

CD. 7351/B - Town Council Representation

**CHIPPING CAMPDEN (CC) TOWN COUNCIL OBJECTIONS TO 16/00937/OUT**

**1 IN 2015 AN APPLICATION FOR 90 HOUSES WAS UNANIMOUSLY REJECTED BY THIS COMMITTEE .YOUR DECISION WILL BE OVERTURNED VIA THIS APPLICATION PLUS A 2ND PHASE DEVELOPMENT REFERENCED IN THE APPLICATION. TOTAL POTENTIALLY OF 127. REJECTION IS THE ONLY OPTION TO STOP THIS. (NPPF PARA 116) . ALSO THE SITE IS OUTSIDE THE DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARY (POLICY 19)**

**2 CC HAS ALREADY 10+YEARS COVER OF ITS 20 YEAR TARGET AND IS SERIOUSLY "FRONT END LOADED". THIS APPLICATION WOULD MEAN 14 YEARS COVER AND WITH "WINDFALL" 16 YEARS. CLEARLY WE HAVE NO MEDIUM TERM NEED AND OUR INFRASTRUCTURE IS ALREADY SERIOUSLY STRETCHED. WORSE , IN OUR NORTH COTSWOLD "CLUSTER" WILLERSEY FOR EXAMPLE IS ALREADY 20 YEARS COVERED .**

**3 WE MAINTAIN THAT EVEN 40 HOUSES IS "MAJOR " IN THE CONTEXT OF CHIPPING CAMPDEN, EVEN MORE CLEARLY WITH 1 ABOVE. FOR THE RECORD THE TOWN COUNCIL HAS NEVER PROMOTED DEVELOPMENT OF THIS SITE. THE SPRING HILL SITE UNDER ACTIVE DISCUSSION IS "BROWN FIELD"AND HAS ADJACENT GROWING ECO FRIENDLY COMMERCIAL ACTIVITY MAKING IT FAR MORE APPROPRIATE FOR MEDIUM TO LONGER TERM ORGANIC GROWTH.**

**4 REDUCTION OF SITE AREA BY 40% STILL MEANS DESTROYING 7 ACRES OF CURRENTLY VERY PRODUCTIVE HIGH QUALITY AGRICULTURAL LAND. WE SHOULD PRIORITISE FEEDING THE NATION. THE PRESENCE OF OTHER HIGH QUALITY FARM LAND AROUND CC IS NOT AN ACCEPTABLE EXCUSE (NPPF PARA 112)**

**5 OF UNIQUE AND VERY GREAT IMPORTANCE IS THE NEAR CERTAINTY THAT WE WOULD DESTROY A PROVEN BREEDING GROUND FOR RED LISTED SKYLARKS...AN ENDANGERED SPECIES. EARLIER LOCAL EXPERT OPINION HAS NOW BEEN ENDORSED BY A VISIT TO VIEW THE SITE FROM PROF.GRAHAM MARTIN , AVIAN SCIENCE PROFESSOR AT BIRMINGHAM UNIVERSITY WHO CONFIRMS THAT THE RESULT OF EXTENSIVE PROLONGED CONSTRUCTION PLUS IMPACT OF DOMESTIC PREDATORS WOULD MEAN THE BIRDS WOULD NEAR CERTAIN LEAVE THE AREA (DESPITE THE ATTEMPT TO CLAIM MITIGATION) AND NEVER RETURN. TO ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN WOULD BE GROSSLY IRRESPONSIBLE AND CONFLICTS HEAD ON WITH NPPF PARA 115 AND 117.**

**6 A SERIOUS NEGATIVE IMPACT WOULD STILL RESULT ON THE QUALITY OF AONB VIEWS ESPECIALLY ENTERING FROM THE NORTH OF TOWN . SITE IS REPORTED AS HIGH/MEDIUM LANDSCAPE SENSITIVE!! (NPPF PARAS 17,109,115 AND POLICY 42)**

