

ITEM NUMBER: 5g

21/04777/RET	Retention of outbuilding	
Site Address:	34 Coniston Road, Kings Langley, Hertfordshire, WD4 8BU	
Applicant/Agent:	Mr Mohammed Ajab	Mr Martin Ballard
Case Officer:	Laura Bushby	
Parish/Ward:	Kings Langley Parish Council	Kings Langley
Referral to Committee:	Contrary views of the Parish Council	

1. RECOMMENDATION

That planning permission be GRANTED

2. SUMMARY

2.1 The application is for the retention of an outbuilding in the rear garden of 34 Coniston Road. The area of the garden in which the outbuilding is sited is located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The construction of new buildings within the Green Belt amounts to inappropriate development, which, as set out in the NPPF and Policy CS5 of the Core Strategy 2013 is harmful by definition. The proposal is thus unacceptable in principle unless very special circumstances exist to clearly outweigh the harm.

2.2 There are very special circumstances in this case. A detached outbuilding of identical size and scale could be constructed without the need for planning permission provided it is located more than 2m from the boundaries of the site (0.5m further to the north-east). Given it is concluded that such a building would have the same overall visual appearance to the outbuilding as constructed and now sought for retention, this is considered to constitute very special circumstances. In addition a lawful structure located at a higher land level, closer to the dwelling would have a greater adverse impact when compared to the outbuilding as constructed.

2.3 The proposal would not result in any visual harm to the property, street scene or this part of the Green Belt, would not adversely affect residential amenity, nor would it harm the safety and operation of the adjacent highways to comply with Policies CS5, CS8, CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy 2013.

3. SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 The application site is located on Coniston Road in a residential area of the large village of Kings Langley. The rear garden is partially located within the Metropolitan Green Belt. The application site consists of a two storey semi-detached property with a private driveway to the front of the property and a large rear garden.

4. PROPOSAL

4.1 Proposal is for the retention of an outbuilding to the rear of 34 Coniston Road

5. PLANNING HISTORY

Planning Applications:

20/00369/LDP - Hip to Gable, Rear Dormer, 3no Velux windows to front elevation.
GRA - 9th April 2020

20/00411/HPA - Single storey rear extension measuring 6m deep with a maximum height of 3.09m and a maximum eaves height of 2.8m.

PNR - 17th April 2020

20/02291/FHA - Creation of single storey outbuilding for domestic use.

WDN - 5th October 2020

Appeals: None

6. CONSTRAINTS

Article 4 Directions: Land at Abbots Rise, Kings Langley

CIL Zone: CIL2

Green Belt: Policy: CS5

Heathrow Safeguarding Zone: LHR Wind Turbine

Large Village: Kings Langley

Oil Pipe Buffer: 100

Parish: Kings Langley CP

RAF Halton and Chenies Zone: Yellow (45.7m)

Residential Area (Town/Village): Residential Area in Town Village (King Langley)

Parking Standards: New Zone 3

EA Source Protection Zone: 3

EA Source Protection Zone: 2

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 (2021)

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

CS4 - The Towns and Large Villages

CS5 – Green Belt

CS10 - Quality of Settlement Design

CS11 - Quality of Neighbourhood Design

CS12 - Quality of Site Design

CS29 - Sustainable Design and Construction

Supplementary Planning Guidance/Documents:

9. CONSIDERATIONS

Main Issues

9.1 The main issues to consider are:

The policy and principle justification for the proposal;
The quality of design and impact on visual amenity;
The impact on residential amenity; and
The impact on highway safety and car parking.

Principle of Development

9.2 The application dwelling itself is located within a residential area of the large village of Kings Langley. The dwelling however benefits from a generous garden to the rear of the property, with the furthest section of the garden being located within the boundary of the Metropolitan Green Belt. The outbuilding which is the subject of this planning application is located within the area of the garden which is within the Metropolitan Green Belt. As such the application must be considered in relation to the Green Belt policies.

9.3 The NPPF (para 149) and Core Strategy clearly state that the construction of new buildings in the Green Belt are not acceptable, save for a number of key exceptions. The outbuilding proposed for retention does not meet one of the exception tests outlined and as such amounts to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, which is, by definition harmful.

