

Response to comment: **Kings Cottage Brantridge Lane Balcombe**

Comment: This application would seem to be identical to application DM/22/3875 in which the subject structure is referred to as a "Domestic Garden Room". Without modification this is now referred to as an outbuilding for " agricultural storage ". In its present form the structure is patently unsuitable for this purpose (glazing and a single door) through which agricultural equipment larger than a domestic lawnmower would be unable to pass. In addition there has been no sign of any agricultural activity having ever taken place on the property. This application would seem to be just verbiage to try to retain the structure by simply renaming it.

Response: The comment that the new application, ref: DM/25/2218 is identical to previous submissions would be incorrect. The reason for this is that the previous application at the site, indeed attempted to retain the structure in place as a residential garden room, with the new application seeking to retain it for agricultural storage purposes. As can be seen through the supplied planning drawings, there have been no changes to the design and the reason for this is simple, that the scale and design is compliant with the local development plan. Following previous engagement with the case officer on previous applications, it was stated how the scale and design of the unit is appropriate at this location, due to the fact that the structure is well screened at this location from any public viewpoints. The contention with the previous application related to the classification of the structure as a residential garden room which was considered to be non-compliant, in relation to the existing context of the land. While no design changes have been proposed, the applicant is happy to adhere to any reasonable planning conditions which restrict the units use to agricultural purposes in the hope that this would alleviate any concerns from the council, and indeed objectors.

Kind regards,

Michael Breen