

Standing up for Hertfordshire's countryside

Our Ref:

Your Ref:

Luke Ashley  
Neighbourhood Services (Development Control)  
East Hertfordshire District Council  
Wallfields  
Pegs Lane  
Hertford SG13 8EQ

6<sup>th</sup> September 2017 (by email)

Dear Mr. Ashley,

**Application No. 3/17/1614/FUL**  
**Demolition of a group of former pig farm buildings. Construction of two detached dwellings on Land Adjacent to Gelders, Conduit Lane, Great Hormead, Buntingford Hertfordshire SG9 ONU**

CPRE Hertfordshire objects to this proposal for inappropriate development in the Rural Area Beyond The Green Belt, outside of the village boundary of Great Hormead.

The proposals are contrary to Local Plan policies GBC2, GBC3 and OSV2. It has previously been determined by the Planning Inspectorate (in considering the development of land at Hare Street Road, Buntingford) that “ *the thrust of LP Policies GB2 and GB3 is to protect the countryside from unnecessary development, which is an aspiration of the (National Planning Policy) Framework. I therefore consider this aspect of the policies to be in conformity with the Framework and capable of attracting significant weight.*” (APP/J1915/A/13/2205582, APP/J1915/A/13/2205581 and APP/J1915/A/13/2199777). As a result the application constitutes inappropriate development.

As the applicant says in para. 5.1 of the Design and Access Statement “ *the alleged harm to the character and appearance of this part of the village are finely balanced in Local Plan and NPPF terms. In many respects, these judgements are subjectively based and capable of differing outcomes.*” We do not disagree with that comment. However the essential argument in the Statement is that the land has previously been developed and therefore the proposed development would not be inappropriate. Planning law is clear that agricultural sites, such as piggeries, do not constitute ‘previously developed land’ for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework.

President:  
Sir Simon Bowes Lyon, KCVO  
Chairman:

Consequently we do not consider the argument to be valid and that the application should be refused.

Yours sincerely,

David Irving