

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C1950/W/21/3287854

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference APP/C1950/W/21/3287854

Appeal By LW DEVELOPMENTS LTD

Site Address
Northaw House Coopers Lane
Northaw
POTTERS BAR
EN6 4NG

SENDER DETAILS

Name MS LISA CHAPLIN

Address
Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council
7 Maynard Place
Cuffley
Hertfordshire
EN6 4JA

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- Appellant
- Agent
- Interested Party / Person
- Land Owner
- Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- Final Comments
- Proof of Evidence
- Statement
- Statement of Common Ground
- Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council fully support the WHBC decision to refuse planning permission for the following reasons

- Design and appearance - A total of 8 roof lights on the roof slope facing the listed barn results in a cluttered appearance. When considered cumulatively with the proposed glazed bi-fold doors behind roller shutters (which, in any case, would be impractical for the use of the building by agricultural machinery), the alterations to the building make the building appear domestic rather than agricultural. It is highly unusual for agricultural buildings to have these features. The appearance of the building clashes with the agricultural character of the rest of the farmyard, and, in combination with the scale of the building, leads to harmful visual impacts from neighbouring properties and views beyond the site.
- Heritage impact - The domestic appearance of the building detracts from the character of the farmyard, which is an important element of the setting of the listed farmhouse, stables, barn and wall. The Council's heritage advisor has identified less than substantial heritage harm to the setting of the listed buildings. There are no public benefits that exist relating to the additional roof lights and new doors that could outweigh the less than substantial harm, therefore the proposal falls short of the policy test of Paragraph 202 of the NPPF.
- Green Belt harm - The design approach of the appellant has produced a building that is residential in appearance. This undermines the appellant's Green Belt justification for the building as it calls into question whether it can be rightfully considered a building for agriculture under Paragraph 149a) of the NPPF. Arguably, the appeal proposal is 'inappropriate' Green Belt development, for which a very special circumstances case would be required and has not been proven by the appellant.
- Planning strategy of the appellant - The planning history and background to this case raises the question of whether the appellant's long-term intentions are for the building to be converted to residential use. It is widely known in the community that the appellant is a successful property developer and it is believed that any farming activities at Nyn Manor are carried out by contractors or other farmers who rent the land for the purpose of cultivating hay. Internally, the photo at Paragraph 6.18 of the appellant's Statement of Case shows that the building appears ready for conversion to residential use (noting the building's finishings, fenestration, and mezzanine beams). Likewise the same photo reveals a number of other contradictions to the assertion that this structure is intended for machine storage

- 1) The flooring is not of a construction suitable for machinery. There are large boards protecting the floor from any markings made by the machine forks and other equipment
- 2) There are a few tyre tracks, presumably from the one and only time the trailers was positioned there for this photo shoot, suggesting this building is not used for any machine storage. Indeed, the photographs of other machine storage/workshops show an entirely different floor base, access, height and construction
- 3) It is true, most machine storage sheds are made of corrugated steel and therefore makes a mockery of the need to install bi-fold doors to improve insulation in this application

- 4) The location of the mezzanine beams would significantly hinder the storage of any hay making equipment

Its totally unrealistic to suggest that the only reason for installing bi-fold doors was because they were 'left over from another job' as they were mis measured. Yet they happened to be the precise dimensions for this application

The Inspector should consider that the current appeal follows previous proposals to make amendments to the approved application scheme, all of which risk diluting the Green Belt and heritage reasons for approving the original development. It is also disappointing that this appeal relates to a retrospective application to regularise the building as-built with the approved drawings.

Northaw & Cuffley Parish Council fully support the council in their efforts to resist this development given its location and the application which lacks any credibility.