



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 9 November 2021

Site Visit made on 9 November 2021

by David Wyborn BSc(Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3615/W/21/3271807

Send Barns Stables, Woodhill, Send GU23 7JR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Paul Treadaway of Trafalgar Retirement Plus against the decision of Guildford Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 20/P/01412, dated 19 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 3 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 1 x 2 bedroom, 3 x 3 bedroom, 2 x 4 bedroom and 1 x 5 bedroom dwellings and replacement B1 (office) unit, following demolition of the existing buildings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was submitted in August 2020. On 1 September 2020, amendments were enacted to the Town and Country (Use Classes) Order 1987 and B1 (office use) was incorporated into a new Class E. However, the transitional arrangements that were set out in the Regulations¹ mean that the appeal is required to be determined by reference to the then Use Classes. Nevertheless, the revisions to the Order are a material consideration to which I have taken into account in my deliberations.
3. Since the decision of the Council, the Send Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2034 (the Neighbourhood Plan) was successful at referendum and was made on 19 May 2021. It now forms part of the development plan. Both main parties have been able to make submissions on the Neighbourhood Plan during the appeal process and therefore there would be no prejudice with my reference to the plan in this decision.
4. An agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) in respect of contributions to address the likely impacts on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area has been submitted. As the agreement is between the Council and the appellant, I am satisfied that this has been submitted so as to address the Council's concerns with regard to that related reason for refusal and therefore this matter does not need to be a main issue in the appeal. I will consider the planning agreement later.

¹ The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020.

Main Issues

5. The main issues are:

- whether or not the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the effect on openness, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and any relevant development plan policies,
- whether or not the development plan would support the proposed office space, as an alternative to the present business building on the site,
- whether or not the development plan would support the loss of the equestrian facilities in this location,
- the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, having regard to the design, layout and built form of the scheme,
- the effect of the development on the setting of the nearby listed buildings, namely Tudor Barn Farm Barn (now known as 4-6 Woodhill Court) and the adjacent Barn (now known as Tudor Barn), and
- if the appeal development is inappropriate development, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal.

Reasons

Whether or not inappropriate development in the Green Belt

6. The site lies within the Metropolitan Green Belt and the Framework identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. It goes on to state that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. In addition, the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt subject to a number of exceptions as set out in paragraph 149 of the Framework.
7. Policy P2 of the Guilford Borough Local Plan: Strategy and Sites 2015-2034 (the Local Plan) and Policy Send 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan detail the development plan approach to development within the Green Belt. The policy tests essentially refer back to the Framework policy tests such that if the development is not inappropriate development then the scheme would accord with the development plan in this regard.
8. The proposed development is advanced on the basis that it would comply, in terms of paragraph 149(g) of the Framework, with, in summary and with relevance to this case, the exception for the complete redevelopment of previously developed land which would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.
9. The site includes stable buildings, an office building, equestrian arena and areas of hardstanding. The site as a whole falls to be considered as previously

developed land². The key issue is therefore whether the scheme would or would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development.

