**From:** Judith Ward
**Sent:** 06 March 2019 15:33
**To:** Bob Neville
**Subject:** 19/00171/F Swalcliffe Park Equestrian

Hi Bob

There are a couple of discrepancies between the report and levels on the plan 1.2.4.gives a floor level of 180.35 and the plan 100.35 I presume this is a typo. Also 2.9.4 the heights don’t correspond with the plan. Unless the site levels relate to a temporary benchmark?

The proposed building is within the height range of existing buildings on the site and it is proposed to locate it within close proximity to existing buildings keeping the built form together

The site levels show that the distance between the boundary and building on the SW elevation is such that the slope from the hedge line to the building will be 1:3. This is too steep for maintenance access  and impact on the roots of the hedgerow. The building needs to be moved 2m to the NE. To the NW the levels give a shallower slope which is acceptable.

Vp 1The corner of the building will be visible. The ridgeline is likely to be in line with the existing building. The view would benefit from the building moving slightly to the east (this is necessary due to the levels)  Also some additional planting

Vp2 The proposed building will be visible above the existing stable building. The ridge line is likely to be in line with the horizon. Some off site planting would help break up the view.

Vp3 The building will be visible above the stables  but as a relatively small part of the wider view.

Vp4 Some part of development visible. Gappy hedge provides partial screen. Hedge would benefit from reinforcing.

VP5 Extension of the built form to the NE View would benefit from some screen planting to Nw side of building and hedgerow trees to grange Lane boundary

VP6 Extension of the built form to the NE. Part of the hedgerow to the north could be retained and the removed hedge replaced

There is no mitigation planting currently proposed. An existing hedgerow will be removed. Mention is made of an agreement to replace planting on the N and W sides of the building but no indication has been given where this may go.

In terms of visual impact the proposed building is acceptable providing that it is moved to provide less steep slopes to the bank on the SW side, and a comprehensive landscape scheme is submitted showing clearly vegetation to be retained and new planting where suggested.

Kind regards

Judith