

Minutes of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** meeting held at
Groombridge Old Station on **Monday 13th September** at 7.00pm

PRESENT: Cllrs Andrew Fane, Diana Kelly, Jill Pardey, Chris Pope,
Marcus Tarling (Chair).

In attendance: Natalie Brett –Assistant Clerk (Minutes)

Members of the public are encouraged to come to the meetings and there is a 10 minute opportunity at the start of the meeting for them to address the Planning Committee. There were 3 members of the public in attendance. 2 by zoom for item 6.1 and 1 in person for item 6.2. The Parish Council also received correspondence from 11 residents by email with reasons the LED should not be approved in relation to 6.1, these had been circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting.

The following statement was read by a member of the public who was representing 7 members of the community and in attendance via zoom.

We wish to object to the Upper Tanyard – WD/2021/2114/LDE for the following reasons:

- 1. The area is within the High Weald Designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.*
- 2. The Site is outside the Village Boundary as stated in Wealden District Councils Local Plan which I believe is still in force.*
- 3. The Land where the unlawful development has taken place along with the whole of The Tanyard is on a flood plain, which in recent years has flooded with increasing regularity. This makes it totally unsuitable for habitation unless of course the applicant has built a bund or retaining wall alongside the adjoining river bank which would be in contravention of the Environment Agency. I have photographic evidence of flooding which occurred both in recent years and around 2000 when the entire site was under water.*
- 4. Any Building Development on this site has taken place without Planning Consent or Building Control. By what means is any sewerage being disposed of bearing in mind it is on a flood plain.*
- 5. The Site has been screened from the road and other publicly accessible areas by green plastic sheeting and dense hedging to stop residents and Council Officials from seeing into the entire area thus preventing any inspection.*
- 6. The Documentation providing evidence of Permanent Occupation is at least questionable. Two declarations from Tradesmen that they have visited and worked on plumbing and electrical installations over the years does not constitute proof of uninterrupted permanent habitation since 2015. Neither do invoices from Electricity, Water and other suppliers whose services are certainly on site but again do not constitute proof of continuous permanent residential use.*
- 7. Whilst it is true the Applicants are frequent visitors to the Site they have always implied to us that they use the land for Recreational purposes, certainly staying overnight on many occasions judging by the light we can see from our property but have NOT lived there permanently for the last 4 years of more.*

8. *Finally, having done some research into the little known 4 Year Rule relating to the Certificate of Lawful Development for which the Applicant is applying it seems that it may not be permissible for two reasons:*
 - a. *As the Site is in an AONB where Special Conditions apply.*
 - b. *If there has been any concealment of the development which prevents residents and Council Authorities from seeing into the area, thus not enabling action to be taken.*

This, in our opinion is far from being a Lawful Development but a calculated attempt to deceive both the Local Authorities and Residents by bypassing the Planning Rules and if allowed would set a dangerous precedent in the area and indeed makes a mockery of the The Local Planning Regulations.

The second resident in attendance via zoom supported the comments made by the first resident.

The resident in attendance for 6.2 asked if the Committee had any question regarding the application. The committee did not have any questions.

Cllr Tarling thanked the residents for their comments and opened the meeting.

1. ENQUIRE WHETHER ANYONE PRESENT INTENDS TO FILM, PHOTOGRAPH AND/OR RECORD THE MEETING: None.

2. APOLOGIES – Cllr Robert Gordon-James

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST – Cllr Tarling in relation to 6.7

4. MINUTES

4.1 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 23rd AUGUST 2021

002135 RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 23rd August 2021 be taken as read and signed by the Chairman

4.2 MATTERS OUTSTANDING FROM THESE MINUTES: - None

5. ENFORCEMENT

An enforcement update was circulated to Councillors by email.

It was noted that fires had been lit on the land at Gillridge Lane which were causing a significant hazard.

Machinery was no longer present on the land at Park Corner and a hard-core level surface had been added to the barn floor.

6. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

COMMENTS TO BE RETURNED TO WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL

- 6.1 WD/2021/2114/LDE UPPER TANYARD, CORSELEY ROAD, GROOMBRIDGE, TN3 9PP Description: CERTIFICATE OF LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT FOR EXISTING DWELLINGHOUSE (USE CLASS C3). (Expiry date for comments 24th September 2021)**

Link to documents on web:

<http://planning.wealden.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=155122>

An LDE is an evidence gathering process and is different to a Planning Application. The committee did not believe that evidence shown in the LDE was correct or proof that occupation had occurred. It was noted that should it be proved that an LDE contains a statement that is not trueful this can result in a prison sentence or fine.

The committee supported the statement by the member of the public at the beginning of the meeting and the comments made in the 11 letters the committee has received (redacted letters in appendix).

The committee agreed that the lack of council tax and refuse collections was evidence of non-habitation.