10. The Send Barns Stables site lies beyond the edge of the defined settlement where there is a mix of mainly detached houses set in landscaped grounds with some surrounding fields. The office building and adjoining stable barn are positioned to the generally more eastern part of the site and the stables along the northern side are positioned fairly close to this boundary. The equestrian arena is previously developed land but has a low form. I appreciate that the arena could have jumps and other paraphernalia at times and there could be parking of vehicles, trailers and horse boxes, including to the west of the existing barn along the northern boundary. Nevertheless the arena area and the position of the buildings, even with such parking and paraphernalia, provides a reasonably open area within the generally central and western parts of the site and this open character links visually with the open field further to the west.
11. The scheme would remove all the buildings and structures on the site. Units 4-6 would be sited in the vicinity of the existing office and stable barn and, while higher, would maintain the approximate position of buildings more closely aligned with the existing buildings and not extend into the more open parts of the site. Indeed, this terrace would be set back further to the east than the main stable building in this area. Units 1-3 would be positioned in from the boundary and extend further to the west and be higher than the existing buildings along this boundary. Unit 7 would be sited on part of the existing arena area and again project away from the position of the existing buildings on the site.
12. While these proposed buildings would not be higher than others in the vicinity, nevertheless, the combination of the bulk, height and position of Units 1-3 and Unit 7 would generally extend the visual appearance of built development further to the west, encroach into a more central area and buildings would be spread more widely across the site. This location of these buildings would be towards and within an area that presently includes low rise features such as the parking area and arena that contributes to the openness of the site. This existing openness would be undermined by the position and form of these proposed dwellings. The landscaped area proposed in the western section of the land would make a small improvement to openness in this section of the site. However, the provision of the courtyard parking area between the buildings, and the likely physical presence of the vehicles, would consolidate the appearance of the development extending further to the broadly west than at present and across more parts of this general central section of the site. This would result in a net loss of open character.
13. I have carefully considered and taken into account in my assessment the footprint, floor area and volume figures which compare the existing and proposed development and the various arguments made in their respects. While the appellant makes the case that the looser arrangement of buildings would be more reflective of the general pattern of development in this area, the effect would be to extend built development across a wider part of the site

² As defined in the Glossary to the Framework and agreed by the main parties in the Statement of Common Ground.

and this would have a modest but adverse effect on the openness of the land within the site in both visual and spatial terms.

14. The case at Law Meadow Stud³ has been brought to my attention as an example of how the Council have accepted within the Green Belt higher buildings in association with a residential redevelopment proposal. However, it appears to me that the issue is not just the relative height of replacement buildings but their position and bulk, and the related effect on openness. These matters are usually site specific and therefore I attach limited weight to the circumstances at Law Meadow Stud as a justification for the appeal scheme in respect of Green Belt issues.
15. Drawing these matters together, because of the position and bulk of the proposed Units 1-3 and Unit 7 the scheme as a whole would have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt than the existing development. Consequently, the scheme would not comply with the exception for new buildings in the Green Belt as detailed in paragraph 149(g) and the proposal would constitute inappropriate development.
16. Furthermore, in terms of the five purposes of including land within a Green Belt⁴, because the site lies outside the settlement and is located in countryside for planning purposes, and with the extension of built development into the generally more central parts of the site, the scheme would not safeguard the countryside from encroachment. It would, therefore, conflict with this purpose that Green Belt serves.
17. In the light of the above analysis, I conclude that the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt because it would reduce openness. Accordingly, it would therefore conflict with Policy P2 of the Local Plan and Policy Send 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan which set out the approach to development within the Green Belt.

Office accommodation

18. At the present time there is an office building which is subdivided into a number of separate rooms of varying size. The building has upvc windows and doors, a clay tile roof and render elevations. The space measures about 100sqm and from my site visit the building appears to be in reasonable repair and could provide a useable and productive office space. The end section was built following a planning permission in 2007 and therefore has been constructed fairly recently. The building is presently mainly unused, other than two rooms temporarily for a physiotherapist, and the previous business use by the owners of the site has relocated to the adjoining house and other properties.
19. A replacement office would be provided on the site and this would provide about 45sqm of accommodation. While the new office building may be purpose built and therefore to a modern standard, the existing accommodation appears fit for purpose and therefore the evidence does not satisfy me that there would be a worthwhile qualitative improvement in office accommodation if the scheme was to take place.

