor method to circumvent green belt restrictions.</li> <li>2. Claims by applicant as to current use of the land is disingenuous, at best, a deliberate falsehood at worst.</li> <li>3. Therefore, the requirement for equestrian facilities which is the basis of the application, is highly suspect - see above point 1.</li> <li>4. The scale of the building for which access is sought is completely out of character with the adjacent area.</li> <li>5. The building requested does not seem in proportion to the claimed equestrian use.</li> <li>6. Looking at the application as a whole, there appears to be other intentions for the use of the buildings and land which are not stated, but implied.</li> </ol> <p>I object to the application because, in general, it will increase traffic in an area which already suffers due to its use as a cut through (rat run) for commuters. It could serve as the thin end of the wedge, with regard to further applications to water down the green belt in the area.</p>
<p>Eaglewood Sheethanger Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BG</p>	<p>We strongly object to the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposal, on green belt land, is significantly larger than could reasonably be required for the alleged purposes and we are concerned that this is a stalking horse for a future proposed change to residential use. Green belt land is designated for a purpose and we believe that purpose should be protected by the local authority.</p> <p>We concur with the detailed comments submitted in writing and online by our neighbours, in particular with those submitted on 18th May by MSC Planning and on 16th May by one of our neighbours online.</p> <p>Finally, I note that your website shows a note of support from this address on 12th December, albeit without details - in the light of the revised plans, this is not the case.</p>

<p>Featherbed Lane</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead HP3 0BT</p>	<p>I resolutely object to the planning application.</p> <p>I support and echo the objections made so far. I am at risk of repeating comments already robustly made - but I think it is important to object clearly even if at risk of repetition. I also support and echo the statements made by the independent planning consultants engaged by local residents to articulate clearly why this application should be a non-starter based on green belt policy rules and guidelines.</p> <p>Unfortunately, so much damage has been made to this beautiful meadow already due to the developer's unlawful actions and disrespect of the green belt and the local environment.</p> <p>This application does not meet any of the green belt requirements. The so-called stables floor plan is quite obviously for a house with a double garage, with what will be a long driveway to the access gate once he has applied for change of use. The meadow is quite simply not big enough to support 3 horses for grazing, least of all for stabling. Residential fencing already installed months ago has damaged the openness of the field and Enforcement action should be taken to remove this, and the unlawful structures he built prior to submitting this application.</p> <p>The points made in my objection to the original proposal are still all relevant, given this revised proposal was only invited to incorporate details on access and location.</p> <p>It does seem that all of the objections regarding non-compliance to green belt policy are being waived here and that the developer seems to have some sort of dispensation to do what he wants here. A great deal has been put in his favour to prevent public knowledge of this application, including no site notices going up and also the public consultation letters for this revised proposal not being posted until a complaint was raised on this matter.</p> <p>This is very concerning and I hope this and all of the objections submitted are taken very seriously by the planning department and members of the Council.</p>
<p>N/A FLAUNDEN LANE FELDEN HP3 0PQ</p>	<p>I have thankfully been made aware of this application by all our neighbours. We object on the grounds of this application not meeting greenbelt policy, destruction of the wildlife and trees which have been visibly cut down, inadequate road access, noise nuisance. The current UNLAWFUL buildings look terrible and so noticeable from the road even though they are in the corner, certainly not in keeping with the character of greenbelt land. The new plans are awful, the building will stand out in the centre like a sore thumb amongst the meadow land.</p> <p>In a neighbouring plot of land (the crossroad junction -top of Felden Lane, Featherbed Lane) there is a proper unobtrusive stable made of wood and close to the access gate. A good example of how stables should stand within a field, it is barely visible.</p> <p>This application is not an application for a genuine equestrian facility. The size is huge, who makes stables the size of a potential house with a pitched roof?</p> <p>Why would you place stable development at the opposite end of the field from the access gate, especially in a field of this size, creating even further destruction to greenbelt land with a long track? Also given this field has always been green belt and never had any vehicular track/traffic running through it. It just does not make sense - if this were to be a genuine stables proposal!!</p> <p>This will no doubt ruin the beauty of the lovely hamlet area we live in as it will</p>

	<p>allow other neighbouring plots of greenbelt owners to apply for "stables" so that they can change their use to homes in the foreseeable future. This area will just become a money making venture by the success of this application setting precedent.</p> <p>Greenbelt policy is there for a reason and this application sets out to abuse everything it stands for.</p>
<p>undisclosed Felden HP3 0BG</p>	<p>Having read the background of this application and reviewed it independently, I highly object to this given the deceitful nature of the proposal.</p> <p>Featherbed lane has single lane traffic and quite dangerous at times. It cannot sustain horse boxes, hay/straw bales and everything that comes with a working equestrian environment. There is no turning circle and no other provisions mentioned in the proposal therefore there is inadequate access and parking. For stables of that large size, a request has not been made to the highways to facilitate this., or is the intention to offload the horses and utilities onto Featherbed Lane, hence creating traffic and inconvenience. However also creating a throughput onto the paddock land will destroy the nature of the green belt land which is not in keeping with the area.</p> <p>The proposal refers to moving the unlawfully erected stables to the corner. This is extremely close to residential dwellings, therefore causing a noise nuisance for all the residing neighbours. I believe there is an Oak tree close to where it is cited the stables to be built. Acorns are known to the equestrian world to be poisonous and toxic to horses so why are these stables placed in the wrong end of the paddock, where there poses a fatal risk to horses? Surely the safest area would be close to the entrance to featherbed lane on the opposite corner furthest away from any risk to the horses? If this was a genuine proposal intended for pure agricultural or equestrian use, proper risk assessments would have shown a site for stables closer to the road and away from hazardous risks to the horses.</p> <p>The proposal has too many flaws and it is riddled with long term complications and disingenuity. We object! The revised proposal does not address any of the previous key points raised below. It actually highlights further flaws. Our objection stands.</p> <p>Position</p> <p>It is now centrally positioned. As it stands the illegal structures (which may I add have still not yet been removed!?) are smaller than the new proposal and in the corner of the field and yet are highly visible from all angles of Featherbed Lane. The new structure will be more central and substantially bigger, and therefore much more visible. This does not satisfy greenbelt objectives as it is negatively impacting the openness of the field. The plan for the proposed stables of this size are hugely disproportionate given the acreage of this field. It is totally over the top so to speak.</p> <p>Access</p> <p>We have already covered this off in my previous objection below but to add:-</p> <p>Why are the stables placed in the furthest away position from the gate access at the opposite end of the field? This will create an unnecessary thoroughfare</p>