Withyham Parish Council had requested Wealden District Council Enforcement to visit this site on 6 occasions from 2014 to 2019 and more recently. Had the dwelling been inhabited would enforcement action not have been undertaken at the site? It was understood, if there has been enforcement in place or a planning application refused, then the ten-year rule was applicable not the three-year rule.

It was agreed that the site had been deliberately concealed with tarpaulin, large gates and security cameras and dogs to keep people away. This is clear concealment and goes against the LDE.

There was no ecology report, and concerns were raised, regarding waste water and the integrity of the stream.

Withyham Parish Council find this application is NOT LAWFUL and objects.

6.2 WD/2021/0163/F TOLLHURST FARM, OAK LANE, BLACKHAM, WITHYHAM, TN3 9UB Description: ERECTION OF AN AGRICULTURAL WORKERS DWELLING. (Expiry date for comments **21st September 2021)**

Link to documents on web:

<http://planning.wealden.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=152593>

The committee complimented the applicant on a well written and comprehensive application. It was agreed this was a well-argued case and the committee wished to support and encourage a genuine and successful agricultural business.

Withyham Parish Council Supports this Application and would request a Section 106 to tie the building.

6.3 WD/2021/1653/F SUMMERSALES HOUSE, SUMMERSALES HILL, LONDON ROAD, CROWBOROUGH, TN6 1UT Description: REAR EXTENSION TO FORM A REAR ENTRANCE PORCH AND THE REMOVAL OF AN EXISTING EXTERNAL CHIMNEY STACK AND INTERNAL CHIMNEY BREASTS (Expiry date for comments: **7th September 2021 extended to the 14th)**

Link to documents on web:

<http://planning.wealden.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=154547>

Although the information provided was limited the committee agreed that this was a suitable application and noted that neighbours would not be affected.

Withyham Parish Council Supports this application

- 6.4 WD/2021/1817/F** BARN ADJACENT TO 1 SCHOOL HILL HOUSE, WITHYHAM ROAD, WITHYHAM, TN7 4BE Description: CHANGE OF USE OF ANCILLARY OUTBUILDING TO RESIDENTIAL DWELLING. (Expiry date for comments: **7th September 2021 extended to the 14th**)

Link to documents on web:

<http://planning.wealden.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=154756>

It was noted that there was no ecology report or traffic report, and both should be requested. The application sits outside of the development boundary so cannot be supported. The effects on the listed building were also not mentioned. The applicant refers to the site as a brown field site which it is not.

Withyham Parish Council objects to this application

- 6.5 WD/2021/1932/F** THE PINES, WITHYHAM ROAD, GROOMBRIDGE, TN3 9QT Description: REMODELLING AND EXTENSIONS TO AN EXISTING BUNGALOW. (Expiry date for comments **14th September 2021**)

Link to documents on web:

<http://planning.wealden.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=154911>

It was noted that this sits very close to the boundary and other properties, although no neighbour comments had been submitted.

Withyham Parish Council Supports this application subject to no neighbour objections.

- 6.6 WD/2021/1822/F** HOADLEYS BARN COTTAGE, HOADLEYS LANE, CROWBOROUGH, TN6 1TH Description: PROPOSED NEW FRONT PORCH AND TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. WITH THE ADDITION OF A NEW PEDESTRIAN ACCESS AND NEW BOUNDARY WALL TOPPED WITH RAILINGS AND IRON GATE. (Expiry date for comments **21st September 2021**)

Link to documents on web:

<http://planning.wealden.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=154761>

Concern was raised regarding the metal railings having a negative effect on the ancient drover's way making it out of keeping. The committee were unable to support in its current form but would be happy to see a resubmission with the railings amended.

Withyham Parish Council Objects to this Application

- 6.7 WD/2021/2010/F** GILLRIDGE FARM OAST, GILLRIDGE LANE, CROWBOROUGH, TN6 1UR Description: CHANGE OF USE FROM GARAGE/STORE TO RESIDENTIAL ANNEXE. (Expiry date for comments **23rd September 2021**)

Link to documents on web:

<http://planning.wealden.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=155008>

Cllr Tarling had declared an interest in this application as he had advised the applicant regarding providing information on the use and a voluntary section 106. He handed Chairing of the meeting to Cllr Pardy as Vice Chair and was not involved in discussions.

The committee felt that the information provided by the application was insufficient to make a decision.

Withyham Parish Council is unable to comment due to limited information but would be happy to reconsider a resubmission.

Cllr Tarling re-joined the meeting and commenced Chairing.

7. APPLICATIONS RECEIVED AFTER AGENDA - None

002136 **RESOLVED** that the observations on the planning issues detailed in these minutes be submitted to the Planning Authority.

