

	Online Comments
Application No:	18/09517/FUL
	<p>I am broadly supportive of this application because it will regenerate a clearly run down building that will no longer be used for agriculture. That said, I do have two main concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The foot print of the proposed building looks bigger than the existing foot print of the barn. Will this application set a precedent for increased development on agricultural land? 2. There are other buildings in the village that have been granted planning permission as holiday homes, which are now clearly inhabited permanently. These other developments have not submitted a change of planning but the maximum occupation limit caveat below has not been enforced: <p>No person shall occupy the holiday accommodation hereby permitted for a continuous period of more than 28 days in any calendar year and it shall not be reoccupied by the same person/s within 28 days following the end of that period.</p> <p>Based on precedence in the village, I am concerned that granting planning permission as a holiday let is a way to short cut the planning for full time residence. Would it not make more sense to grant planning for full time occupancy rather than as a holiday let as the caveats will clearly not be enforced?</p>
Address:	Keevil BA146LX
Date:	06.11.2018