

From:Lynne Evans
Sent:6 Jun 2019 09:38:01 +0100
To:Planning Consultation
Subject:Reference 19/2716/FUL

FAO: Claire Moore, Planning Officer

Dear Ms Moore,

I refer to your letter dated 16 May 2019, advising [REDACTED] and I, of the planning application referenced above. I would like to oppose this application.

I live at 38 Galley Lane and have a legal "right of access" on the access road that leads to 36A Galley Lane and the rear of my property. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Should planning be granted for this conversion, the works will take place immediately in front of the rear gate to my property, which will prevent access. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Lynne Evans

Managing Director

RUN

M: +44 7740 676773

E: Lynne.Evans@WeAreRUN.com

W: www.WeAreRUN.com

Skype: [live.lynn.e.evans_6](#)

[Connect with me on LinkedIn](#)

[Follow us on twitter @RUNMediaLtd](#)

[Like us on Facebook](#)

RUN Media Ltd is a company registered in England and Wales. Registered number: 05449723. Registered office: Pen y Cae, 38 Galley Lane, Arkley, Barnet, Hertfordshire EN5 4AJ, United Kingdom

DISCLAIMER

The information contained in this e-mail is confidential and is intended for the recipient only. If you have received it in error, please notify us immediately by reply e-mail and then delete it from your system. Please do not copy it or use it for any other purposes, or disclose the content of the e-mail to any other person or store or copy the information in any medium. The views contained in this e-mail are those of the author and not necessarily those of RUN Media Ltd

7 June 2019

Dear Sir or Madam

19/2716/FUL

**CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED
PARKING, AMENITY SPACE, REFUSE AND RECYCLING
LEAHURST NURSERY, 36A GALLEY LANE, BARNET, EN5 4AJ**

I refer to the above application and register my objections as follows:

IMPACT ON GREEN BELT OPENNESS AND PURPOSES

It should be noted that whilst it is stated at paragraph 1.4 of the Applicant's Planning Statement that the proposed dwelling will be retained and occupied "in connection with the horticultural nursery" this is an application for a residential dwelling and not a building for agriculture.

Furthermore, the Applicant has not established a need for residential development at this site. The Applicant has previously made an application for an agriculturally tied dwelling to serve the nursery which was refused and rejected on appeal.

The Applicant relies upon Paragraph 146 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), however, the provision stipulates that the development is not inappropriate in the Green Belt **provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within Green Belt.**

Furthermore, the NPPF para 134 outlines the five purposes of Green Belt land. The most pertinent to the application are to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. It is evident that this proposal will result in development encroachment and impact the character by changing the use of agricultural land.

It is noteworthy that there are no existing residential buildings on the site; this would not be a replacement dwelling. The effect of this proposal would be to introduce a dwelling to the site, which will effectively move the edge of the built-up area out into the countryside and adds to the perception of urban sprawl within the locality, thereby failing to respect the openness of the Green Belt.

It is clear that allowing a dwelling on agricultural land is in conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The land will no longer be agricultural if the residential dwelling, together with amenity space, is permitted. Should the conversion be permitted, how could any restriction be imposed in relation to any future expansion of the dwelling.

The creation of a dwelling is an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt and would change the use to residential. Inappropriate development should be refused, except in very special circumstances. Special circumstances have not been demonstrated that would justify the development. The nursery has operated without

on-site accommodation for many years and there are ample other dwellings that can provide the applicant with housing.

The Planning Inspectorate has previously found that the evidence does not support that it is essential in these circumstances for a nursery worker to live on site. Furthermore, no evidence was found of an agricultural need, given the advances in technology available. The Inspector did not find an essential need or special circumstance to justify inappropriate development being allowed.

The development will have an unacceptable impact on the aims, purpose and openness of the Green Belt.

NO WEIGHT CAN BE ATTACHED TO EXAMPLES PROVIDED BY APPLICANT

Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13 of the Applicant's Planning Statement refer to permission being granted for stable conversion proposals, however, there is no information provided to demonstrate that they are so similar to the development proposed that they provide precedents. Each development proposal should be considered on its own merits, in the absence of the detail, no weight can be attached to the examples.

The existing garage has no intrinsic features which make it suitable for conversion. A cursory search of the internet throws up examples of applications for conversion of stables on Green belt which have been refused.

