

I would like to object to the proposed development on four grounds as detailed below:

ECOLOGY

Due to the gross inconsistency between the red line application boundary and the area surveyed to inform the submitted Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) assessment, the ecological conclusions reached by the Applicant cannot be relied upon.

Furthermore, there is clear evidence of on-site degradation that has not been accounted for within the submitted BNG metric. This omission materially undermines the accuracy of the baseline used and, by extension, the claimed biodiversity outcomes.

As a result of these deficiencies, the ecological information submitted fails to provide a robust or credible assessment of the proposal's impacts. In the absence of a BNG assessment that accurately reflects the full application site and its current condition, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate compliance with national and local planning policy relating to biodiversity protection and enhancement.

HERITAGE

The Application Site lies within the setting of two designated heritage assets: Cotlands Grade II and Brook Place Grade II* (Star).

The application is fundamentally inadequate in its assessment of heritage impacts. No proper Heritage Statement has been submitted; instead, the Planning Statement contains only a small number of paragraphs which fall significantly short of the level of assessment required for development affecting the setting of designated heritage assets.

The Applicant places undue reliance on landscape screening to justify the acceptability of the proposal. However, the presence of screening does not remove a development from the setting of a heritage asset. Appeal precedent confirms that such an approach is not supported by the Planning Inspectorate, and that setting relates to more than intervisibility alone.

Of particular relevance is sub-paragraph (c) of the heritage assessment. The previously approved barn was considered acceptable because it represented an entirely appropriate and locally characteristic form of development, reflecting the established rural vernacular defined by farmsteads, dwellings, and associated agricultural outbuildings.

By contrast, the siting of four static caravans, regardless of any claimed design quality, would represent a form of development that is incongruous with this established character. Notably, no elevation drawings have been submitted, providing no assurance as to design quality or appropriateness. Rather than

preserving or enhancing local character and distinctiveness, the proposal would read as a stark and discordant intervention within a sensitive rural historic landscape.

The proposal therefore fails to preserve the significance of the affected heritage assets or their setting, contrary to heritage policy requirements.

LANDSCAPE

The proposed development fails to respect or enhance the historic qualities that are so readily prevalent in the surrounding landscape.

In addition, the Landscape Technical Note confirms that the proposal would result in a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings. The introduction of the proposed development would erode the established rural character, resulting in harm that would not be adequately mitigated through landscaping or screening.

The proposal therefore conflicts with planning policy which seeks to protect landscape character and ensure that development responds positively to its context.

HIGHWAYS

Based on the information submitted, sufficient visibility splays in both directions from the access junction and appropriate to the speed of the road cannot be achieved within land under the control of the Applicant. Searches of land register titles means that the woodland and trees which facilitate those visibility splays are not within the control of the applicant.

The resulting substandard visibility presents a serious highway safety concern, particularly given that this stretch of road has a documented history of serious and fatal road traffic collisions in the vicinity of the existing access.

With three recorded fatalities and a number of further casualties arising from recent incidents, the proposal is demonstrably undeliverable, both in technical terms and when considered against the available collision data.

The development fails to comply with highway safety standards and would result in an unacceptable risk to highway users. It is therefore recommended that the application be refused to prevent the likelihood of future fatalities and serious injuries.

Overall Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm in respect of ecology, heritage, landscape character, and highway safety. The application is inadequately supported, contrary to planning policy, and should be refused.