9.4 Paragraph 148 of the NPPF sets out that *'When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations'*.

9.5 In this instance very special circumstances are required to justify the development.

9.6 In this case would be what would be permissible to construct under permitted development rights without the express need for planning permission to be granted and how this relates and compares to what has been constructed would be a material consideration. Under the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) an outbuilding can be constructed within the Metropolitan Green Belt without the need for permission provided certain size criteria are met.

9.7 The outbuilding constructed measures 10.8 metres in length, 5.4 metres deep with an eaves height of 2.45 metres and an overall height of 3.4 metres. It has been built within 1.5 metres of the boundary with no. 32 Coniston Road. As such the construction does not meet permitted requirements. In order for the outbuilding to meet the requirements of the GPDO it would need to be sited 0.5 metres further from the boundary with No. 32. Whilst the GPDO is clear that if a construction does not meet the requirements it is therefore not permitted development and will require planning permission, in this instance what could be built under permitted development is a material planning consideration and may provide the very special circumstances under which this application could be considered acceptable.

9.8 An identical structure albeit 0.5m further to the north-east would not need permission and is considered to have the same overall visual impact as the outbuilding sought for retention.

The permitted development fall-back position (what can be built without consent) is therefore considered to be a very special circumstance in this instance and would justify the granting of planning permission.

9.9 Furthermore weight should also be given to the fact that had the applicant constructed the outbuilding in the area of their garden closest to the house and thus outside the Green Belt it would not amount to inappropriate development. The potential impact to the setting of and openness of the Green Belt could however be greater, and more harmful due to the differing land levels within the garden. The outbuilding as constructed currently occupies the lowest part of the site. It is therefore noted that the outbuilding constructed is less harmful in visual terms, and has less of an impact on the neighbouring properties (see section below) than one built outside of the Green Belt which again is considered to amount to a very special circumstance.

9.10 The difference between what has been constructed and what could be built without planning permission is limited. Whilst it does require planning permission, the fact that a very similar building could be built under permitted development, and that such an outbuilding would have a very similar, if not worse impact is a material consideration and does in this instance constitute very special circumstances.

9.11 Whilst the outbuilding as constructed amounts to inappropriate development, given its siting and the topography of the area, it does not have a significant adverse impact on the openness and character of the countryside or this part of the Green Belt.

9.12 As such it is considered that the above offers the very special circumstances required for this to be considered acceptable under Green Belt policies within the NPPF and CS5 of the Core Strategy.

Quality of Design / Impact on Visual Amenity

9.13 Saved Appendix 7 of the Dacorum Local Plan (2004), Policies CS11, CS12 of the Core Strategy (2013) and the NPPF (2021) all seek to ensure that any new development or alteration respects or improves the character of the surrounding area and adjacent properties in terms of scale, massing, materials, layout, bulk and height.

9.14 The outbuilding is located to the rear of the dwelling, and as such is not visible from public vantage points. To the rear of the application site are open fields, which form part of the Green Belt, there are no noted rights of way to the rear and as such the outbuilding would only be visible from the application site and the gardens of the surrounding properties.

9.15 Where visible it is noted that the outbuilding is largely in keeping with other outbuildings seen within the area, and whilst it is acknowledged that the outbuilding is generous in its overall footprint, given the location of the outbuilding to the rear of the garden, the size of the rear garden and spacing from the dwelling it is not considered to be overbearing or of a mass, scale and bulk that is out of keeping with the area. Outbuildings of various sizes and orientation can be seen across the gardens of neighbouring properties.

9.16 The rear of the site slopes down from the dwelling to the end of the garden, and the land then rises to the rear of the site across the open fields. The outbuilding has been located towards the rear of the site where the land levels are lower than that of the dwelling. When viewed from the dwelling the overall mass and scale of the outbuilding is reduced due to the sloping land level, such that the overall height of the outbuilding is less impactful than were it to be located closer to the dwelling outside of the boundary of the Metropolitan Green Belt.

9.17 On balance it is considered that the retention of the outbuilding would not have a significant adverse impact on the character and openness of the countryside due to the location of the outbuilding and specifically at a lower point of the garden than the dwelling. Were the outbuilding to

be located outside of the Green Belt boundary and closer to the dwellings it is likely that due to the land level being higher, the impact on the openness of the Green Belt and surrounding countryside would be greater.

Impact on Residential Amenity

9.18 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 should be designed to reduce any impact on neighbouring properties by way visual intrusion, loss of light and privacy.