Accordingly, the proposal would represent inappropriate development, which is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt

HARM WOULD BE CAUSED TO THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTS.

It is a matter of record that there was a fire at the nursery in July 2018 and another fire incident a few years ago. On both of these occasions there were difficulties when emergency services attended and were unable to access the site; the fire service had to access the site via other properties on Galley Lane. This is of great concern and must give rise to health and safety concerns, owing to the narrow access path to the site and the risks associated by this.

This application would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would result in an increase in light, noise and activity at the site, together with increased traffic to and from the site. I live very close to the vehicular access path and would be impacted by the disturbance.

Properties on Galley Lane have been targeted by burglars. At present, the access road to the site is blocked by a gate when the nursery is closed. This would not be a practical arrangement if there is a residential dwelling on site. Opening up the access road creates a security risk as this would enable burglars to access other homes on Galley Lane through the fields at the back.

The proposed application would have a significant adverse impact. Having regard to the principles of character and appearance, the site is not suitable site for housing.

The proposed dwelling does not correspond to the surrounding character of existing housing. The proposed positioning and design will create a low-quality environment which is not in keeping with the surrounding residences.

Granting this application would set a precedent and result in agricultural land being developed by piecemeal. The fields at the back of the houses on Galley Lane will all be at risk of further housing in the future, in addition to developers purchasing property with a view to providing access/a roadway onto Galley Lane. It will establish uses beyond Agricultural on Green Belt Land. No valid "exceptional circumstances" have been proven in this case. Planning creep would inevitably mean that if the application is approved the land and surrounding fields will eventually be used for housing.

The application is contrary to the Mayor's position of strongly supporting the current extent of London's Green Belt and its protection from inappropriate development.

Additionally, this application conflicts with the fundamental aims and purposes of including land within the Greenbelt. Special circumstances to outweigh this harm cannot be demonstrated; the application should be found to be unacceptable and duly refused.

Yours faithfully

Serena Jayasinghe
40 Galley Lane
Barnet
Hertfordshire
EN5 4AJ

STUART
RAPHAEL

From:STUART RAPHAEL
Sent:8 Jun 2019 12:05:23 +0100
To:Planning Consultation
Subject:Planning 19/2716/FUL

8th. June 2019

Dear Sir or Madam

I live opposite this Planning Site & Object to this Planning Application most strongly

The Planning Applicant has made other planning applications & it is my belief that they are trying to convert this Green Belt area to Residential for monetary gain

Have I discussed this matter with my neighbours & I reiterate one of my neighbours comments as they have looked into this matter more than I

I would add that since making the road No Parking it is almost impossible to get off our front in the morning rush hour due to volume of Traffic & at all other times it is highly dangerous due to Galley Lane being used as a RACE TRACK by numerous motorists !

The Technical Objection

19/2716/FUL

**CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE WITH
ASSOCIATED PARKING, AMENITY SPACE, REFUSE AND RECYCLING
LEAHURST NURSERY, 36A GALLEY LANE, BARNET, EN5 4AJ**

I refer to the above application and register my objections as follows:

IMPACT ON GREEN BELT OPENNESS AND PURPOSES

It should be noted that whilst it is stated at paragraph 1.4 of the Applicant's Planning Statement that the proposed dwelling will be retained and occupied "in connection with the horticultural nursery" this is an application for a residential dwelling and not a building for agriculture.

Furthermore, the Applicant has not established a need for residential development at this site. The Applicant has previously made an application for an agriculturally tied dwelling to serve the nursery which was refused and rejected on appeal.

The Applicant relies upon Paragraph 146 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), however, the provision stipulates that the development is not inappropriate in the Green Belt **provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within Green Belt.**

Furthermore, the NPPF para 134 outlines the five purposes of Green Belt land. The most pertinent to the application are to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. It is evident that this proposal will result in development encroachment and impact the character by changing the use of agricultural land.

It is noteworthy that there are no existing residential buildings on the site; this would not be a replacement dwelling. The effect of this proposal would be to introduce a dwelling to the site, which will effectively move the edge of the built-up area out into the countryside and adds to the perception of urban sprawl within the locality, thereby failing to respect the openness of the Green Belt.

