

Comments from [REDACTED]

I believe there is no justification or merit to warrant permission for a variation.

My sympathy goes out to the Planning Department for having to deal with what I believe is a retrospective planning application because what has been built is not in accordance with that granted under 6/2019/1813/FULL in respect of the machinery store plan PL01D dated 30th August 2019 showing four roof lights in each roof elevation. This decision was taken in consultation with the historic building and conservation advice given by [REDACTED] particularly in respect of fenestration and following a major objection from the Parish Council.

This new application shows eight roof lights on the roof elevation facing the old barn PL10E and four on the field elevation although it includes a superseded plan showing ten roof lights on each roof elevation dated June 2019 which had originally accompanied the earlier application but which was again superseded.

The planning history is extremely complicated because firstly local residents and indeed the LPA were of the opinion that agricultural activity did not warrant these two large buildings and this was overruled by the Planning Inspectorate when the inspector conducted the appeal on 31st January 2019 and a "flying" flock of sheep appeared in the fields a few days earlier. Surely the proof of proper agricultural activity would have been to ask for copies of the Farm accounts for the previous three years and an inventory of the farm machinery to be stored and maintained within the shed. Whilst the planning application 6/2019/1830 was being considered, and indeed whilst the buildings were being erected, large areas of land within this agricultural unit were being actively promoted and offered as called for sites in the District Plan.

The hay crop in previous years has been carried out by contractors, using their own machinery and often transported away immediately. No hay crop has been taken this year. The only piece of machinery regularly seen in the field is a John Deere grass cutter which could easily be accommodated in a single garage.

If this structure became redundant as an agricultural building, it could very easily be used for non-agricultural purposes or indeed become residential under Class Q, especially if there were already ample roof lights in being. The extensive brick weave 'farmyard' hardstanding is certainly more residential than agricultural.

This application should be refused and I think the Applicant and his planning advisers should be ashamed of themselves.