**Points I wish to make regarding the Planning Report for 25 Midge Hall Lane, Midge Hall.**

**Planning Application Number 07/2018/8493/PIP**

**2. Application Site and Surrounding Area.**

2.2 states large open carpark.- this is full daily and a bus turnaround, also is mainly hedged so no open view.

Also states Village of Midge Hall is beyond Bamfords Mill to the east, This is misleading, I have a letter from SRBC Planning stating the village extends past the mill to the 40MPH Sign beyond number 27 Midge Hall Lane to the west.

2.3 The statement ‘ deep tracts of agricultural land’ in conjunction with No 25 Midge Hall Lane is misleading, to the rear there are Farm buildings, to the west there is domestic garden .The area of open and rural agricultural land is beyond No 27 Midge Hall Lane to the west.

**4.Proposal**

4.2 Scope of PIP Applications – all other matters reserved for consideration in Stage 2, yet the main reason for refusal at Stage 1, is stated as lack of Special Circumstances. Contradictary.

4.5 Layout and access to the site stated as unavailable. The outline plan for 1 dwelling and access from the site were sent to planning with the Application, therefore available.

**5.Representations**

5.1.1 This statement is very misleading .What actually happened : Application submitted for December 18 Committee.3 weeks later Application voided by SRBC Planners. Following frustration and Barristers advice by Consultants costing £1000,SRBC Planners agreed they had misinterpreted guidance, no apology, Application resurrected but had left insufficient time for planners to prepare report for December Committee. Moved to January Committee, letter from Planner saying too busy to prepare for January 19 committee , could it be moved to February 19 committee .There was no reason for an extension if the Application had been accepted and dealt with correctly. It was SRBC planner errors that caused the unnecessary delays.

5.1.2.There was not a lack of detail, full drawings were sent with the Application ( 4.5 refers)

**6.Material Considerations**

6.4 The who site is over ½ acre and the subdivision is near equal 2 portions. Plans submitted were for a smaller dwelling, in keeping with the existing one. I can find no definition as to Appropriate size, reference is made in the report, as to the same size house as the existing large one, where does it quote in Policy, it has to be the same?

6.5 Back land development is not appropriate, a lot of sites on Midge Hall Lane have extensive Back land development eg; Bamfords Mill, No 27 Midge Hall Lane, also farm buildings of Midge Hall Farm, behind 25 Midge Hall Lane.

Wide Frontage required for any further development at No 25. Currently no 2 houses are the same on Midge Hall Lane, indeed the 2 previous infills, at No 2 and No 15 are completely different in size , shape and materials to the existing site dwellings.

I was advised, during Test Track discussions about the unnatural increase in the number of houses from the original SR Planning Framework document, that this is now acceptable because the Government has withdrawn the requirement for a minimum size per plot of a dwelling, therefore more houses per size of site, The Test Track site is to house 200 extra houses. why therefore is the site of No 25 deemed too small when it is several times bigger than any big plot on the Test Track and would house 3-4 Test Track big houses.

6.7 &6.8 The Report does not make it clear, that this Application fits the criteria of the NPPF in relation to e) and g)criteria, because the Green belt openness starts after No 27 Midge Hall Lane and the plot at No 25 does not encroach on the Green Belt therefore not causing harm .The opening sentence of 6.7 is therefore misleading by stating both NPPF and Policy G1 define construction of new buildings as harmful to the Green Belt, when at point 6.11 it states that this applied for infill development, is considered as Brownfield land, and development of such land within the greenbelt will be excluded from the restrictive Green Belt Policy, as long as the development doesn’t have a bigger impact on the openness of the Green Belt. The openness starts after No 27, not at No 25 Midge Hall Lane.

6.9 Misleading, No 25 does NOT extend the Village, also it is Not “edge of settlement” .The settlement is a total of 7 houses( 1 is infill),1 pub,1 mill.the new infill plot will make 8 houses.

The range is 3 houses, 1 existing infill, pub ,mill and 1 house, proposed infill, 2 houses. All houses different sizes.

6.10 Report is misleading. States proposed infill not between existing buildings. It is between existing buildings , No 25 (west) and Mill (east).

6.11 Confirms the proposed site is Brownfield(6.8 refers)

6.12 Another dwelling would urbanise the site, the site isn’t open, therefore no loss of views, Domestic fencing at other house sites on Midge Hall Lane , notably No 27 which is even nearer the Open Green Belt.The site is a garden not open views.

6.13 The following do not preserve the openness of the Green Belt:

Carpark/mill and extensions to East

Farm buildings and paintballing to South

Domestic Garden and House to West

6.14/6.15 I was unaware details of Special Circumstances were required for this type of Application, but will be supplied at the Planning Committee.

6.16. It is not clear what the Report means by ancillary works.No harm to the openness as it starts after No 27.

**7. Conclusion**

7.2 No evidence in law of definition of Appropriate size. Planners have details of size of proposed dwelling.(6.5 refers).Doesnt affect openness of Green Belt as it is currently a domestic garden with hedges. Reference that it would set a Precedent is unacceptable. Each Planning Application should be determined on its own merits, NOT, on what happens with future applications.

7.3 Not inappropriate land use as detailed before and as not asked to submit special circumstances at this stage. Proposed development will not overdevelop site, advised by planners it is the biggest site on Midge Hall Lane.

 Cllr Susan Snape