³ Application 18/P/00417

⁴ as detailed in paragraph 138 of the Framework

20. I do not find that the present employment floorspace is outmoded or unsuitably located and the extent of accommodation could, in the absence of marketing evidence to demonstrate the contrary, potentially provide local employment accommodation. Effectively the reduction in employment floorspace would be transferred by the redevelopment to the housing on the site.
21. Based on the evidence before me I consider that the reduction in the business floorspace, although modest, would be contrary to Policy E3 of the Local Plan and the Framework policy which places significant weight on the need to support economic growth.
22. Generally there are permitted development rights that could allow the change of use of office accommodation to residential use. There was a discussion at the hearing as to whether the restrictive condition attached to the 2007 permission for the office extension applied to the whole building. This would need to be determined by a Certificate or Prior Notification application to determine whether any permitted development rights allowed the change of use of part of this building to residential use. In the absence of such an determination or approval, I attribute the potential that part of the building could be converted to residential use limited weight in the assessment of this main issue.
23. Accordingly, I conclude that the development plan would not support the proposed office space as an alternative to the present business building on the site. In particular, the scheme would conflict with Policy E3 of the Local Plan and the Framework which seek, amongst other things, to protect employment floorspace.
24. The reason for refusal referred to Policy Send 9 of the Neighbourhood Plan. This was identified as an typographical error and should have referred to Policy Send 3. However, Policy Send 3, while seeking to support the local economy, only applies to sites within the settlement and is, therefore, not applicable to the appeal scheme.

Equestrian facility

25. The site has a long standing equestrian use, initially as a stud and more recently as a livery yard. It appears that the equestrian arena was used mainly by owners to exercise their horses when stabled at the site.
26. The reason for refusal argues that the scheme would be in conflict with Policy E6 of the Local Plan. This policy is titled the leisure and visitor experience. The supporting text makes particular reference to the visitor experience and the policy itself, when seeking to resist the loss of existing visitor, leisure and cultural attractions, lists arts and entertainment facilities, hotels and indoor sports venues. While this list in the policy is not closed, there is notably no mention of out-door facilities.
27. The livery yard is predominantly a facility to support those who wish to have their horses stabled. It does not appear to me to be a facility that would attract visitors and while it supports the leisure activity of horse riding this is only indirectly. The reference in the supporting text of Policy E6 to horse riding is in the same context as rambling and cycling which then relates this to the extensive system of footpaths, bridleways and cycle routes, rather than to equestrian facilities themselves. Reading Policy E6 and the supporting text as a

whole, I am not persuaded that a livery yard use would be covered by the wording or intentions of the policy. Consequently, the equestrian use of the site would not be protected by the policy criteria.

28. My view that Policy E6 is not applicable to the appeal site is reinforced to some extent by the planning report for the proposal at Law Meadow Stud. That scheme comprised the loss of the equestrian business on the site but there was no mention of the then emerging Local Plan Policy E6 in the report.
29. In this case, the Council accept the evidence that there are alternative livery spaces available in the general area that could accommodate any horses that may have required stabling when the livery use closed on the site. As a consequence, I consider that there would be no material conflict with the Framework policies in terms of any need to protect the livery facility on the site.
30. Drawing all these matters together, I conclude that the development plan is essentially silent on the issue of the loss of the equestrian facility and, consequently, there would be no conflict with Policy E6 of the Local Plan or the Framework in respect of this main issue.

Character and appearance

31. The site lies beyond the edge of the defined settlement where the built form has a fairly informal and generally well-spaced character. The general area around this section of Woodhill includes a number of reasonably sizeable, usually detached dwellings set in landscaped plots. There are the four barn conversions broadly south-east of the site with 4-6 Woodhill Court in a terrace and forming a courtyard-like arrangement with Tudor Barn. However, Nos 4-6 have a generous front landscaped area such that the spacing provided to the frontage is not out of character with the wider surroundings.
32. The appeal scheme would consist of two terraces and a detached single dwelling. The courtyard arrangement is not without some merit as a concept but the scheme would have a fairly intensive nature with seven dwellings incorporated into a reasonably modest sized site. The dominance of the car parking and manoeuvring space between the frontages, with fairly modest associated landscaping opportunities within this part of the layout, together with some moderately sized garden spaces, would all combine to provide an intensity of development that would be at odds with the less dense and more informal and generally more spacious nature of the surroundings at this part of the village.
33. Generally the design of the dwellings would be compatible with the wider style of buildings in the area. However, there are some reasonably minor design details, such as the large pane of glass next to the front doors, the different sizes to the gables to the front and rear elevations and the large expanse of ground floor windows to the rear elevations that would not sit entirely comfortably with the overall design concept. The front elevation of Unit 7 with the mix of window sizes, with some off set, would appear visually awkward.
34. Taking all these matters together, the scheme would have some positive design attributes but the layout of development with its intensity, dominance of car parking and turning areas, and the paucity of space to adequately soften with greenery the frontage of the buildings themselves, together with the detailed