9.19 The rear gardens of Coniston Road are all generous in length, with the boundaries between gardens being primarily constructed of chain link fences, small trees and hedging and therefore of an open nature, without robust boundary fences. The openness of the rear gardens and as such the potential impact of the outbuilding by way of visual intrusion on the neighbouring properties must be taken into consideration. However it is noted that a boundary fence measuring 2 metres in height could be constructed under permitted development without the express need for planning permission.

9.20 Several neighbour comments have been received in relation to the application, primarily in relation to the impact of the development on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties, whilst these comments are taken on board, it must be acknowledged that a similar outbuilding built 0.5 metres further away from the boundary, or to a maximum height of 2.5 metres would meet permitted development requirements.

9.21 Whilst the outbuilding would measure 10 metres in length the rear gardens on Coniston Road are very generous in size, and there would be adequate garden retained without the outbuilding including the immediate garden area to the rear of the property that serves as the primary outdoor amenity space. Furthermore any visual intrusion caused by the outbuilding would not be considered to be any greater than if a boundary fence of 2 metres were to be built on the boundary, or if the outbuilding were to be moved 0.5 metres across.

9.22 On balance it is not considered that the outbuilding already constructed would cause a significance adverse impact to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties by way of loss of light, privacy or causing visual intrusion in comparison to what would be permissible under permitted development. As such the application is in accordance with Saved Appendix 3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy.

Impact on Highway Safety and Parking

9.23 The proposed application does not seek to alter the access or parking arrangements for the property or seek to increase the number of habitable rooms within the property. Furthermore off street parking is provided by way of a private driveway. There is further parking available on street on Coniston Road. As such there are no significant concerns regarding parking or highway safety in relation to this planning application.

Other Material Planning Considerations

Impact on Trees and Landscaping

9.24 It is noted that neighbour comments were received in relation to a number of trees and hedgerows being removed to enable the construction of the outbuilding. In this instance due to the property not being within a Conservation Area, or any trees within the site being subject to a Tree

Preservation Order the removal of a tree or hedge is not restricted and can be carried out without permission being required.

Services

9.25 Neighbour comments have been received in relation to the outbuilding being connected to services. The outbuilding can be linked to services such as electricity and water without any additional planning permission being required, furthermore if an outbuilding is constructed under permitted development this can also be connected to major services.

Ancillary Uses

9.26 Neighbour comments have been received in relation to future uses of the outbuilding and whether it may be used as a standalone dwelling in future. This outbuilding will be for uses ancillary to the dwelling know as 34 Coniston Road and a planning condition will be applied to ensure this in perpetuity. The use of the outbuilding separate to the dwelling would require planning permission.

Removal of Class E Permitted Development Rights

9.27 Considering the assessment that has been made in relation to what could be constructed under permitted development, along with the assessment that something built under permitted development may be more harmful to the Green Belt than what has been constructed it is necessary and reasonable to include a condition to remove Class E Permitted Development rights in this instance.

Response to Neighbour Comments

9.28 Representations have been received and the points raised are summarised below. A number of points which have been raised within the neighbour comments are not planning issues, and as such are not covered in the report above.

- Rear Patio – Concerns have been raised regarding the height of the patio attached to the rear extension and whether this is higher than the permitted 30cm. This is not related to the application being considered and as such should not form part of this application.
- Overdevelopment – a neighbour comment has been received regarding overdevelopment. It should be noted that overdevelopment refers to whether a site can adequately accommodate what is being proposed. In this instance the application site is of a suitable size to accommodate both the extensions to the main dwellinghouse and the outbuilding.
- Building Control – some comments have been submitted in relation to the requirement for building control to ensure that building regulations are met. This falls outside of the planning system and as such is not something that is assessed as part of this application.
- Previous applications – it is noted that an application was received 20/02291/FHA for another outbuilding. This application was withdrawn, however does not impact how this application is assessed.
- Incorrect plans – amended plans have been submitted which show the correct distance from the boundary and with the window in the side elevation
- Security lights – lights can be installed in private gardens without the express need for planning permission and in any event lighting does not form part of this planning application.
- Timings – a number of comments received comment on the discrepancy relating to when the building work was carried out. Whilst this would be relevant if this was an application seeking to prove the constructed outbuilding was lawful due to the time elapsed since construction, this is an application for the retention of the outbuilding, it is not therefore necessary to ascertain when it was constructed. This application has been assessed against the relevant

national and local planning policies and as if the structure were not in situ. No weight has been given the fact this is a retrospective application.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

9.29 The application is not CIL liable

10. CONCLUSION

10.1 To conclude, it is acknowledged that the constructed outbuilding does not meet the requirements of the GPDO Permitted Development Order. However, what could be constructed through permitted development without the requirement for planning permission is a material planning consideration.