It is clear that allowing a dwelling on agricultural land is in conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The land will no longer be agricultural if the residential dwelling, together with amenity space, is permitted. Should the conversion be permitted, how could any restriction be imposed in relation to any future expansion of the dwelling.

The creation of a dwelling is an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt and would change the use to residential. Inappropriate development should be refused, except in very special circumstances. Special circumstances have not been demonstrated that would justify the development. The nursery has operated without on-site accommodation for many years and there are ample other dwellings that can provide the applicant with housing.

The Planning Inspectorate has previously found that the evidence does not support that it is essential in these circumstances for a nursery worker to live on site. Furthermore, no evidence was found of an agricultural need, given the advances in technology available. The Inspector did not find an essential need or special circumstance to justify inappropriate development being allowed.

The development will have an unacceptable impact on the aims, purpose and openness of the Green Belt.

NO WEIGHT CAN BE ATTACHED TO EXAMPLES PROVIDED BY APPLICANT

Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13 of the Applicant's Planning Statement refer to permission being granted for stable conversion proposals, however, there is no information provided to demonstrate that they are so similar to the development proposed that they provide precedents. Each development proposal should be

considered on its own merits, in the absence of the detail, no weight can be attached to the examples.

The existing garage has no intrinsic features which make it suitable for conversion. A cursory search of the internet throws up examples of applications for conversion of stables on Green belt which have been refused.

Accordingly, the proposal would represent inappropriate development, which is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt

HARM WOULD BE CAUSED TO THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTS.

It is a matter of record that there was a fire at the nursery in July 2018 and another fire incident a few years ago. On both of these occasions there were difficulties when emergency services attended and were unable to access the site; the fire service had to access the site via other properties on Galley Lane. This is of great concern and must give rise to health and safety concerns, owing to the narrow access path to the site and the risks associated by this.

This application would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would result in an increase in light, noise and activity at the site, together with increased traffic to and from the site. I live very close to the vehicular access path and would be impacted by the disturbance.

Properties on Galley Lane have been targeted by burglars. At present, the access road to the site is blocked by a gate when the nursery is closed. This would not be a practical arrangement if there is a residential dwelling on site. Opening up the access road creates a security risk as this would enable burglars to access other homes on Galley Lane through the fields at the back.

The proposed application would have a significant adverse impact. Having regard to the principles of character and appearance, the site is not suitable site for housing. The proposed dwelling does not correspond to the surrounding character of existing housing. The proposed positioning and design will create a low-quality environment which is not in keeping with the surrounding residences.

Granting this application would set a precedent and result in agricultural land being developed by piecemeal. The fields at the back of the houses on Galley Lane will all be at risk of further housing in the future, in addition to developers purchasing property with a view to providing access/a roadway onto Galley Lane. It will establish uses beyond Agricultural on Green Belt Land. No valid "exceptional circumstances" have been proven in this case. Planning creep would inevitably mean that if the application is approved the land and surrounding fields will eventually be used for housing.

The application is contrary to the Mayor's position of strongly supporting the current extent of London's Green Belt and its protection from inappropriate development.

Additionally, this application conflicts with the fundamental aims and purposes of including land within the Greenbelt. Special circumstances to outweigh this harm cannot be demonstrated; the application should be found to be unacceptable and duly refused.

Yours faithfully

Gwen & Stuart Raphael
43 Galley Lane
Barnet
Hertfordshire
EN5 4AJ

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 Jun 2019 14:14:37 +0100
To: Planning Consultation
Cc: Moore, Claire
Subject: 19/2716/FUL LEAHURST NURSERY OBJECTION

Dear Sir or Madam

19/2716/FUL
CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING,
AMENITY SPACE, REFUSE AND RECYCLING
LEAHURST NURSERY, 36A GALLEY LANE, BARNET, EN5 4AJ

I refer to the above application and register my objections as follows:

INAPPROPRIATE DEVELOPMENT HARMFUL TO GREEN BELT & OUT OF CHARACTER

This application conflicts with the fundamental aims and purposes of including land within the Greenbelt. Special circumstances to outweigh this harm cannot be demonstrated; the application should be found to be unacceptable and duly refused.

This is an application for a residential dwelling - not a building for agriculture - there are no existing residential buildings on the site.