**7 THE CONSERVATION BOARD, CAMPDEN SOCIETY AND PETITION OF 262 ALSO OBJECT.**

**CONCLUSION BASED ON EARLIER REJECTION ,IMPACT IN AONB, LACK OF NEED,PREFERRED "BROWN FIELD"OPTION, LOSS OF VALUABLE AGRICULTURAL LAND AND DESTRUCTION OF THE NESTING HABITAT OF AN ENDANGERED SPECIES WE URGE THE COMMITTEE TO REJECT THIS APPLICATION. DO NOT ALLOW IT TO BECOME THE FIRST STEP TO A HUGELY DISPROPORTIANATE DEVELOPMENT RUINING FOR EVER THE CHARACTER OF CHIPPING CAMPDEN. OVERALL CONCLUSION IS "HARM OUTWEIGHS BENEFIT"      CLLR. BOB KING (CHAIRMAN CHIPPING CAMPDEN TOWN COUNCIL)    JUNE 2016**

# CD. 7351/B - Objector's Representation

Objection Note CDC Planning Committee 8/6/16 16/00937/OUT

This application is for a densely-built modern estate of 40 houses on a visible edge of town, the northern gateway into Campden. It differs from the earlier submission only in reduction of house numbers and by describing it as a "first phase", signalling the intent to move to further development phases.

This planning committee acknowledged the overwhelming opposition within the town towards this threatened development in rejecting the first submission. This should now be respected.

The local need is not proven as the Town Council's survey has shown. The short-to-medium term requirements for additional housing have already been met, as acknowledged by the Planning Officer.

The increased housing requirement from Central Government applies to the whole of the CDC area but may not be appropriate for Campden.

We endorse the Conservation Board's view that this application is premature to the Local Plan Hearings. So **before** considering whether this amended application is acceptable, alternative strategies that will meet **local** needs in more suitable ways, or in more suitable locations, need to be examined in order to avoid the loss of these open green fields in the AONB.

Please reject this application the impact of which would irreparably damage the visual integrity of Campden's landscape.

Carol Nixon on behalf of The Campden Society

CD.7351/B - Agent's Representation

**Planning Committee Statement of Robin Kisby MRTPI  
Land North of Chipping Campden School, Aston Road, Chipping Campden,  
Gloucestershire (16/00937/OUT).**

Chair, Members, my name is Robin Kisby I am a planning consultant and I represent the planning applicant - Gloucester County Council

As a local service centre with a good range of services, facilities and amenities capable of supporting, and being supported by, new housing development, Chipping Campden is a sustainable location for these proposals.

Similarly, the application site is a sustainable one in the physical context of the town. Indeed, the application site and adjoining land have been identified as Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment sites<sup>1</sup> in the emerging local plan for that very reason.

The site is a logical physical extension to the built up area and offers efficient and convenient access to the highway network and to the service and community facilities.

The current planning application demonstrates that the residential development can be satisfactorily accommodated on the site in a way that would provide for effective mitigation of perceived visual impacts on the AONB<sup>2</sup>. Furthermore the Planning Officer's Report makes it clear that the development is not to be regarded as major development in the AONB, with regard to the provisions of the NPPF (para. 116).

The Planning Officer correctly acknowledges that new housing development should not be limited to land that lies within defined settlement boundaries and has concluded that the current planning application satisfactorily addresses the Council's objections to the previous scheme.- The applicant endorses the findings of the Committee Report in which it is confirmed that no objections have been made by any of the statutory or technical consultees in respect of such matters as highway impact and safety, drainage and flooding, ecology or heritage.

It follows that the Applicant supports the Planning Officer's main conclusion that these development proposals - that represent only a 3.3% increase in the housing stock of the town - are sustainable, and agrees with the recommendation that planning permission should be granted.

I therefore urge the Committee to support your Officer's recommendations and approve this application. Thank you.