design examples I have highlighted, mean that the scheme would have a discordant effect on the character and appearance at this edge of the village. In coming to this view, I have had regard to the visualisation plans which show a representation of the scheme, particularly after the landscaping would have matured.

35. For these reasons, the proposal would not meet the Framework policy requirements that development should be sympathetic to local character, including the built environment and landscape setting.
36. Accordingly, I conclude that the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the area and in particular conflict with Policy D1 of the Local Plan, Policy Send 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan, saved Policy G5 of the Guildford Borough Local Plan 2003 and the Framework which seek, notably, that all development will be required to achieve high quality design that responds to distinctive local character of the area in which it is set.

The effect of the development on the setting of the nearby listed buildings

37. 4-6 Woodhill Court and Tudor Barn are both Grade II Listed Buildings. They were constructed for use as agricultural barns, then used for stabling and following approval have been converted to dwellings. They were originally part of a manorial estate that included the appeal site.
38. The significance of these buildings, includes their grouping, their traditional construction and the aesthetic that derives from it together with their historic use and association with the manorial estate. The surroundings to the barns have changed over time especially with the removal of the large agricultural buildings next to them as part of the redevelopment of part of that site which also incorporated their conversion and the development of 1-3 Woodhill Court. Following this development, the western elevation of 4-6 Woodhill Court is more apparent especially from the central area of Woodhill Court and these open surroundings, which also include broadly the land around Tudor Barn to its north, now forms part of their setting and contributes to their significance.
39. From these spaces within Woodhill Court the open character of the surroundings enables the western elevation of 4-6 Woodhill Court to be appreciated. This general openness with the single storey garage building to the broadly north west of 4 Woodhill Court and the separation of 1-3 Woodhill Court ensure that there is now little that competes within the surroundings to this part of the setting of the listed buildings. From this Woodhill Court location, the existing appeal site buildings have little influence on the listed buildings because they are generally either set behind and lower than the Woodhill Court garage building or fairly well set back from the listed buildings in the case of the stables along the northern elevation of the appeal site. The appeal site falls within the setting of the listed buildings because it is part of the surroundings in which the heritage assets are experienced.
40. In considering any effect of the proposal on the setting of the heritage assets I am mindful of the duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving listed buildings, their setting and features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess⁵.