	<p>across the field which will absolutely destroy the nature of the green belt. It is logistically ludicrous. This is not in keeping with the area.</p> <p>My previous objection still stands in spite of the revised proposal. None of my points below have been nullified or neutralised by the revised plans.</p> <p>These points remain:</p> <p>Featherbed Lane has single lane traffic and quite dangerous at times. It cannot sustain horse boxes, hay/straw bales and everything that comes with a working equestrian environment. There is no turning circle and no other provisions mentioned in the proposal therefore there is inadequate access and parking. For stables of that large size, a request has not been made to the highways to facilitate this., or is the intention to offload the horses and utilities onto Featherbed Lane, hence creating traffic and inconvenience. However also creating a throughput onto the paddock land will destroy the nature of the green belt land which is not in keeping with the area.</p> <p>The proposal refers to moving the unlawfully erected stables to the corner. This is extremely close to residential dwellings, therefore causing a noise nuisance for all the residing neighbours. I believe there is an Oak tree close to where it is cited the stables to be built. Acorns are known to the equestrian world to be poisonous and toxic to horses so why are these stables placed in the wrong end of the paddock, where there poses a fatal risk to horses? Surely the safest area would be close to the entrance to Featherbed Lane on the opposite corner furthest away from any risk to the horses? If this was a genuine proposal intended for pure agricultural or equestrian use, proper risk assessments would have shown a site for stables closer to the road and away from hazardous risks to the horses.</p> <p>The proposal has too many flaws and it is riddled with long term complications and disingenuity. We object!</p>
<p>Featherbed Lane</p> <p>Felden HP3 0BT</p>	<p>I object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The related application was refused seems to be for permanent structures put up on the site without planning permission. It looks to me that the applicant was trying to get away with these going up without anyone knowing so that he could say he was going to demolish them and then 'move' the square footage of building/storage and convert to a stables. Given he was caught out, I'm surprised the planning department have let this one get this far.</li> <li>2. This application does look very disingenuous. The design and size of the stables is that of a small house. I can see why so many residents think that this is a ploy to get change of use permitted in the future.</li> <li>3. The real issue for me is the Green Belt. The applicant doesn't have any respect for it. Trees and vegetation around the perimeter but especially the East, South and West boundaries have been severely cut back. It has lost its meadow look and feel. God knows what has happened to the wildlife and surrounding ecology. Why isn't this being protected and why isn't the council taking steps to enforce this? This application will lead to so much destruction of this green belt field - if this is allowed, then why have a green belt policy in the first place. This field and neighbouring fields/paddocks are there for a reason. I am amazed that on these grounds alone, the Council haven't thrown this out</li> </ol>

	<p>already. Smells fishy if you ask me....</p> <p>4. The location of the stables is at the most furthest point away from the access gate. This is counter-intuitive. There are also a number of established oak trees around the perimeter. Acorns are poisonous to horses, so again, this doesn't stack up. Unless the applicant is going to chop those trees down as well.</p> <p>5. Traffic and thoroughfare on Featherbed Lane is bad enough as it is with the residential development approved at the A41 end. You can make a car trip down Featherbed Lane without having to stop and give way or reverse back to let traffic through. This particular stretch of Featherbed Lane where this field is situated is one of the narrowest. It will just make things so much worse for the local residents.</p>
<p>The Coppins Sheethanger Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BG</p>	<p>I write as a resident of Felden living in a property adjacent to the Green Belt. I OBJECT to the demolition of the disused "shed" and the construction of a new stable block which is inappropriate and thereby harmful to the Green Belt and for which no credible "Very Special Circumstances" have been put forward by the applicant. I have read, and fully support, the objections and detailed submissions put forward by MSC Planning Associates on behalf of their client in their letter of 18/05/2020.</p>
<p>Featherbed Lane  Felden HP3 0BT</p>	<p>For the attention of planning and the enforcement team :-</p> <p>Without repeating the strong and valid arguments already demonstrated here which carry a lot of weight, I object on the following grounds.</p> <p>There is no and was no storage building to demolish. This is quite plainly made up. We have resided in this neighbourhood for over 40 years. What urgently needs to be demolished is those unlawful and unsightly structures that have been put up.</p> <p>What is also unlawful is the separation of the meadow land that has been divided by the fencing. This has been erected onto GREENBELT and without the relevant permissions. (It has obviously been made to look like the neighbouring residential dwellings)</p> <p>What also needs to come down is that ghastly fencing that has been placed around the circumference. It is utterly not in keeping with greenbelt land. Why would anyone put this up is beyond belief?</p> <p>Those beautiful trees and hedges that existed there for many years have been savagely destroyed without any thought to the impact on its ecology and habitats which rely upon them. These should be and must be replaced! We are not talking a small amount here.</p> <p>It used to look like a scenic and picturesque meadow, which has now been totally destroyed of its original characteristic features. The presumptuous developer has completely cleared the site as if he has arrogantly already got or knows that he will get residential planning permission in his back pocket!</p> <p>Surely planning and the enforcements teams should take action now against the myriad of severe contraventions taken place by this developer? Not sure if there is any point in writing an objection when the previous</p>

objections from myself and other residents have been ignored.