---

<sup>1</sup> Refs: CC\_23B and CC\_23C

<sup>2</sup> S85 Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 – a duty to: "have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the landscape

# CD/6972/C - Parish Council Representation

**15/02907/FUL – building plot on site of 6/7 Fyfield Cottages – to build one detached dwelling and garage with accommodation above**

Chairman,

My name is Pete McHugh; I wish to address the Committee in my capacity as Chairman of Eastleach Parish Council and as a resident of Fyfield.

The Parish Council wishes to restate the points covered during the Committee Meeting 11th May and urge the Committee to refuse the application. The people of Fyfield have voiced the very strongest objections to the development of this site.

The Hamlet of Fyfield and The Parish of Eastleach in which it resides has not seen a "New Build" in nearly 30 years. Unsustainability, no transport connections, nearby shops at least 4 miles away. Please discount the volunteer run once weekly shop at Southrop the adjoining village, it hardly represents a mecca in retail therapy and is there purely to support local occasional needs and as a community meeting point.

The Committee will be aware of two previous applications for developments on this site were refused due to access.

CD.6972/A – erection of one detached cottage – REFUSED 11.04.1988

CD.6972/B – erection of a pair of three bedroom cottages – REFUSED 15.03.2001

There is a compelling argument that this reason should once again be the basis of objection to this application. The Eastleach to Southrop Road, subject of the Visibility Assessment of 14th January is undoubtedly busier now than in 1988 or 2001. The blind bend junction is a notable traffic hazard. So on the point of consistency, the Committee will recognise that little has changed to improve the prospect of a dwelling being built in the proposed location, on the contrary, with more and heavier farm traffic and with the establishment of nearby Baxter's Barns, have contributed to make the access even more challenging. It's not surprising therefore that the seller of the land parcel, the same party that had the two previous refusals to the site, sold the land as a Garden Plot rather than a Building Plot to the applicant of this proposed dwelling.

Chairman, the specific complaint from the parishioners is lane itself. Some halfway down the lane is the BT exchange that services Fyfield, Eastleach and Southrop. BT vehicles require access to this site, there is a layby allocated for BT personnel. Home owners have to resort to leaving their own vehicles in the layby at night due to lack of personal parking or the impractical nature of trying to reverse out of the lane into the Eastleach/Fyfield/Southrop road. The Councils own refuse and recycling contractor has to reverse into the lane as there is no turning provision.

The next obstacle is the "pinch point" towards where the proposed development site. It's barely passable by large car and regularly congestion occurs when the farmer /local land owners require access to grazing land at the lanes end. At this point, it is merely a dust track. To grant permission for the construction of a dwelling at this point of the lane provokes many questions about the feasibility for construction vehicles, delivery of building materials, and general disruption for locals seems to have escaped the applicant's attention. Some of the current residents only have street parking and there is a very real problem when access is required by oil delivery tankers, refuse collection vehicles, delivery vans and emergency vehicle access.

Finally Chairman, I would address the plans for the dwelling itself. It's arguable that this doesn't have any impact at addressing a local housing need due to its size, it doesn't

\* Time elapsed here

specifically adopt a sensitive style in the local vernacular. Similar styled Garage applications nearby were refused as not being in keeping.

In summary Chairman, the local community and the Parish Council object to the application and we urge the Committee to refuse planning permission for this development.

Thank you.

Pete McHugh  
Chairman  
Eastleach Parish Council

6 Baxter's Barns  
Fyfield

CD. 6972/C - Objectors Representation

**Objection to Planning Application – 15/02907/FUL (CD.6972/C) – Erection of a house and Double Garage with Accommodation over at Fyfield**

I raised an objection that the Application contravenes the current *Local Plan Policy 19 (Development Outside Development Plan Boundaries)*.

