

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 June 2018 14:18  
**To:** Tawton, Amy <amy.tawton@herefordshire.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Planning Application 181438 - Middlewood

Dear Sir/Madam,

Ref: 181438 - Middlewood,

We feel we need to respond to the correspondence received from the Agent dated 1 June 2018 as we are concerned some points made are misleading.

1. In response to concerns raised on intensification, the agent states that "activity on a typical day is likely to be limited to leaving in the morning and arriving in an evening". This is in direct contradiction to the Planning Statement which states and we quote:

"The Functional Need.....it is vitally important that Aaron is on call to his clients 24 hours a day, seven days a week."

"These situations require Aaron to be on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week, which are outside of normal working hours"

2. Regarding passing places, the agent states there are seven. It can be seen from a map, and is evident when in situ, that none of the places marked are "designated" passing places.

PP1 and PP7 appear at road junctions, where lanes meet at one end and on the B3452 at the other.

PP2, 4 and 5 are field gate ways

PP5 is on a corner, considered by locals to be a blind corner and dangerous.

PP3 is the applicants' gateway

PP6 is a green sward, usable only by a four-wheel drive vehicle and also littered with tree debris that would prevent a car pulling in, especially during spring and summer when the vegetation is high, or during wet weather when the ground is very soft.

3. In addition, although the first straight travelling north has "reasonable" visibility, it remains impossible for a car to pass a walker without slowing down to walking pace. A tractor must actually come to a standstill. The lane attracts walkers, many with dogs or pushchairs, also horse riders, and tractors need to wait for the walker to reach a gateway in order to pass. This illustrates just one example of why the lane is deemed "unsuitable for wide vehicles" at its entrance.

4. The agent makes reference to the site being a former timber yard stating that the site and infrastructure were able to accommodate such use but is unable to describe exact use patterns. Having lived next door for 32 years and

had a close connection to the area prior to that, we can confirm that the yard has had no regular use since the early 1970's, being used only for limited storage with the only real activity being the cutting down of a couple of trees on the site and grass strimming. We are not sure where the terminology "Timber Yard" or "Former Agriculture Building" came from, because up until the 1970's it had only been used as a builder's maintenance yard and the tin shed was a carpenter's shop. There was a small sawmill for his own use up until the 1940's. In its heyday the mode of transport was horse and timber carriage, certainly not the large trucks as it would be today.

5. We are concerned by the lack of clarity regarding the use of the plot. The Planning Statement states clearly that the plot is vital to the applicants' needs as it is essential they have proximity to and storage and security on site for their machinery, but, having attended the Parish Council Meeting, we understand, from the applicants that this is not so. This was noted in the comments submitted by the Parish Council after the meeting (30 May 2018) where it is stated that "the applicants confirmed at the meeting that the application didn't reflect their needs".

Whilst we laud the applicants' desire to live and work in the local area and do wish them every success and happiness in growing their business, we remain concerned that the plot is unsuitable for the use stated, we believe that our previous objections remain valid (30 May 2018) and wish for greater clarity of the apparent contradictions between the Planning Statement submitted and comments made by both the agent and the applicants.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any queries regarding the above, we would be more than happy to discuss the above points and our concerns in greater detail should you wish.

Yours faithfully,

Ron and Margaret Davies