The revised plans (14.05.20) are in fact worse.

The "stables" are now centrally positioned closer to residential dwellings. From Featherbed Lane it clearly looks like an eyesore and a residential dwelling. More importantly this does not fit in with GREENBELT POLICY.

The access is absolutely ridiculous. The gate access from Featherbed Lane does not support the turning circle for vehicles towing horse boxes. This will cause further impact to houses on Featherbed Lane around the site access. The visibility and width of the road at that point is extremely constrained. Even small cars traveling in opposing directions cannot pass each other without one stopping much further back to give way.

It is completely odd that the so called stables are placed in a location furthest away from from access. The track to the stables will just further destroy greenbelt land. If this was a genuine application then surely the stables would be placed closest to access to ensure preservation of Greenbelt land as much possible rather than further destroying it.

My below previous objection remains. This is not a genuine application.

For the attention of planning and the enforcement team :-

Without repeating the strong and valid arguments already demonstrated here which carry a lot of weight, I object on the following grounds.

There is no and was no storage building to demolish. This is quite plainly made up. We have resided in this neighbourhood for over 40 years. What urgently needs to be demolished is those unlawful and unsightly structures that have been put up. This still has not been removed?

What is also unlawful is the separation of the meadow land that has been divided by the fencing. This has been erected onto GREENBELT and without the relevant permissions. (It has obviously been made to look like the neighbouring residential dwellings)

What also needs to come down is that ghastly fencing that has been placed around the circumference. It is utterly not in keeping with greenbelt land. Why would anyone put this up is beyond belief?

Those beautiful trees and hedges that existed there for many years have been savagely destroyed without any thought to the impact on its ecology and habitats which rely upon them. These should be and must be replaced! We are not talking a small amount here.

It used to look like a scenic and picturesque meadow, which has now been totally destroyed of its original characteristic features.

The presumptuous developer has completely cleared the site as if he has arrogantly already got or knows that he will get residential planning permission in his back pocket!

Surely planning and the enforcements teams should take action now against the myriad of severe contraventions taken place by this developer?

<p>Sheethanger Lane Felden HP3 0BG</p>	<p>I object to this application.</p> <p>The revisions have made it worse. It is now closer to adjoining properties on the northern boundary. If this is ever going to be a genuine stables, the muck heap will be right by the boundary to homes on Sheethanger Lane. There are rules about how close the muck heap can be in relation to boundaries with houses.</p> <p>The proposals are a joke. I've never seen stables like that in this area. It's got a pitched roof for goodness sake! There is a stable in a green belt field down the road on Featherbed Lane - small, made of wood, no big fancy roof or extra rooms for so called storage and tractors.</p> <p>This application is the polar opposite. I can't believe the planning department can't see through it for what it really is.</p> <p>What's the point of having a green belt in this county if it isn't being protected. The field was once a beautiful meadow. Lots of trees, vegetation and wildlife. The owner has decimated it. Quite shocking.</p>
<p>Highlands Featherbed Lane  Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BT</p>	<p>Sadly 90% of the 'harmless' surrounding trees and hedges, part of the greenbelt, have been removed. We are now looking out on a potential building site!</p> <p>The size of the development, i.e. the proposed stables, is completely out of proportion for a green belt area and to state that it is replacing a current structure is absurd.</p> <p>There is no vehicular access called for in the Application, which is inconsistent with transporting horses, feed, fuel and anything else relating to the running of a stable. There is no parking or turning facility on the roadside: the lane is narrow and twisty with a blind bend near the entrance.</p> <p>I totally object to this planning application for which the site preparations have already gone way too far. I also strongly recommend that the lost trees and hedges are being replaced.</p> <p>I am repeating my objection to this proposal, my original objection dated 22nd February can be seen below and all my comments then are still relevant today.</p> <p>Having studied further proposed changes which were posted this month I comment as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the planting of 8 trees on the north and west borders of the plot hardly compensates for the overall damage done by removing most of the hedges and some trees, some 90%, on the east and south side of the plot</li> <li>- the additional hard standing for a car(s) with fencing around it at the entrance to the plot will take away even more of the character of a protected green belt area</li> </ul> <p>I sincerely hope that this planning application will now be rejected in full as it represents a blatant insult to the principle of green belt preservation.</p>
<p>Longwood Sheethangar Lane</p>	<p>Please add my objection to the application to reconstruct derelict stables on land at Featherbed Lane (application no. 4/02270/19/Ful).</p>