In the previous planning meeting, the minutes refer to consideration whether Policy 19 still applies or, if not, then the Application should be considered within the National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) in favour of sustainable development. Quoting from the Minutes:

*...“It follows that the appeal scheme must contravene the requirements of Policy 19. But the policy is time-expired and conforms to a superseded strategy, failing to reflect the advice in the NPPF in severely restricting rather than boosting the supply of housing and conflicts with the Emerging Strategy”... Given that Policy 19, the only one cited as relevant, is out-of-date, the Development Plan can have little direct bearing on the determination of the appeal. It is therefore the Council’s position that little weight can be accorded to Local Plan Policy 19 in the specific circumstances of this case.*

However, the *Cotswold District Local Plan Local Development Scheme April 2016 – March 2019* refers to:

*...“Preparation of a single Local Plan for the Cotswold District. Once adopted, the Local Plan will replace the ‘saved’ policies of the Plan adopted 2006.*

The Council also sought guidance regarding saving specific policies of the existing Local Plan and the Secretary of State agreed the specific policies (which include Policy 19) should be saved initially for 3 years post adoption of the 2006 Plan but then maintained until such time as they are replaced by the New Local Plan.

So Annex B on Page 22 of the *Cotswold District Local Plan Local Development Scheme April 2016 – March 2019* confirms that Local Plan Policy 19 is currently retained and from my reading of the document, it will be migrated into the New Local Plan. Therefore, I do not believe that it is a valid argument that Policy 19 is time-expired.

The Minutes continue:

*...“And, of course, the Emerging Local Plan has not yet reached a stage where its mooted policies might reasonably serve as replacements”...*

However, the CDC website says the Council will meet on Tuesday 17 June to approve the Draft Submission of the Local Plan which, from Annex B of the LDS, infers some policies such as 19 will be retained. So it would appear that the Emerging Local Plan’s provisions are well advanced.

Reference is made in the Minutes to the Application contravening Policy 19 as it results in new-build open market housing. No mention is made to the contravention:

*“Causes significant harm to existing patterns of development including the key characteristics of open spaces in a settlement “.*

I am sure that from their Site Visit, the Committee will appreciate this is the last open space in a now crowded hamlet. Also, in support of the Application, the Minutes refer to evidence of a previous dwelling. It is 60 years since there was a property on the site and there is little evidence of it.

If Policy 19 no longer applies (although, from the current documents available regarding the Emerging Local Plan, it seems its provisions will be retained) then does this application provide sustainable development and boost the supply of housing? I don't believe it does for 3 reasons:

- 1) 1 house as an in-fill in a hamlet will hardly boost housing unless the Council is changing its policy to allowing in-fill across the District, as this Application will set a precedent.
- 2) Reference is made to sustaining a post office & shop in Southrop that are non-existent.
- 3) With no local amenities or public transport, the application will further exacerbate the access problem along the Lane in Fyfield. Additional cars, delivery vans and service vehicles as a result of an in-fill property will result in even more vehicles having to back-up a lane, which is also a public footpath, resulting in further danger to dog-walkers and children that use it.

Paul Bailey  
6 June 2016

# CT.5679/C - Objector's Representations

Address to Planning Committee - 8<sup>th</sup> June 2016 in respect of item 6: 15/04899/FUL

By Stephen Bawtree of  
Glebe House, School Hill, Stratton

Having read the officer's report to committee we are most concerned that neither the case officer nor the conservation officer have properly addressed the relationship between the proposed dwelling, together with its outbuildings and the adjoining properties Grade II listed Glebe House and Stratton Hurst.

Glebe House is substantially lower than the development site and the siting of the proposed dwellings and buildings is too close to the retaining wall separating the properties for any screening to be effective. That which is proposed, including forest tree species such as oak within 1 metre of the boundary, would cause significant damage to the retaining wall.

This proximity, together with the height of the new building and the difference in levels is such that the new dwelling will continue to have the overbearing and dominating impact on the setting of the adjoining listed building as the previously appealed scheme. This "negative impact" upon the setting was identified by the Inspector in the previous appeal decision.

It is further noted that the size of the proposed dwelling and the massing on the boundary with Glebe House remains substantially as previously proposed and dismissed on appeal, indeed the dwelling is higher along the boundary.

In order to demonstrate the effect we attach a photomontage, prepared using the level and height information contained in the current planning application.