This proposal will encroach into the countryside, adding to urban sprawl. This fails to respect the openness of the Green Belt. It is, therefore, an inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would change the use to residential. Special circumstances have not been demonstrated that would justify the development. It is not also compatible with the character of the area.

The Applicant has failed to demonstrate an essential need for a nursery worker to live on site. The development will have an unacceptable impact on the aims, purpose and openness of the Green Belt.

The Applicant has referred to permission being granted for other stable conversion proposals, however, no information has been provided to show that the conversions are similar to the development proposed.

HARM TO NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTS

There have been at least two fire incidents at the nursery in recent years: in July 2018 and a few years ago. When emergency services attended they were unable to access the site. This gives rise to health and safety concerns, owing to the narrow access path to the site and the risks associated by this.

There would be an increase in light, noise and activity at the site, together with increased traffic to and from the site.

An additional concern is that opening up the access road will pose a security risk, as burglars could access other homes on Galley Lane at the back.

The site is not suitable site for housing and the proposed dwelling does not correspond to the surrounding character of existing housing. The proposed positioning and design will create a low-quality environment not in keeping with surrounding residences.

Permitting this application would set a precedent and the fields at the back of the houses on Galley Lane will all be at risk of being used for housing.
The application is not compliant with supporting the current extent of London's Green Belt and its

protection from inappropriate development.

Yours faithfully

Anthony Rushton
40 Galley Lane
Barnet
Hertfordshire
EN5 4AJ

11th June 2019

Dear Sir or Madam

19/2716/FUL

**CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO SINGLE DWELLINGHOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED
PARKING, AMENITY SPACE, REFUSE AND RECYCLING
LEAHURST NURSERY, 36A GALLEY LANE, BARNET, EN5 4AJ**

I refer to the above application and register my objections as follows:

IMPACT ON GREEN BELT OPENNESS AND PURPOSES

It should be noted that whilst it is stated at paragraph 1.4 of the Applicant's Planning Statement that the proposed dwelling will be retained and occupied "in connection with the horticultural nursery" this is an application for a residential dwelling and not a building for agriculture.

Furthermore, the Applicant has not established a need for residential development at this site. The Applicant has previously made an application for an agriculturally tied dwelling to serve the nursery which was refused and rejected on appeal.

The Applicant relies upon Paragraph 146 of the NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework), however, the provision stipulates that the development is not inappropriate in the Green Belt **provided they preserve its openness and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within Green Belt.**

Furthermore, the NPPF para 134 outlines the five purposes of Green Belt land. The most pertinent to the application are to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. It is evident that this proposal will result in development encroachment and impact the character by changing the use of agricultural land.

It is noteworthy that there are no existing residential buildings on the site; this would not be a replacement dwelling. The effect of this proposal would be to introduce a dwelling to the site, which will effectively move the edge of the built-up area out into the countryside and adds to the perception of urban sprawl within the locality, thereby failing to respect the openness of the Green Belt.

It is clear that allowing a dwelling on agricultural land is in conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The land will no longer be agricultural if the residential dwelling, together with amenity space, is permitted. Should the conversion be permitted, how could any restriction be imposed in relation to any future expansion of the dwelling.

The creation of a dwelling is an inappropriate form of development within the Green Belt and would change the use to residential. Inappropriate development should be refused, except in very special circumstances. Special circumstances have not been demonstrated that would justify the development. The nursery has operated without

on-site accommodation for many years and there are ample other dwellings that can provide the applicant with housing.

The Planning Inspectorate has previously found that the evidence does not support that it is essential in these circumstances for a nursery worker to live on site. Furthermore, no evidence was found of an agricultural need, given the advances in technology available. The Inspector did not find an essential need or special circumstance to justify inappropriate development being allowed.

The development will have an unacceptable impact on the aims, purpose and openness of the Green Belt.

NO WEIGHT CAN BE ATTACHED TO EXAMPLES PROVIDED BY APPLICANT

Paragraphs 2.12 and 2.13 of the Applicant's Planning Statement refer to permission being granted for stable conversion proposals, however, there is no information provided to demonstrate that they are so similar to the development proposed that they provide precedents. Each development proposal should be considered on its own merits, in the absence of the detail, no weight can be attached to the examples.

The existing garage has no intrinsic features which make it suitable for conversion. A cursory search of the internet throws up examples of applications for conversion of stables on Green belt which have been refused.