HP3 BG	<p>As the many objectors have stated it is certainly greenbelt/ farmland, but the plans suggest that a substantial bungalow type building is proposed to replace the "stable" which is almost certainly going to be followed by a further application to convert it to a dwelling and obviously that will mean cars vans lorries possibly tractors onto a road that is unsuitable for extra traffic.</p> <p>Please refuse this application as it is completely out of keeping.</p>
<p>Felden Close Sheethanger Lane Hemel Hempstead</p>	<p>Dear Sir / Madam re the revised planning application for Stables featherbed Lane 4/02270/19/FUL</p> <p>We, Maureen and Martin Bryant are rate payers . The land in question lies adjacent to and on the south side of the garden of our property</p> <p>We have had no difficulty logging onto the planning website but the comments section is inaccessible in spite of our registering The Dacorum telephone operator told us our comments would be registered if we email you ( before the closing date which is 3/6/2020 i.e. today) Our comments are as follows</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">ref 4/02270/19/FUL application This does not meet green belt policy rules and guidelines. The green belt is important to preserve. The field is of insufficient size to support the 3 horses and there is an oak tree and acorns are toxic to horses. There never has been a proper stables in the field, just a small shack. The current British Horse Society regulations are that horses require a stable measuring a minimum of 12ft x 12ft for horses, and preferably 12ft x 14ft for larger breeds. For ponies the recommended minimum stable size should be 10ft x 10ft, or 10ft x12ft for larger ponies - the total is less than 45 sq. m. for three horses. The proposed building for three stables a tack room and other rooms is many times the size of the original horse shelter and is inappropriately large (over 360 s.m. I understand) and placed so far from the road that it is impractical particularly because the land here is heavy with clay and will be damaged by lorries / tractor in wet weather. This is in no way a replacement building but rather a building large enough to consider in due course for conversion into a residential home, yet it is on green belt land. No acceptable "very special Circumstances" have been offered. Featherbed lane is narrow and tractor / lorry / horse box could have difficulty in entrance / exit and delay traffic in a hazardous manner because of the reduced visibility in the lane. Because of the work already done the owner applied for retrospective planning permission.I believe this was refused. Not sticking to planning rules should not be rewarded and the proposed building is too close to three residential homes Felden Lawns, Oakwood and Felden Close and to the two new properties recently granted planning permission behind Felden Close and all properties will be affected by the proximity of the proposed new building. If planning permission were approved, it should be for a building not significantly larger than the original and should be nearer the entrance of the field. We object to this development.</p> <p>Please accept this comment for insertion into the planning portal website and confirm to us that you have done so.</p>

<p>Woodriding, Sheethanger Lane HP3 0BG</p>	<p>Dear Head of Planning Not for the first time I have tried to access your site to obtain details of Planning Applications without success. On this occasion it was the Application quoted above. Fortunately I have managed to obtain details from a colleague and wish to register my objection to this application. My reasons are mainly having noted the applicant and being aware of previous activities to circumvent the planning strictures. Whilst the site quoted is currently 'green belt' and grazing for horses it is totally unsuitable for development. The infrastructure in the vicinity is stretched to the limit at present incapable of adequately supporting additional vehicular traffic. In addition of course we really cannot afford losing further 'green space'. I apologise for communicating by these means, but being unable to access the nominated site had no choice.</p>
<p>Felden Grange  Featherbed Lane  Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BT</p>	<p>I object to this planning application on the grounds that it does not meet the national planning policy criteria for green belt development.</p> <p>The land in question is CS5 green belt land.</p> <p>I object to this planning application on the grounds that it does not meet the national planning policy criteria for CS5 green belt development and therefore breaches planning law.</p> <p>I further object on the grounds that there is T1 Oak (Quercus robur) Adj E boundary; 17 fr SE corner which has on it a Tree Preservation Order.</p> <p>I further object on the grounds that the existing structure on this land is derelict and therefore has not been used for stabling purposes. The building of a new stabling block would therefore constitute a new development and as such is outside the scope of national greenbelt planning policy criteria for CS5 land.</p> <p>I further object on the grounds that the land is currently being used illegally by the land owner as housing for up to eight families. Allowing the building of new structures for stabling would validate existing breaches of planning law.</p> <p>I further object because information about residential usage allowed by the land owner has been omitted from this planning application. This omission by the land owner, in itself, invalidates this application.</p>
<p>Chaileys Felden Lawns Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BG</p>	<p>Objection on the basis of: Destruction of greenbelt. Significant destruction of trees and hedge footprint already evidenced. Ecology and biodiversity of site have been affected. Protected species of wildlife and birds are at risk. Pollution from effluent and waste from proposed stables. Siting of development too close to boundary with other properties.</p> <p>Development would appear to be with a view to a future change of use to a residential dwelling given scale and size proposed. 4/02270/19/FUL</p> <p>I write further to the revised plans that have been submitted 14 May and to reiterate my objection to the proposed development.</p>

	<p>I would like to draw the case officer's attention to the detailed submission from MSC Planning Associates dated 18/05/2020 which sets out a clear argument as to why the application is significantly non-compliant and with which I fully agree.</p> <p>To flag a few specific points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- it does not appear that any of the past objections from numerous parties have been taken into account.</li> <li>- plans vastly excessive for a stables.</li> <li>- land insufficient in acreage to support three horses. Also trees on the site are poisonous for horses which adds further evidence that the owner has no long term intention to use the site for this purpose.</li> <li>- proposal seems to be a Trojan horse for a change of use to a residential property.</li> <li>- owner has already cut down a vast proportion of hedges &amp; trees on the site.</li> <li>- owner has erected buildings on the site in contravention of planning rules (as evidenced by subsequent need to apply for retrospective planning permission).</li> <li>- total footprint of 360 square meters is vastly bigger than the original dilapidated wooden shed that was on the site. I note that this original structure was removed by the owner and replaced with the new structures (without planning approval).</li> <li>- development is completely out of keeping with the surrounding area.</li> </ul> <p>This is an inappropriate development because of its scale, bulk and massing and thus would have a very detrimental effect to the openness of the Green Belt and the "very special circumstances" outlined in the application have not been substantiated.</p> <p>The proposed development remains a non-compliant application on Green Belt land facing numerous significant objections from local residents.</p>
<p>Felden Stile Featherbed Lane</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BT</p>	<p>I wish to record my strong objection to the proposed plan on the following grounds;</p> <p>Since the purchase of the site, the owner has broken the agreements granted to him (and has been known to do this at other sites in the past) and has had an unlawful proposal rejected - ref 19/02959/FUL which is concerning as the construction which he now proposes is not suited for the purpose he intends.</p> <p>The location of the proposed stables is not convenient for traffic in and out and in fact would be a nuisance to neighbouring properties. Furthermore, destruction of Green Belt land would be necessitated for access to the site.</p> <p>Already the decimation of the trees and hedges on the site has had a significant effect on local wildlife and flora and fauna, and there is a concern that protected species are at risk.</p> <p>In the developer's application 4/02270/19/FUL it is clear that he could apply for a future change of use for the supposed stables to a residential dwelling (a trick which he has used previously) and which would have a significant detrimental effect on the local area.</p> <p>The traffic on Featherbed Lane has increased exponentially in the five years we have lived here, due to the large development next to the A41 and cars using the Lane as a rat run. To add large vehicles such as horse boxes onto</p>