We understand that our neighbours, Mr & Mrs Whipp at Stratton Hurst, School Hill also wish to reaffirm their objections and we will be liaising with them in order to present a coordinated submission.

Under S.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and case law, including the Barnwell judgement of 2014 (1) and subsequent cases which reinforced it, decision makers have a responsibility to give "considerable importance and weight" to the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings and "There is a statutory presumption and a strong one, against granting planning permission for any development which would fail to preserve the setting of a listed building..." (2). Where harm is caused this must be given considerable importance and weight in determining whether to grant planning permission.

We consider that the harm which would be caused to the setting of the listed building and hence to the significance of Glebe House itself, has not been properly recognised or assessed and that the necessary weight has not been given to this in the recommendation for permission.



We therefore respectfully request that, contrary to the officer's recommendation, the Committee should refuse the current application.

(1) Court of Appeal Case No. C1/2013/0843. Date 18/02/2014

(2) High Court of Justice Case Nos. C0/735/2013 & C0/16932/2013. Date 12/06/2014

W.6964/2

W.6964/4

PLANNING APPLICATION

Objector's Representation, 15/04754/FUL

I am speaking on behalf of parishioners and particularly for the many people whose relatives are buried in the churchyard of St. Peter's, Southrop.

The desire to change amenities and to increase the potential for more business at Thyme can be understood and in general, the plans for change are acceptable. The exception is the effect of enclosure that will be produced if the building of bedrooms adjacent to the west wall of the churchyard is permitted. A church has stood on the site for more than 1000 years and is Grade 1 listed. Many visitors come especially to see the famous font and because of the church's connection with John Keble.

The churchyard has many old graves and many graves of local people whose relatives visit regularly to tend those graves and spend time in a tranquil place.

Maintaining a churchyard is expensive. Recently rebuilding of the stone wall in the south western corner has been done and a large compost area cleared. It is beneficial that the CDC now provides a green bin, free of charge, to help with compostable waste.

The west wall according to the Church's Terrier and Inventory is the responsibility of the PCC. The tree survey comments on the size and state of the lime trees which border this west wall. Apparently they were pollarded some 20 to 30 years ago and therefore they are now of considerable size. The PCC are aware that they need attention. In full leaf, as they are at present when the site inspection took place, the intrusion that a roofline some 2 metres above the wall would make on the churchyard, might not have been appreciated. Light filters through trees but solid structures block light.

A requirement in the Tree Survey states that if the buildings are allowed, the lower branches will have to be cleared to a level of 5 metres from the ground. This will completely expose the whole length and height of the roofs. ( Reference 9. 6 in the Tree Survey)

The application states that the bedrooms will replace barns. Barns were never built and this is commented on and challenged by the CPRE chairman in his objection letters. He states that the right to build the barn was gained under an AGFO. Please refer to his letter for further evidence.

Many of the letters of support, most of which are from outside the village, comment on the positive effect in terms of the development as a whole and employment, but none has looked from the church's perspective.

There are many birds which nest, including owls, and many wild flowers. These may well be affected by a change in the sunlight which comes into the churchyard particularly in the afternoon and evening.

If this building is allowed there will be an impact on the setting of a Grade 1 listed church and its churchyard.

It will have a detrimental impact on the appearance and character of the landscape and the openness of the countryside.

W.6964/2; W.6964/7 Supporter's Representation

Comments submitted by Mr Martin J Bacon

The Cottage, Southrop, Lechlade, Gloucestershire. GL7 3NU

8 June 2016

Change of use of the Granary, Ox Barn, Lambing Sheds and Pigsties, Haybarn and associated land from part agricultural, equestrian, D1, D2, and B1 use classes to a composite use comprising A3 (food and drink), C1 (hotel), D1 (treatment and wellbeing/lectures/courses) and D2 (social events) use classes. Replacement of former barns to provide guest bedrooms. Construction of treatment and wellbeing buildings and the change of use of equestrian riding arena and other land, part to include overflow car parking, associated landscaping and all other associated works

Manor Farm Barns Southrop Gloucestershire

Ref. No: 15/04754/FUL

These comments are in addition to those I posted in the support comments section of the planning web site

I planned to attend this meeting as an observer but after finding two discrepancies in the "Reasons for Referral" section I decided to speak.