10.2 Having assessed what has been constructed, and what changes would be required in order for it to meet the permitted development regulations, it is not considered that the constructed outbuilding will have a greater adverse impact than what could be constructed under permitted development by way of impact on residential amenities, and the impact on the character of the countryside and openness of the Green Belt. This is considered to amount to very special circumstances.

10.3 Furthermore through the removal of Class E permitted development rights the approval of this planning application will enable the Local Planning Authority to safeguard the openness of the countryside and Green Belt in the future.

11. RECOMMENDATION

11.1 That planning permission be GRANTED

Condition(s) and Reason(s):

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

Drawing no. 300
Location Plan

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

- 2. The development hereby permitted shall be constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the approved plans**

Reason: To make sure that the appearance of the building is suitable and that it contributes to the character of the area in accordance with Policies CS11 and CS12 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013).

- 3. The outbuilding hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as 34 Coniston Road and shall not be independently occupied.**

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and to ensure that the use of the development remains ancillary to the use of the main dwellinghouse without allowing the intensification of

residential accommodation within the site in accordance with Policy CS5 and CS11 of the Dacorum Core Strategy.

4. **Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any Order amending or re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within the following classes of the Order shall be carried out**

Schedule 2 Part 1 Class E

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the development in the interests of safeguarding the openness of the Green Belt in accordance with Policy CS5 of the Dacorum Borough Core Strategy (2013) and Section 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021).

Informatives:

1. Planning permission has been granted for this proposal. Discussion with the applicant to seek an acceptable solution was not necessary in this instance. 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.

APPENDIX A: CONSULTEE RESPONSES

Consultee	Comments
Kings Langley Parish Council	The Council objects to this application as it is a substantial building in the Green Belt for which no special case has been submitted.

APPENDIX B: NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES

Number of Neighbour Comments

Neighbour Consultations	Contributors	Neutral	Objections	Support
4	7	0	7	0

Neighbour Responses

Address	Comments
28 Coniston Road Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 8BU	Dear Dacorum Planning The application is misleading and inaccurate and section 13 states that the declaration is true and accurate This shed- summer house- dwelling was built between June 2020 and October 2020 and I have photos taken during that time showing the shed construction

	<p>It was not built between 6-6-21-1.7.21 as stated in section 6</p> <p>Not sure how you could build this structure which is as big as 2 bed room flat in 24 days</p> <p>It does not have a felt roof but a fibreglass / resin all weather finish usually associated with flat roofs</p> <p>There is a window in the side elevation not shown in the drawings</p> <p>The plans show the shed in a central position but it is in fact situated very close the fence line of 36 Coniston, I have not measured it but it looks about 1 metre and as it is 3.4 mts high it contravenes permitted development in location in addition to its excessive size 58.32 m2 almost double the PD size.</p> <p>I was told that if the shed was not 2 metres from the boundary line its maximum size is only 15m2 I do not know if this correct I was under the impression that it was 30m2</p> <p>Many trees and vegetation were felled and burnt and I remember the sound of a chainsaw past 9pm on a Friday night in June 2020 as I was outside trying to enjoy the late summer evening</p> <p>During this time Mr Ajab also submitted an application for a 101.5m2 structure/house on one level 4.4 metres high half way between this structure and his main house 20/02291/FHA 12.08.20 situated next to the boundary line with 36 with no gap</p> <p>the site drawing from that application did not show this shed 58.3m2 although it was mainly built by August 2020</p> <p>combining the two structures their size would be 160m2 which is a larger floor plan than the existing house</p> <p>Why he did not submit an additional application for this shed/summerhouse I do not know, his architect must have been aware of the permitted development rules which I believe state a garden room/summerhouse has a maximum size of 30m2 and if higher than 2.5metres must be more than 2 metres from the neighbouring fence</p> <p>I have a shed summerhouse which is one room 30m2 2.75metres at the pitch and 2.45 metres from my neighbour's fence at 26 therefore complying with the PD rules</p> <p>To conclude if this is structure is allowed it will set a precedent which will give the green light to large dwellings almost twice the maximum PD size to be built on the green belt and if everyone on this side of Coniston Road built a structure such as this it would spoil the rural setting completely and look like a holiday caravan park</p>
<p>50 Coniston Road Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 8BU</p>	<p>The building work was not started in June 2021 - August 2021. The work actually started in the Summer of 2020 and went on for many months, late into the evening and over most weekends and bank holidays, with no regard for neighbours who were all at home during lockdown. The applicant said it was a temporary structure to store tools</p>