	<p>what is now already a dangerous thoroughfare increases the chance of accidents and nuisance to local residents. I wish to record my strong objection to the proposed plan on the following grounds; Since the purchase of the site, the owner has broken the agreements granted to him and has been known to do this at other sites in the past and has had an unlawful proposal rejected . The location of the proposed stables is not convenient for traffic in and out and in fact would be a nuisance to neighbouring properties. Furthermore, destruction of Green Belt land would be necessitated for access to the site.</p> <p>Already the decimation of the trees and hedges on the site has had a significant effect on local wildlife and flora and fauna, and there is a concern that protected species are at risk. In the developer's application 4/02270/19/FUL it is clear that he could apply for a future change of use for the supposed stables to a residential dwelling (a trick which he has used previously) and which would have a significant detrimental effect on the local area. The traffic on Featherbed Lane has increased exponentially in the five years we have lived here, due to the large development next to the A41 and cars using the Lane as a rat run. To add large vehicles such as horse boxes onto what is now already a dangerous thoroughfare increases the chance of accidents and nuisance to local residents. This development appears to defy the openness of the whole Green Belt policy. I request that the application should be refused</p>
<p>Highfield House Featherbed Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BT</p>	<p>We strongly object to this proposal. This land directly opposite our home is greenbelt land and which should be protected. Work that has undergone on the land already includes the destruction of hedgerow and trees which were so significantly reduced we have concerns for local wildlife and flora that would take advantage of the protected land for them. During the chipping process of some of these trees, the rear end of the tree shredder was directly opposite our home and these items ended up covering our driveway and the road - a clear worrying sign that complete disregard to neighbours and nature is taken here from the beginning. We the concerns for access suitability as when approaching from Apsley end of Featherbed Lane, the turning circle for a car and horse box to get into the access stated is not big enough. There would be the need to reverse and manure whilst blocking the road and we are certain that our driveway would be used as part of their turning circle.</p> <p>The design and size of the proposed is excessive for a small paddock. We have concerns that any horse waste will be kept as far away from the stables and this would therefore mean it would be kept near the road directly outside our home, with small children we have concerns to the attraction of flies and horse manure odours as our property is directly opposite.</p>
<p>Sheethanger Lane Felden HP3 0BG</p>	<p>This application has some history based on the public comments and the related application 19/02959/FUL. It is clear that the applicant has tried to pull the wool over the planning department's eyes and those of the local residents with his actions.</p> <p>However, as the application 19/02959/FUL was rejected as the buildings constructed were deemed unlawful, and this has driven the applicant to amend his proposal for his new stables, I am reviewing the amended application on its</p>

own merit.

Even without taking into account the above, I object severely to this application. For the following reasons:

1. Local ecology has already been impacted and would be further impacted with this development. Protected species include families of roe deer, and protected birds. Trees and hedgerow have been viciously removed without any consideration of the green belt landscape nor the biodiversity that this has significantly impacted.

2. The proposed stables has been sited in the NW corner of the green belt paddock, close to neighbouring properties. This would create a noise and smell nuisance.

3. The proposed siting is also close to a significantly established Oak tree. Anyone with genuine intent of building a stable for horses would know that you never build a stables near an oak tree due to the toxicity of the acorns. As such, it does strike me, that as with other comments on thesis application that the applicant is seeking to change use to a residential dwelling.

4. The siting of the proposed stable is also at the furthest point from the access gate via Featherbed Lane. There are no provisions for access from Featherbed Lane to the stable itself. No road, no parking, no provision for a turning circle for vehicles towing horse boxes etc. The land itself would not support vehicular traffic.

5. There are no local public transport access points for workers, given the lack of parking provisions.

6. There is no analysis from Highways to support that the site can cope with increased traffic as a result of transporting horses, hay, materials etc., associated with a stables of this size.

7. Specific policy on the new development of equestrian facilities taken from the 'saved' policies of the Local Plan, Policy 81 stipulates a number of factors associated with new equestrian facilities.

- 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. These stables are proposed as new buildings, not accommodated in existing buildings.

Policy 81 goes on to outline the following criteria for permitting the development of equestrian facilities stating;

- equestrian facilities should be well located in relation to existing and proposed rights of way for equestrians; this is not the case.

- any new buildings should be compatible in scale and design with the countryside setting and ancillary to the overall equestrian use; this is not the case, the plans are excessive for the location.

- the scale of activity should respect the countryside setting and quality of the surrounding area; this is not the case, trees and hedgerows have been removed, residential fencing has been added and so the applicant has not at all respected the setting.