I refer to line five – "Church wardens" the use of the plural is incorrect as one of the 2 wardens voted not to object. The Parochial Church Council's (PCC) vote on whether to object or not resulted in a split vote and it was agreed that the PCC as a body should not object to the application as there was not a majority in favour of doing so.

I refer now to line 8. – "Letters of support have not come from residents of the village..." I have been resident in and active in the village for thirty years, my wife for forty years and we feel therefore our comments of support as "true" locals should not be dismissed out of hand.

Moving on, as a PCC member I volunteered to undertake the day to day maintenance of church and churchyard and spend between half and two hours a week in doing so. Of the visitors I see, few venture as far as the churchyard and those who do, do so mainly to look at late Saxon stonework. Even fewer wander round the churchyard as it is in my opinion a rather dour and uninviting place filled with and overshadowed by thirty foot high hollies and yews and with a somewhat limited outlook due to the surrounding six foot high ivy clad walls to the east and west and to the south an overgrown hedge and semi mature trees.

Utilisation. During my 30 years living directly opposite the site under discussion I have watched it fall from been a practical though underused working farm into a collection of neglected unsafe semi derelict buildings. Over the past ten years this same plot has undergone what can only be described as a renaissance. It has been restored and transformed with great attention to detail, consideration to its heritage and incidentally, with minimal disruption to near neighbours, into a thriving business providing, once again, much needed local employment.

Finally traffic. As stated previously I live directly opposite the main entrance to the site. Whilst there was a slight increase in traffic its nature changed, cars and people have replaced tractors and lorries. With the opening of the new access road to the south of the premises the volume of traffic reduced considerably.

W. 6964/2; W. 6964/7 Supporter's Representation

My wife and I live in the centre of Southrop and have both lived in the area all our lives. As such, we feel rather disheartened that our letter of support for this development has been deemed weightless by the two ward members asking for the referral to committee.

We live opposite the barn and buildings and are therefore two of most directly affected residents. We both support the application due to the obvious benefits it will bring. These include the enhancement of the buildings visually, the employment of locals, the encouragement of business and enterprise, and facilities being open to locals too.

The building work carried out previously by the estate has been of the highest quality, truly sympathetic to its surroundings and if anything such works have only enhanced the village's beauty.

We have not in any way been affected by noise either building work or guests in the 5 years we have lived opposite the Manor Farm buildings, nor would we expect to be. Any traffic we hear is either on the rat-run through Southrop to Brize Norton, or the parents dropping off children at the school. We haven't noticed any Thyme traffic at all.

It would seem that the people least affected by this - seem the most opposed.

For these reasons we cannot see any reason to oppose this development in our village, and actively support it.

## **CDC speech v6a**

My name is Jerry Hibbert, and I've lived in Southrop for 14 years, next door to the site in question, Manor Farm, now called 'Thyme'. My wife and I run 'Thyme' and 'The Swan' pub in Southrop as one business.

In 2002, Manor Farm was put up for sale with planning permission to convert the listed buildings into 'a housing estate'. We thought that there had to be a more appropriate and sensitive use, as did most of the village: there were a lot of objections to the idea of turning them into houses.

In the end we bought them, and have managed to save and restore them, winning a CPRE award for what we have done. The huge internal spaces now remain as they were and the barns still stand within a simple, agricultural setting. That part was relatively easy; the hard part has been establishing and growing a successful, but low key, high quality, family business which is suited to the buildings' special qualities.

Thyme employed 21 people at the time of application, full and part time, with a few more now: the Swan, more still. Most live in the surrounding area, but quite a few are in the village itself, so we employ and cater for local people as well as visitors and tourists.

Our business is built on promoting the Cotswolds way of life: growing, cooking and serving fresh, seasonal food, and enjoying and respecting the countryside. The guests that stay with us benefit a whole range of other local businesses too.