⁵ Section 66(1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

41. The proposed scheme would involve taller buildings than presently found on the appeal site. Units 1-3 would be visible from within the Woodhill Court area but this terrace would be set back quite a distance from the listed buildings and would appear as a fairly innocuous background feature in the overall surroundings. In this way this terrace would not be harmful to the setting of the listed buildings. I also consider that Unit 7, while it would be clearly apparent from these Woodhill Court locations would be sufficiently separated from the listed buildings and would be seen in a sweep of detached dwellings in the context of 1-3 Woodhill Court. For these reasons, Unit 7 would not be harmful to the setting of the listed buildings.
42. However, the proposed Units 4-6 would be closer to the listed buildings. The top section of the part hipped side gable would appear above the height of the adjoining garage building. In areas close to the front of 4 Woodhill Court and parts of the area in front of Tudor Barn, the bulk, height and proximity of the proposed terrace would be experienced in the surroundings of these listed buildings and it would have a fairly conspicuous presence. A substantial section of the bulk of this proposed terrace would be visible above the boundary wall and would intrude into the reasonably open surroundings around these parts of the listed buildings. It is understood that this proposed terrace would be of a similar height to other dwellings in the wider surroundings. However, I do not consider that this proposed terrace would be adequately separated from the listed buildings and the intrusion of the terrace, in particular Unit 6 into the area which now has a reasonably open character around the listed buildings, would have a negative impact on their setting and thereby detract from the significance of the listed buildings.
43. I have had regard to all the heritage evidence that has been presented, in particular in support of the scheme. However, for the reasons explained, I conclude that the proposal would harm the setting of these listed buildings and thereby detract from their significance. The harm to the setting of these designated heritage assets would be less than substantial within the meaning of paragraph 202 of the Framework. In accordance with the Framework, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
44. The benefits of the scheme include the provision of good quality housing and modern office accommodation in a location with good access to the services and facilities at Send. The development would be delivered on previously developed land, make effective use of the site and be a windfall development that would make a small but worthwhile contribution to housing delivery. There would be social and economic benefits to the local area during construction of the homes and office and in their subsequent occupation, although these would be to a limited degree due to the scale of the proposal, and in respect of construction would only be for a limited time. These would all be benefits of the scheme, however, as only seven units and the modest sized office would be delivered, and in a Council area which is able to demonstrate a Framework compliant supply of housing land⁶, I consider that the public benefits would be minor and should afford no more than of limited weight.
45. The Framework advises that any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, including development within its setting, should require clear and convincing justification and that great weight should be given to the

⁶ As stated in the Council Planning Report and Council's appeal statement.

asset's conservation, irrespective of the level of potential harm. The public benefits of the proposal afford limited weight and, therefore, would not outweigh the harm to the setting of both listed buildings and their significance which, in accordance with the Framework, is required to be attributed great weight.

46. It follows that I conclude that the effect of the development would be to harm the setting of the nearby listed buildings, 4-6 Woodhill Court and Tudor Barn and detract from their significance as heritage assets. This harm would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the development. Accordingly the scheme would conflict with Policy D3 of the Local Plan, Policy Send 1 of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Framework which, amongst other things, explains that the historic environment will be conserved and enhanced in a manner appropriate to its significance.

Other planning issues

47. The site lies within the 400m to 5km zone of influence from recreational pressure on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA). The scheme has been accompanied by a signed and dated planning agreement that on commencement of the development would obligate contributions towards Strategic Access Management and Monitoring and Suitable Accessible Natural Green Space. This would, in all likelihood, secure suitable mitigation, in accordance with the relevant strategy, such that the proposal would not, either alone or in combination with other projects, likely to have a significant and adverse effect on the integrity of the habitat site. In these circumstances, the scheme would be likely to accord with Policy P5 of the Local Plan and saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan 2009. However, given my overall conclusion I have not had to consider this matter further or needed to undertake an appropriate assessment.
48. Other planning matters not covered by the main issues have been raised in the written submissions and/or at the hearing. In particular concerns have been raised in relation to the highway implications of the development. I saw when I visited the area during the period when pupils were being picked up from the local primary school that sections of the main road and adjoining side roads, including parts of Woodhill, were lined by parked vehicles and this was a source of congestion. From the evidence before me, and the snap shot when I visited, I have no reason to believe that this was not typical of other school days. However, the dropping off and picking up period would be limited to two times of the day and at other times it is likely that there would be a much freer flow of traffic in the area.
49. The additional traffic movements associated with the development are likely to be spread throughout the day and those extra movements that would coincide with the school drop off and pick up times are likely to be reasonably limited. I am not persuaded that the additional traffic from the development would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or that the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe, compared with the existing situation. The highway implications of the additional traffic would therefore be acceptable and this accords with the advice of the County Highway Authority.
50. I do note, however, that at the application stage, the Recycling and Waste Projects Officer raised concerns with the waste collection arrangements for the proposed domestic properties. The application was accompanied by details that

showed the swept path of a refuse vehicle and that it would be able to enter the site, turn and leave. However, this situation appears quite tight and there are comments that the access drive is restricted in width and that the refuse vehicle when turning would be close to Unit 7. It would not be satisfactory to leave the refuse containers for the proposed seven dwellings within the vehicular entrance onto Woodhill as this would be likely to block part of the access. The Council did not raise a substantive concern on this issue in the planning report believing that given the information available, and that it would be physically possible for the refuse vehicle to enter the site, turn and leave, that it could sustain a reason for refusal on this matter. On balance, I accept this assessment and therefore I agree that the proposal would be satisfactory in terms of refuse collection.