- opportunities to extend or add links to the bridleway network and improve

	<p>riders' safety should be taken; this is not the case.</p> <p>- proposals should not result in subdivision of fields into small paddocks with stables and fencing in each area; this is also not the case. The site has already been subdivided with fencing to create a visual and physical border, in line with residential planning criteria for such a location.</p> <p>As such, there are so many reasons why I object to this application.</p>
<p>Oakwood, Sheethangar Lane Felden HP3 OBG</p>	<p>I am writing to you as I have tried to submit an objection on the planning portal - but for some reason with limited success.</p> <p>I am a direct neighbour of the field in question and I would like you to accept my objection as per below for consideration given the consultation deadline is tomorrow.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The size of the stables is grossly disproportionate to the size of the field. I'm surprised if anyone looking at these plans genuinely believe that the purpose of this build is for a stables.</li> <li>2. Style and floor plan is overly ostentatious for a stables in a green belt field. The layout lends itself to a house build. The pitched roof allows for what would be a loft extension for bedrooms. The 'tractor garage' is in fact sized to be a double garage. A tractor of this size is quite simply superfluous for the size of this field.</li> <li>3. Location of the build is in the furthest point away from the access gate, meaning further destruction to the field where traffic will have to drive over. The field, once a very scenic meadow until recently has been completely decimated with impact on wildlife and its related ecology.</li> <li>4. The point is made in the planning statement that individuals will be on site throughout the majority of the day. Hence this is not a stables application but instead a working leisure facility. Again, this is not in line with green belt policy.</li> <li>5. There are established trees around the boundaries to the field including a TPO in our garden that borders the field - but all are poisonous to horses. No one would legitimately look to stable horses so close to these types of trees.</li> <li>6. Equestrian guidance suggests that one horse will chew through 11 hectares of grass in one year. This field is significantly undersized to support one horse, let alone three. And if hay and food are to be brought on site to counter this, this means traffic flow on the field right along the NW boundary with our property, effectively a roadway right on my boundary for what will be transportation vehicles - bringing significant noise and pollution right on the boundary of my home. All of this on what is a green belt field. Also, vehicles leaving the site when the field is muddy (for at least half of the year) will end up depositing mud along Featherbed Lane.</li> <li>7. Points 1,2,3,4,5,6 strongly suggest this is a Trojan horse application to warrant full utilities be implemented to assist with a change of use to residential in the near future. The location and layout of the build is much more akin to where a house build should be sited being centrally located at the bottom of the field, with the remaining field in front of it. The field fence he has erected across the field has been put up in line with the boundary hedge that spans the width of our plot. This boundary hedge marks the green belt for our plot. On our plot, south of the boundary hedge is our green belt field. North of the boundary hedge is our home built on land that is not green belt. Our neighbour's plot on our west side has exactly the same layout as do their neighbours. The applicant is trying to mirror this layout on his field to justify that a build that is in line with our house and that of our neighbours. However, the applicant's field is</li> </ol>

	<p>entirely green belt - and this application does not comply with green belt policy and should be refused.</p> <p>8. If a stables/working leisure facility was to go up, with people on site throughout most of each day, we would suffer from a severe lack of privacy on the NW side where our kitchen and master bedroom faces onto. There would also be excessive noise, loss of privacy and smell from the muck heap - all of which will be metres from our home. This isn't acceptable given the field should be protected by green belt policy. We moved to this area for this very reason 4 years ago. We felt assured that having a green belt field next to us would mean that would not be any development of this kind as it is protected by the Green belt policy. We would never have moved here if there had been any indication or possibility that something like this would be allowed.</p> <p>9. Two unlawful structures were put up without planning permission, and also within the RPA of the TPO. Retrospective planning application was refused, but these structures remain to this day, and there could be root damage to the TPO that has not been investigated to my knowledge.</p> <p>10. The applicant erected residential featherboard fencing around half of the perimeter of the field that would house the 'stables' build, prior to putting up the unlawful structures. Quite possibly in the hope of keeping them out of our sight. This fencing blocks the view of the green belt field which makes it unlawful from a green belt policy point of view as it is affecting the openness of the field and its role in preventing urban sprawl.</p> <p>We are relying on the council to protect the green belt but also to ensure that interests of the neighbours and residents who live in this small and close community are not taken advantage of by unethical developers who find loopholes and backdoors in planning policy.</p> <p>Please can you confirm that my objection will be considered when this application is being reviewed for decision, especially as I am one of the direct neighbours impacted.</p>
<p>The Grange Cottage Featherbed Lane  Felden Hemel Hempstead HP3 0BT</p>	<p>Strongly Object To This Planning Application.</p> <p>There Are No Stables Present On The Site Currently, So How On Earth Is This Replacing Stables?</p> <p>This Is Purely An Attempt To Build On The Land So The Owner Can Then Move For 'change Of Use</p>
<p>Eaglewood Sheethanger Lane Felden Hemel Hempstead HP3 0BG</p>	
<p>The Coppins Sheethangar Lane HP3 0BG</p>	<p>The above application has been brought to my attention by a fellow resident of Felden.</p> <p>I wish to record my objection on the following grounds:</p> <p>1. The application was submitted for the demolition of existing stables and the erection of a new stable block. The only building on the site is a small,</p>