However, the key ingredient to keeping a business such as ours sustainable, is having enough rooms to rent. It is very hard to sustain a project like this just on cooking and selling food (and wine). These rooms will secure the future of these listed buildings with minimum intervention.

So, following public consultation, with the help and hard work of the planning and conservation officers, our original proposals have been amended, reduced and simplified so that they address all of the issues and concerns raised by them.

We have NO OBJECTION from the Parish Council (of which I'm a member), led by Councillor Beccle in the chair. The vote was unanimous. The Parochial Church Council (of which I'm a member) has sent a letter to the Council here saying that they do NOT object, despite it being on the website marked otherwise (with the qualification that in this case the vote was not unanimous).

The conclusions of the Planning Officer, and the Conservation Officer, are that the amended scheme "*raises no objections*" and "*would not result in harm*" and that, with suitable conditions, it should be approved.

However, I was dismayed to read the reasons for referral to this committee - and I quote:

*"The letters of support for the application have not come from residents of the village but from customers and friends of the applicant, so I really cannot give them any weight as these people have no connection with the village."*

Firstly, only the briefest glance at the council's website shows that many of those who have written in support are indeed Southrop residents.

Secondly, it's true that many of those who have written to support are people we do know: but you'd expect that - local people use our facilities - and of course, we have friends. But we know as many of the objectors as we do the supporters, and we do NOT know all the supporters. The implication here is that the local support for our proposals is not genuine - and I hope you agree that that is really not a fair assessment.

Thirdly, the referral also says that the "*Church Wardens are ... particularly concerned...*" To be clear: one is - the other is not. He voted NOT to object originally (with the PCC) and does not object now.

However, I think the primary concern is that the view from the churchyard over the wall into our farmyard will be partially obscured. That the churchyard will have "*an enclosed feel.*"

Well, the churchyard is already surrounded by trees, with a high wall on the western and eastern boundaries. There were buildings - and larger ones than we propose - on the other side of that eastern wall for the better part of the last century, as there were other buildings in the farmyard.

Our proposed roofline, architecturally as recommended by the Conservation Officer, will be roughly only <sup>50</sup>~~30~~ inches above the height of the eastern wall, replacing what was a flat corrugated iron roof previously, also higher than the wall. The difference is minimal - and that's when it's not obscured by trees.

*and 9' AWAY FROM IT.*

Manor Farm would have always been a noisy and busy place. Tractors, trailers, lorries, animals coming and going, machinery buzzing away. Up until last year, it was a busy horse yard with 18 horses, and their accompanying vehicles - some of them very large lorries.

So our proposals are for a much quieter use than would have been the case for the last 200 years.

We do rely on this Committee to support rural enterprise and employment and I hope that you will approve our efforts to preserve these lovely old buildings and enhance them in a quiet, useful and meaningful way.

Thank you.

The first part of the document discusses the importance of maintaining accurate records of all transactions. It emphasizes that this is essential for ensuring the integrity of the financial statements and for providing a clear audit trail.

Furthermore, it is noted that the records should be kept in a secure and accessible location. This ensures that the information is available when needed and is protected from unauthorized access or loss.

In addition, the document highlights the need for regular reviews and updates of the records. This helps to identify any discrepancies or errors early on and allows for prompt correction.

It is also stressed that the records should be maintained in a consistent and standardized format. This facilitates the comparison of data over time and across different departments or divisions.

The document concludes by stating that the proper management of records is a key component of sound financial control. It encourages all staff members to take responsibility for the accuracy and completeness of the data they provide.

Finally, it is recommended that the records be reviewed periodically by management to ensure that they are up-to-date and reflect the current state of the organization's finances.

The document also mentions that the records should be retained for a sufficient period of time to allow for any future audits or investigations. This is particularly important for tax purposes and for legal compliance.

In summary, the document provides a comprehensive overview of the requirements for maintaining financial records. It serves as a guide for all staff members involved in the financial reporting process.