Accordingly, the proposal would represent inappropriate development, which is, by definition, harmful to Green Belt

HARM WOULD BE CAUSED TO THE LIVING CONDITIONS OF NEIGHBOURING RESIDENTS.

It is a matter of record that there was a fire at the nursery in July 2018 and another fire incident a few years ago. On both of these occasions there were difficulties when emergency services attended and were unable to access the site; the fire service had to access the site via other properties on Galley Lane. This is of great concern and must give rise to health and safety concerns, owing to the narrow access path to the site and the risks associated by this.

This application would be detrimental to the amenities of the occupants of neighbouring properties and would result in an increase in light, noise and activity at the site, together with increased traffic to and from the site. I live very close to the vehicular access path and would be impacted by the disturbance.

Properties on Galley Lane have been targeted by burglars. At present, the access road to the site is blocked by a gate when the nursery is closed. This would not be a practical arrangement if there is a residential dwelling on site. Opening up the access road creates a security risk as this would enable burglars to access other homes on Galley Lane through the fields at the back.

The proposed application would have a significant adverse impact. Having regard to the principles of character and appearance, the site is not suitable site for housing.

The proposed dwelling does not correspond to the surrounding character of existing housing. The proposed positioning and design will create a low-quality environment which is not in keeping with the surrounding residences.

Granting this application would set a precedent and result in agricultural land being developed by piecemeal. The fields at the back of the houses on Galley Lane will all be at risk of further housing in the future, in addition to developers purchasing property with a view to providing access/a roadway onto Galley Lane. It will establish uses beyond Agricultural on Green Belt Land. No valid "exceptional circumstances" have been proven in this case. Planning creep would inevitably mean that if the application is approved the land and surrounding fields will eventually be used for housing.

The application is contrary to the Mayor's position of strongly supporting the current extent of London's Green Belt and its protection from inappropriate development.

Additionally, this application conflicts with the fundamental aims and purposes of including land within the Greenbelt. Special circumstances to outweigh this harm cannot be demonstrated; the application should be found to be unacceptable and duly refused.

Yours faithfully

Zoe Richmond
41 Galley Lane
Barnet
Hertfordshire
EN5 4AR

Leahurst
Nursery
36 Galley Ln.
App Ref:
19/2716/FUL
PLAN JM1

HM Land Registry
Current title plan

Title number AGL287930
Ordnance Survey map reference TQ2296NE
Scale 1:1250 enlarged from 1:2500
Administrative area Barnet



- ① Access along the Lane to Leahurst Nursery from main road.
- ② Garage / Shed - Proposed Dwelling
- ③ Area to R/O 36 Galley Lane - Former Right of Way
- ④ "Orchard" Formerly part of 36 Galley Lane's Garden

This is a copy of the title plan on 20 NOV 2012 at 13:17:08. This copy does not take account of any application made after that time even if still pending in HM Land Registry when this copy was issued.

This copy is not an 'Official Copy' of the title plan. An official copy of the title plan is admissible in evidence in a court to the same extent as the original. A person is entitled to be indemnified by the registrar if he or she suffers loss by reason of a mistake in an official copy. If you want to obtain an official copy, the HM Land Registry web site explains how to do this.

HM Land Registry endeavours to maintain high quality and scale accuracy of title plan images. The quality and accuracy of any print will depend on your printer, your computer and its print settings. This title plan shows the general position, not the exact line, of the boundaries. It may be subject to distortions in scale. Measurements scaled from this plan may not match measurements between the same points on the ground.

This title is dealt with by HM Land Registry, Wales Office

Application 19/2716/FUL- Objection - Leahurst Nursery -13th June 2019

As a neighbour and owner of an adjoining property I write to object to this application.

There are restrictive covenants in favour of a number of adjoining properties which expressly prohibits the conversion of this garage/shed to residential use as well as any other residential development on the application site. The owners of the nursery are aware of these covenants but choose to ignore them.

The change of use from a shed/garage to a dwelling will result in a change of character to the area and general environment. This domestication will also affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties. This is clearly a case where the urban is encroaching into the rural which is contrary to Greenbelt Policies.