	<p>in, which it certainly is not.</p> <p>The applicant answered NO to the question: 'Are there any trees or hedges on your own property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your proposed development?'</p> <p>In fact there are several trees which are well within falling distance.</p> <p>The applicant answered NO to the question: 'Will any trees or hedges need to be removed or pruned in order to carry out your proposal?'</p> <p>In fact many trees have already been destroyed in order to construct this 60m2 building building, ruining the local wildlife habitat and natural scenery.</p> <p>The plan shows the building is 3 metres from the boundary, but it's actually less than 2 metres from the boundary.</p> <p>The building is not a 'shed' as the applicant claims. It has french doors, a large overhang (which aren't show on the drawings). I understand from immediate neighbours that it is fully insulated, and has services running to it. Lights are on during the evening, so it's definitely more than a 'shed'. I suspect its intended use is as a dwelling, which contravenes the Green Belt rules.</p> <p>The building does not have a felt roof - it is a poured rubberised material not used on temporary structures.</p> <p>There are security lights installed on the sides and front of the building, which means the ground and neighbouring gardens are frequently lit up - having a huge effect on the local wildlife, of which there are badgers, foxes, deer and bats.</p> <p>They have already considerably overdeveloped their property: a six metre extension to the rear, loft conversion and a large raised patio area at the rear of the house which also requires planning permission due to its height above ground (over 30cm).</p> <p>The building is 58.3m2 and 3.4m high - which is far too big and out of character for the area. More importantly, anything larger than 30m2 needs to go through building regulations, a fact that was pointed out to Dacorum building control and planning department in 2020.</p> <p>The structure is on green belt land and, if approved, it will set a precedent in the road for everyone to build huge outbuildings, which have a huge negative impact on the local ecology.</p>
<p>8, Wander Wharf, Wander Wharf Wander Wharf Kings Langley WD4 8SL</p>	<p>This 'shed' is less than 2 metres from the boundary line with No 36 (not 3 metres as on the plans)</p> <p>It is on Green Belt land and could well set a precedence for more building on the gardens on this side of Coniston Road.</p> <p>The 'shed' has had permanent services channelled down to it and has at least one light inappropriately set to shine over the bottom of the garden of No 36.</p> <p>There has been no thought given to the detrimental affect the light has</p>

	<p>on the wildlife that always come into the gardens or to the fact that it shines directly onto the rear of the garden of No 36 intruding on their privacy and their right to the rural aspect that their property has always had.</p> <p>There has been a number of inaccuracies submitted such as..... The close proximity to No 36 as mentioned before. The roof has not been constructed with felt but has a permanent rubberised roof covering. The 'shed' was constructed in 2020 and not in 2021 as stated. The 'shed' is substantially larger than on the drawings.</p> <p>If this planning is passed, with all the inaccuracies, does this mean that other constructions can automatically go through eventually without any action being taken?</p> <p>Although I now live in another part of Kings Langley I still have a close connection to this property.</p>
<p>26 Coniston Road Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 8BU</p>	<p>My objection to this application is that a substantial (it has a footprint of nearly 60 square metres) and permanent building (i.e., it is not a "shed") has been inappropriately constructed, without permission, on protected green belt land.</p> <p>Additionally, the submitted documents contain a number of inaccuracies, for example: the construction dates, the location of the building with respect to the property boundaries, the actual building design (including materials), and information on the removal of trees.</p>
<p>32 Coniston Road Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 8BU</p>	<p>A few years ago a neighbour further up Coniston Road intended to construct a large outbuilding in their garden and I objected on the grounds that it was green belt land and out of keeping with the area. Unfortunately I feel I must object to this development for the same reasons:</p> <p>This outbuilding is substantially constructed and large, and is not a temporary building such as a greenhouse or shed. It is inappropriately sited on green belt land at the bottom of the garden at number 34 and is visible from my property. Very bright lights shine from this on occasion leading me to think that services may have been laid to this construction, and leading to light pollution and potentially disturbing the local wildlife of which there are many species at a micro level including two types of deer and more than one species of bat.</p> <p>A temporary structure such as a modest summer house would have been a better option, in my opinion. In addition, although not necessarily pertinent to the consideration of this case, is that for the last two years the immediate neighbours have had considerable noise and dirt to contend with. Internal and external building work continues to take place at number 34 at any time of any day and evening up to late at night, including during Saturdays, Sundays and Bank Holidays.</p>

