-----Original Message-----
From: Diccon Carpendale <Diccon.Carpendale@brimblelea.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:17 PM
To: Jones, Becky <Becky.Jones@wiltshire.gov.uk>
Subject: CLEUD application: PL/2023/10702 Bevisfield, Cow Drove, Chilmark

Dear Becky,

I wanted to respond to the comments recently posted by Dave Williams, the previous owner. Also, I will take the opportunity to respond to what the PC and others have said.

What he says now could be taken as a direct contradiction of his statement from last July when he commented on our application to change the exterior of the large barn (when we were working on the basis it benefitted from Class R rights as had been confirmed earlier by your admin team). Based on what he said previously, we decided to withdraw an application for alterations to one of the barns as he was suggesting it was not in agricultural use at the relevant date.

It is interesting to note he makes it clear the PC asked him to say something last year and it does seem remarkably convenient that he stated it wasn't used for agriculture at that precise time (July 2012).

HOWEVER, reading his current statement (and presumably to avoid perjuring himself) his comments refer to the yard and feed store (small barn) only. They make no reference to the large barn being in agricultural use as, clearly, based on his comments made in July 2023, he was using it for domestic purposes.

Additionally, to assist, I attach the planning permission for the stables from which it is evident the lawful use of this building is 'for purposes ancillary to the enjoyment of the associated dwelling'.

On the basis the stables are required to be (and are currently used) ancillary to the enjoyment of Bevisfield, and that his comments do not relate to the large barn I presume you will be content to issue the CLEUD for the stables and large barn? It is within the LPA's gift to amend the description of a CLEUD application - S.191 (4).

I have noted what other parties have said but there seems to be little of any consequence. Of course, assessment of a CLEUD is about facts and not merits, so raising 'objection' is completely irrelevant.

I know you haven't had a chance to appraise the application yet, but can I suggest you come back to me when you have as we may need to agree a revised description.

Thanks
Diccon

Mr Diccon Carpendale
MA, Dip (Arch.Cons.), MRTPI, IHBC
Planning Partner
BRIMBLE LEA
Chartered Planning Consultants & Architects Unit 3 Kingsmead Business Park, Shaftesbury Road, Gillingham, Dorset SP8 5FB