Proper and sufficient amenity space is required to serve the proposed development. To provide proper and functional amenity space and meet the required standards, will require encroachment into the greenbelt beyond the curtilage of the existing structure. This will cause harm to the openness of the greenbelt and is unacceptable in policy terms.

The provision of parking ancillary to the dwelling as indicated on the proposal will cause harm to the openness of the Greenbelt and is therefore inappropriate. This open greenbelt land has only recently been used for parking by the applicant and his associates. As this land was previously used for access to the nursery and to the garage/shed it is not an established or lawful use and it is incorrect to attempt to portray it as such.

When the land that forms part of this application was purchased (11.07.2013) it was supposedly bought to secure access rights to Leahurst Nursery for Mr Osborne. Up to this point the owners of the Nursery had a right of way over the lane and land at the R/O 36 Galley Lane. This area is marked No. 2&3 in the plan submitted. They crossed over this land to get into the nursery.

The garage/shed was used to house a classic car, private cars & some motorcycles owned and occupied by Mr Mayne, the previous occupant of 36 Galley Lane. The land directly behind 36 Galley Lane provided access to the nursery, the garage and the orchard. It was not used for free and unfettered car parking as the applicant suggests. There is also a small orchard area (marked No 4 on the plan) which was part of the rear garden for 36 Galley Lane. All of this land (Highlighted on Plan JM-1) belonged to the previous owners of 36 Galley Lane prior to 2013.

Additionally there will undoubtedly be a cumulative impact that must be considered. In reality and in practical terms, open Greenbelt land will be required to provide access into the dwelling, parking spaces as well as amenity space. This will cause unacceptable harm to the openness of the greenbelt and it is simply not plausible to say that the effect is de minimis. I refer you to the inspector's decision in appeal APP/N5090/W/18/3199640, where this matter was considered previously and the appeal was rejected by the planning inspector.

In reality in order for the dwelling to work and function on practical level, one would require to take land from beyond the curtilage of the existing building which is currently open greenbelt land and use it for parking, access and amenity space. The photographs of examples of other conversions clearly demonstrate how much amenity space is really required for this type of dwelling. There is no doubt that the proposals would be harmful to the openness of the greenbelt and therefore this ought to be deemed inappropriate.

The applicants refer to the conversion of the existing building to create a dwelling in the planning statement. They state that all of the alterations required are minimal as the building is substantial. I would disagree.

Substantial and significant alterations will be required to convert the existing building. The floor will require alteration and additional layers will need to be added to accommodate the damp proof course and drainage. It will need to comply with building current building regulations and to do so the structure will change.

It will be highly improbable if not impossible to remove the existing roof covering which is already lightweight and replace it with a metal covering and the required insulation that will weigh less and still be compliant with current building regulation standards. The structure of the roof will most likely change to accommodate the new coverings. Whilst these materials may be energy efficient they are dense and add weight. It is inevitable that there will be some increase in loading as will be the case when new domestic windows, door and openings are created to accommodate the proposed changes. It would seem highly improbable that all this can be achieved without some structural alterations even if these are modest. One can't just create window openings and insert new domestic windows without making some structural alterations; it's simply impossible. The applicant has produced no engineer's calculations to support his assertions.

To give some further context and background, since the applicant started to buy additional property, intensification of the uses have occurred. Over time the nursery and other operations have spilled beyond its' original boundaries onto open greenbelt land. More vehicles both commercial and motorcars have been parking in the area marked No3 on the plan and they are now beginning to encroach onto "The Orchard" area marked No4.

The proposed development will cause harm to the openness of the Greenbelt notwithstanding the fact that it will also have a negative effect on the character of the immediate area as well as affect the amenity of the neighbouring properties. What was previously an access to the Nursery is now proposed to become a parking lot which is not appropriate. The amenity space required is also to be located in open Greenbelt land. These are all harmful and inappropriate.

With the intensification of uses that are already taking place (and I'm in no way saying that these are legal in terms of planning policy which is a separate matter and should be looked at independently of this application), the proposals will cause additional significant harm to the openness of the greenbelt and is contrary to policy.

One must take into account all of the facts to assess the impact of the proposal. If one considers all of the facts and circumstances one can only conclude that the proposals will cause harm to the openness of the greenbelt and therefore it is only right to conclude that the proposal constitutes inappropriate development in the Greenbelt and should be refused.

J Molloy

