

# Addendum

## LA01/2023/1164/F

### 1.0 Update

- 1.1 On 21<sup>st</sup> February 2025 the agent submitted a letter from the applicant outlining that the proposal is to ensure proper access to the dwellings that have been erected in recent years, which remains unadopted. They state the realignment is necessary for the following key reasons:
- 1.2 Agricultural Land Consolidation & Drainage: Consolidation of agricultural land and to facilitate drainage to ensuring the land remains usable and productive.
- 1.3 Health & Safety of Access: The current access arrangement requires crossing the laneway, shared by multiple dwellings. Realigning the laneway will improve safety and functionality.
- 1.4 Environmental Considerations & Tree Planting: The consolidation of lands will provide an opportunity to plant indigenous trees, enhancing biodiversity and contributing positively to the local environment. The applicant states they have been engaging with the Woodland Trust who seek a minimum of 0.5 hectares to allow engagement to deliver advice/possible funding/delivery. The applicant states it would assist with a reduction in carbon footprints, provide a betterment in relation to the overall countryside character and it also will have no visual impact.
- 1.5 An illustrative plan was submitted with the letter identifying areas in colour.
- 1.6 A second correspondence from the agent was also received on 21<sup>st</sup> February. The email referenced the office meeting which took place in relation to the application and highlights comments made in a case officers report from a different application for infill development.

### 2.0 Consideration

- 2.1 There are provisions within permitted development for the improvement of agricultural land, there is no need to apply for permission and it is unclear how the amendment would improve land.
- 2.2 The plan indicates the portion of ground either side of the laneway is to be planted and as such is not consolidated with agricultural land. It would also not be necessary to cross the lane if the area is wooded.
- 2.3 Planning has not received any correspondence from the Woodland Trust, but the existing field is 1.0Ha and would be eligible for consideration by the Woodland trust irrespective of the consolidation.
- 2.4 In relation to the second correspondence, Planning would confirm that we raised concerns in relation to the suburban appearance of the site and area, resulting in the recommendation to refuse on grounds of detrimental impact on the character of the rural area.
- 2.5 The site referenced in the case officers report, was for an entirely different site and the proposal was for a single dwelling under CTY8. The comments are of no relevance to the current application.

### **3.0 Recommendation**

- 3.1 That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to refuse the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee report.