	<p>dilapidated shed like structure, that appears to have been extended recently. To describe this as a stable is a misrepresentation of its original purpose, or subsequent use. According to one close neighbour, the structure has never been used as a stable.</p> <p>2. The construction of the proposed building and adjacent yard is out of all proportion to the size of the current structure; the proposed building comprising three separate loose boxes, and three store rooms, including a tractor and equipment store. The construction of such a building would be inappropriate in a green belt paddock, location, threatening the amenity of not only the present site, but adjacent pockets of green belt land in and around Felden.</p> <p>3. The fact that the applicant's horses and tractor cannot be housed in the existing structure, and that he chooses to keep them on a farm in Sarrett, is irrelevant to the merits of his application.</p>
<p>Highcroft Road  Felden HP3 0BU</p>	<p>I strongly object to this planning application.</p> <p>With the vast number of objections on solid grounds to the original proposal, it is confusing to me why this application hasn't been refused already. I refer the case officer to the three objections from two independent planning consultants. MSC Planning objected to the original proposal and again to the revised proposal. Aitchisons Rafferty have objected to the revised proposal. Both of these on behalf of local residents which we support. Detailed policy based rationale has been given by the above as to why this application is not compliant with the green belt policy. Both cannot be wrong.</p> <p>The stables design is too large to be a stables, and in terms of size, scale and area, is undoubtedly plans for a house build. Equestrian knowledge is that one horse will chew through 11 hectares per year. This field is far too small to support one horse, let alone three as per the planning statement and stables design. It is situated in a location furthest away from the access gate which will create further demolition of the green belt with the trackway that will ensue. The location also detracts from the openness of the field, a key issue in the green belt policy. As does the residential fencing around half of the perimeter. A point made by others and completely on point is that there are trees poisonous to horses around the boundaries. No horse lover in their right mind would allow horses to graze here, let alone build a stables. This brings serious doubt and questions as to the genuine intent of the applicant. The stables/horses angle does not stack up here, and this is certainly a smokescreen for a house build in a sought after location - that should be protected by the Green Belt Policy and Dacorum Council. This application is far from being a borderline case, as it is blatantly non-compliant with green belt policy. I very much hope that common sense will prevail and good judgment is made to refuse this application.</p>
<p>N/A Hemel Hempstead HP3 0BT</p>	<p>The owner of the site, an established property developer has committed a number of significant planning infringements since he bought the site.</p> <p>The original shed type dilapidation on the site was very small. Pictures and approximate measurements have been given to the Enforcement Team in the Planning Department.</p> <p>Without following the planning process, he built an extension to the original shed type dilapidation and built an additional permanent wooden structure</p>

	<p>adjacent to the dilapidation without planning consent - to create the impression that this revised building footprint was the original footprint. Pictures and approximate measurements have been given to the Enforcement Team in the Planning Department. Whilst he has been asked to submit retrospective planning application to regularise these infringements he has further lied in his applications.</p> <p>He has still used this unlawfully increased footprint size as the basis for planning permission to demolish these structures and move this 'stable' to the centre of the plot siting equestrian facilities. It is a standard approach for developers looking to get change of use but by siting a structure in the centre of where the residential dwelling would reside as it's easier to build on and around this.</p> <p>Let's be clear, nobody puts a stable in the centre of a plot! It's the perfect siting for a residential dwelling. The construction of the proposed building and adjacent yard is out of all proportion to the size of the original dilapidation/structure; the proposed building comprising three separate loose boxes, and three store rooms, including a tractor and equipment store. The construction of such a building would be inappropriate in a green belt paddock location. It threatens the ecology and wildlife present in the area and site.</p> <p>There is also no vehicular access called for on the Application, which is inconsistent with transporting horses, feed, fuel and anything else relating to the running of a stable, including the riders! There is no parking or turning facility on the roadside: the lane is already narrow with no footpath - and already suffers from single file traffic despite not being a one way system, hence causing already significant delays and traffic problems.</p> <p>He has stated to maintain the look and feel of the green belt location, yet has cut down 90% of the trees and hedges on the site, and erected residential fencing around 50% of the perimeter. The site is now an eye sore to the surrounding neighbours and area.</p> <p>Despite sending detailed information and pictures to the planning department, nothing yet is being done about this. It is clear this approach is used by many developers seeking to apply for change of use and build houses.</p> <p>Every single planning officer that has touched this complaint has subsequently left the council. Jason Seed, the last one is also soon to be leaving the council and has not been unhelpful at best.</p> <p>It is an absolute travesty that this is being allowed to happen to green belt land in this area. It is also clear to me that a precedent is being set here for land hungry developers to build houses on green belt, despite the green belt policy.</p> <p>I am also writing to the MP Sir Mike Penning.</p>
<p>Bulstrode Lane</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead HP3 0BP</p>	<p>Informed of this by a neighbour.</p> <p>Please add my strong objection to the list.</p> <p>Documents posted on the 5th, 19th and most notably 29th of May by independent Chartered Town planners make compelling and stringent arguments for an outright refusal. There are absolutely no special</p>

