

I only wish to comment on this application.

Since Sept 2003 when the applicant purchased the holding, no farming has taken place, except for an occasional annual hay crop and on even less occasions, allowing the grazing by sheep for a short period immediately before lambing.

In the planning appeal that addressed the issue, the Planning Inspector reached, in my view, a perverse conclusion that viable farming was taking place, seemingly relying on the evidence tendered by a representative from Savill's with 5 year experience and who had not visited the holding. In terms of machinery and the need for storage, there has never been more than a small John Deere tractor - only slightly larger than a large ride on lawn mower. The hay crop is reaped by contractors using their own equipment.

I note the photograph supplied on behalf of the applicant. Impressive as it appears, it does not represent the look of a working farm. With hay taken away by contractors and virtually no machinery owned by the applicant, I am moved to ask how long before the declared use of the buildings are claimed to be redundant and by their domestic appearance lead to a short cut to residential use and development on the Green Belt. In terms of the application as I understand it, it is to allow further skylights, already built in but in contravention of the planning permission, I am surprised, given the experience of the applicant in the building industry, that the provisions in this respect were ignored.

Relevant to the use of the building and lack of machinery, I noted that the applicants company was shown as 'Yodel Delivery Network' but reference to this has now been removed. Is there an intention to use the building for another purpose?