51. Concerns have been raised with the impact of the proposal on the living conditions of adjoining properties, in particular in respect of overlooking. The position of Unit 7 and the arrangement of windows would help ensure that this property had a satisfactory arrangement with 3 Woodhill Court.
52. The proposed dwellings, Units 1-3, would have rear windows which would face towards Hillands. Along this boundary, and within the Hillands site, is a mature hedge which extends up to a height just below the ridge height of the adjoining stable building. This provides a good marker to help to judge the effect of the proposed first floor windows, which the levels details show would be approximately just below the ridge height of the existing building. The positioning of this proposed terrace further from the boundary, together with the effect of the hedge, would mean that angled views down into the immediate garden area and ground floor of Hillands from the rear windows of the proposed terrace dwellings would be somewhat limited and not unduly harmful. There would be some intervisibility between the first floor windows of the proposed terrace and the first floor windows of Hillands but this would not cause an unacceptable relationship because of the distance between windows.
53. There would be clear views from the garden and dwelling at Hillands towards the upper sections of the proposed terrace, mainly the roof. However, the built presence of the new terrace itself would be adequately separated from Hillands such that the bulk would not be unreasonably harmful to the living conditions of the occupants of this neighbouring property, although the view from sections of the garden and house would change as the stables at present have a minor presence.

Whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations, so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the proposal

54. Paragraph 147 of the Framework indicates that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. I have found that the proposed development would be inappropriate in the Green Belt because of the harm to openness. Paragraph 148 of the Framework makes clear that substantial weight should be given to any harm to the Green Belt.
55. Additionally, I have found that the scheme would result in the unacceptable loss of employment space, would harm the character and appearance of the area and would harm the setting of the two nearby listed buildings. I attribute this combined harm substantial weight. The finding in relation to the loss of the

equestrian facility, and that the recreational impacts on the SPA would, in all likelihood, be satisfactorily mitigated, are neutral in the overall considerations.

56. Cumulatively, the other considerations put forward in support of the proposed development, which I have outlined above, merit limited weight. As a consequence, the benefits of the scheme would not clearly outweigh the harm to the Green Belt and the other harm that I have identified. Consequently, the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development do not exist.

Conclusion

57. The proposal would constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt and no very special circumstances have been demonstrated. As I have explained above, the scheme would also result in unacceptable impacts in relation to employment land, the character and appearance of the area and the setting of two listed buildings contrary to the identified adopted policies. The scheme therefore would not comply with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no considerations which outweigh this harm.

58. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Wyborn

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr Colin Kiely BA(Hons) Dip UPI MRTPI	Kiely Planning Limited
Mr Nick Bishop BA(Hons) MSc IHBC	Avalon Planning & Heritage
Mr Paul Treadaway	Trafalgar Retirement Plus

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Miss Kelly Jethwa BA(Hons) MA MRTPI	Guildford Borough Council
Miss Louise Blaxall	Guildford Borough Council

INTERESTED PARTIES

Mr Ron Bixley	Local Resident
Mr Tim Goodman	Local Resident
Mrs Sarah Hardy	Local Resident
Mr Bruce Doyle	Local Resident
Mr Roger Greeno	Local Resident
Mrs Lyn Toms	Owner of Send Barns Stables and Local Resident
Mr Terry Toms	Owner of Send Barns Stables and Local Resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING

1. Plans of 2007 office extension.