	<p>circumstances (VSCs) and it definitely does not meet local/national GREENBELT policy. In fact it goes against the openness intended for this land. The newly installed residential fencing around the perimeter looks out of character as do the unlawful structures onsite. This field sadly does not look the same anymore, there is no "openness" about it anymore. If anything it looks like it is getting ready for residential development. From the view from Featherbed Lane, it has been partitioned to make it look like the line of neighbours, except, unlike the neighbouring plots, the whole of this plot is entirely GREENBELT , and ALL of it is subject to GREENBELT policy.</p> <p>Document posted on 22nd May by the applicants construction company-Warner Planning -Simon Warner(a former Dacorum planning officer?!) is renowned for and specialises in commercial properties and converting barns to residential properties!</p> <p>Given the size, it clearly is a residential dwelling proposal, a three bedroom bungalow with a double garage, certainly not a legitimate "stable for horses" application.</p> <p>In light of this informative information it makes no sense to sacrifice precious GREENBELT land in our small Felden Hamlet for the profit margins of an unscrupulous and disingenuous application. Please Refuse.</p>
<p>The Rowans Featherbed Lane</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead Hertfordshire HP3 0BT</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed building is large and out of proportion to the size of its field. It's like an embryonic residential building. This is strongly implied by the statement in the Planning Statement that "individuals that will be on site throughout the majority of the day. With the provision of space for those on site to eat, sit down as well as access to a toilet..."</li> <li>2. There are to be three stables and three horses. Clearly there will not be enough grazing for these animals so there has to be much hay and other food brought on to the site - implied by the large hay store and food room.</li> <li>3. It therefore follows that vehicles will have to come in from Featherbed Lane and get to the stables. Will all of these vehicles (the tractor from its store?) really go over the grass, which will inevitably be muddy especially in winter? If so, mud will be brought onto Featherbed Lane.</li> <li>4. A significant further alteration is proposed for access to the site along with a large area of hardstanding for a "4x4 with horse trailer". This will further be to the detriment of the area's character.</li> <li>5. The hedge alongside Featherbed Lane has already been substantially destroyed (compare the situation on the ground with that shown in the satellite view in the Planning Statement on p2). Is this an attempt to make it easier to view the road when leaving - but it will still not be easy. NB the bend sign shown in the photo on p4 of the Planning Statement.</li> <li>6. This proposal is inconsistent with Green Belt policy.</li> <li>7. This large development is a form of creeping urbanisation.</li> <li>8. I have lived in Featherbed Lane since 1982 and I have never seen horses on this site and do not recall the dilapidated buildings ever being used.</li> <li>9. Even to my lay eye there are obvious faults in the drawings that have been submitted. The building proposed for demolition (did it have planning permission?) is incorrectly drawn and p11 of the Construction Management Plan shows the wheel wash actually in Featherbed Lane!</li> </ol>
<p>Whitelocks Featherbed Lane</p> <p>Hemel Hempstead</p>	<p>We are very concerned about this inappropriate development close to our home and attach below. for information, our most recent objection to Dacorum Council. We understand that you are aware of considerable local concerns about the applicant and his future proposals. We hope that you will feel able to support us as local residents in opposing this proposal. Our comments to the website portal were as follows:</p>

	<p>"We oppose this proposed development which we believe is a disingenuous "foot in the door" application for an intended subsequent application for residential development. It is in no way accurate to describe the proposed development as a replacement for existing buildings or storage. The applicant has already removed and destroyed existing hedgerow and trees ,damaging the local ecology and showing disregard for the Green Belt. In doing so we are also very concerned about a possible intent to create an additional unlawful access from the field into Featherbed Lane. Featherbed Lane is single track at many points and there is already significant damage arising from heavy lorries eroding road surfaces and kerb sides to create passing spaces. There is an existing particular problem with lorries attempting to turn into and access adjacent roads off Featherbed Lane which is likely to be further exacerbated by increased traffic from this development together with the associated additional noise and pollution."</p> <p>it is disappointing that despite numerous valid objections from local residents the applicant appears to have been encouraged to re-submit with further revisions. However, we do not believe the latest amendments address the key concerns regarding national Green Belt policy.</p> <p>We very much appreciate your interest and support in opposing this application</p>
<p>Flaunden Lane</p> <p>Felden HP3 0BW</p>	<p>I agree with my neighbour and object to this application.</p> <p>As a keen cyclist I cycle down Featherbed Lane daily. However I have never seen any site notices informing the public of a planning application submitted on the plot of Greenbelt land in question, otherwise had I been aware, I would have commented on this proposal sooner.</p> <p><b>Inappropriate Access</b> Featherbed Lane is a narrow, winding, single track rural lane. The point of access to this plot of land has reduced visibility and is particularly unsuitable for large vehicles. Moreover it is especially dangerous to pedestrians/dog walkers and cyclists who can be pushed into the edge to evade collision with a vehicle. Hence any provision that may increase the level of traffic must be avoided. I cannot see how a horse box can be manoeuvred at this junction coming from either direction. It simply is not possible on this tiny lane without encroaching on neighbourhood drives or verges, causing a backlog of traffic and possible collisions. The access is therefore logistically unfeasible.</p> <p><b>Greenbelt Policy</b> Secondly the proposal does not meet Greenbelt policy in any way shape or form. The so called stables is an inappropriate development and there are no special circumstances to allow for this to unnecessarily further destroy the field. These structures/stables would categorically hinder rather than preserve the "openness" of the greenbelt. This therefore conclusively poses a conflict of issue with the Greenbelt policy. These policies are there for a reason and are exercised with force in controlling development in the countryside. This plot of land is intended to be kept "open" for a reason under national planning policy and to prevent urban sprawl. There cannot be any exceptions to break policy rules.</p>

<p>Highcroft Road</p> <p>Felden Hemel Hempstead Hp3 0bu</p>	<p>Strong objection based on the following:-</p> <p>It categorically does not meet any of the statutory requirements of the Green belt policy.</p> <p>The revised plans show further destruction of the Green belt adding to what the owner has already destroyed. Carving up Greenbelt land to form an unnecessary track to the stables at the other end of the plot. Carving up more Greenbelt land at the front access. Stables are ridiculously excessive.</p> <p>The professional Objection letters posted on the 05/05/19 and 19/05/19 by what it seems to be an independent Chartered Town planner viewed by clicking on the Documents tab above, further strengthens the arguments on why this application should be thrown out once and for all, without revisions and repeat applications!</p>
---	--