<p>36 Coniston Road Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 8BU</p>	<p>Our objections to the building at the bottom of the garden at 34 Coniston Road are as follows:</p> <p>Situated on greenbelt land and impacts on our rural aspect</p> <p>Not positioned as shown on the plans and less than 2meters from our boundary</p> <p>Considerably larger than stated on the plans and fears that this might set a precedent for future construction</p> <p>Appears to be a summer house with a veranda rather than a shed</p> <p>Constructed from combustible materials</p> <p>Permanent rubberised roof covering not felt as stated in the plans</p> <p>Permanent services buried in channel the length of the garden</p> <p>Powerful lights including one on the side shining directly into our garden impacts wildlife such as deer, badgers and foxes</p> <p>The building was constructed in 2020 beginning in July, not in 2021 as stated</p>
<p>30 Coniston Road Kings Langley Hertfordshire WD4 8BU</p>	<p>The information on this application is inaccurate in many ways: The applicant has stated that the building work was started in June 2021 - August 2021. The work actually started way back in the Summer of 2020 and went on for months on end, late into the evening sometimes, and over most weekends and bank holidays. This was extremely disrespectful to all neighbours especially seeing as we were all on lockdown and unable to escape the noise and disruption. Neighbours were informed it was just going to be a temporary structure to store tools in. (but it is clearly not temporary).</p> <p>The applicant has answered number 6 in the application incorrectly:</p> <p>'Are there any trees or hedges on your own property or on adjoining properties which are within falling distance of your proposed development?'</p> <p>The applicant answered 'no'. In fact there are several trees which are well within falling distance.</p> <p>The second question in this section of the application asks: 'Will any trees or hedges need to be removed or pruned in order to carry out your proposal?' - The applicant answered 'no'. In fact very many trees have already been destroyed in order to construct this building, ruining the local wildlife habitat and natural scenery.</p> <p>The drawing the applicant has submitted is inaccurate. It shows the building around 3 metres from the boundary, but it's actually less than 2 metres from the boundary. (Hence requiring planning permission). This severely impact the neighbouring property and is a huge blot on the otherwise beautiful, natural landscape.</p>

The description of the building is inaccurate. The applicant claims this is a shed. It is clearly more than a shed. It has french doors, a large overhang (which aren't show on the drawings) and I assume will have a veranda when fully completed. I believe it is fully insulated, and also believe it has some sort of services running to it because I recall seeing a trench being dug with cables being laid. Lights are seen on during the evening, so it's definitely more than a 'shed' as stated, and I am worried it could be used as a dwelling in the future (which contravenes the Green Belt rules).

The application also says the building has a felt roof - this is also incorrect. It is some sort of poured rubberised material. (Not something you would see on a temporary structure).

There are security lights installed on the sides and front of the building, which means the ground and neighbouring gardens are frequently lit up - having a huge effect on the local wildlife, of which there are badgers, foxes, deer and bats.

The construction of this outbuilding has caused significant disruption to neighbours with hammering and other loud building noises continuing into the night and throughout weekends and bank holidays for months on end. On top of this (unrelated to this case) building work on the house itself has continued for almost two years - again causing a lot of stress, dust, dirt and disruption to neighbouring properties.

They have already considerably overdeveloped their property in my view. With a six metre extension to the rear, loft conversion and have also built a large raised patio area at the rear of the house (unrelated to this case I know) which I also believe requires planning permission due to its height from the ground being over 30cm, but none has been granted as far as I can tell.

Claiming it is a 'shed' down-plays what it will be used for, and it's impact on the landscape and local ecology. It is 58.3sqm and 3.4m high - which is far too big and out of character for the area. Anything larger than 30sqm needs to go through building regulations.

The structure is on green belt land which worries me greatly. If this is approved, it sets precedence in the road for everyone to build huge outbuildings, which will destroy a lot of the local nature and totally change the landscape and views over the open countryside.