8. PLANNING DECISIONS – All Noted

APPROVED

WD/2021/1376/F REPLACEMENT TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO THE NORTH EAST ELEVATION TO INCLUDE A COVERED BALCONY ALONG WITH A PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND A TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION TO THE EXISTING COTTAGE, INCREASE THE ROOF PITCH, EXTERNAL RENDER AND REPLACEMENT WINDOWS. A PROPOSED AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMP AND A DETACHED GARAGE WITH AN OFFICE AND SOLAR PANELS ATTACHED TO THE ROOF. MOTTS HOUSE, MOTTS DOWN, GROOMBRIDGE, TN3 9PB

WD/2021/1477/F SINGLE STOREY PITCHED ROOF SIDE EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING HARD STANDING. 38 BALLS GREEN, WITHYHAM, TN7 4BU

WD/2020/2283/LB PERMISSION TO EXTEND AND ENLARGE EXISTING GROUND FLOOR KITCHEN PARK COTTAGE, PLUMYFEATHER LANE, LYE GREEN, CROWBOROUGH, TN6 1UX

WD/2020/2282/F PERMISSION TO EXTEND AND ENLARGE EXISTING GROUND FLOOR KITCHEN PARK COTTAGE, PLUMYFEATHER LANE, LYE GREEN, CROWBOROUGH, TN6 1UX

WD/2021/1367/F SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR OF TERRACED PROPERTY 7 CORSELEY ROAD, GROOMBRIDGE, TN3 9RH

9. LOCATION OF FUTURE PLANNING MEETINGS

It was noted that the Parish Office would be in use for the month of October making holding of Planning meetings there an issue. It was agreed to hold meetings in the Village Hall if available.

10. MATTERS OF URGENT IMPORTANCE FOR NOTING OR INCLUSION ON A FUTURE AGENDA

The Assistant Clerk was asked to write to Wealden District Council Planning to advise that limited information provided in applications, including drawings often without any measurements, make it extremely difficult for the Committee to make relevant and well considered comments. District Cllr Obbard, who was also in attendance, was asked to consider this. It was felt that the reestablishment of the Design and Access Statement would go a long way to remedy this.

11. DATE OF MEETING

To note that the date of the next meeting is on **Monday 27th September 2021 at 7.00pm** to be held at The Parish Office, Groombridge Old Station, unless otherwise notified by the agenda.

Meeting closed at 8.05pm

Letter 1

We object to this application on the following grounds:

- 1) The applicants have not lived at the property continuously since 2015, as they claim. Since their failed application for holiday accommodation in two tree houses and a nature trail was refused, we have taken a keen interest in what is happening there and frequently walk past the site, finding their occupation of the site is sporadic, at best, and certainly not continuous. We do not believe it has been their permanent place of residence since 2015.
- 2) The site is in the High Weald AONB.
- 3) The site is outside the village boundary as defined in Wealden District Council's Local Plan.
- 4) In the past the site has regularly flooded - the previous owner who kept his horses there once had to be rescued by helicopter. If the buildings are no longer affected by flooding, it raises the question why, since surely the river alongside the land cannot change its course naturally in such a relatively short time.
- 5) According to the planning history, the last application for the site was for holiday accommodation which was refused, so it would appear that the current conversion of the buildings there have been undertaken without any planning permission or building controls.

In addition to our objections above, we would also make the following observations:

- i) we are surprised the consultees do not include the Environment Agency, since the site is in an AONB and very close to a watercourse.
- ii) if the applicants are living there permanently, why is it necessary for a site visit to be arranged through their agent and not the applicants?
- iii) the supporting statement notes the last enforcement officer visit took place in 2014. Why has there not been a subsequent visit since the applicants' claimed occupation since January 2015? If they had been living there permanently, somebody would have notified the enforcement officer, since it would have been quite obvious.

We ask the Planning Committee to consider our comments seriously and object to this application for Lawful Development, since it is anything but.

Letter 2

These photos taken from the roadside show plastic opaque sheeting and unpruned laurel hedging in excess of 3 metres high. This has created a much darker environment reducing overall visibility.





Letter 3

I am writing to express my concern and that of my 4 adult members of our household to this application for a lawful development certificate

As an interested local and member of the tennis club I have been aware of hidden developments slowly taking place on this land.

The land was shielded from the road and security cameras and a guard dog have been present. There has been a graded increase in use over several years but I would suggest insufficient to confirm permanent residence.

Any attempt to view the property has been foiled by the applicant refusing to drive off until the security gates have closed. I have never seen the applicants walking locally.

This is a flood plain and last flooded around the pill box in 2001. Subsequently we have been unable to see the land

to see the degree of flooding. Any flood defences applied by the applicant will worsen the flooding on the neighbouring tennis court.

I feel this land has been developed in an underhand way and this is against legal process. If you want multiple similar

applications (including land neighbouring Upper Tanyard) then you will allow this to be passed. If you want proper

considered development with planning permission then you must ensure refusal by Wealden planning.

Letter 4

If we understand correctly:

A local planning authority can revoke a certificate if a statement was made, or document used, which was false or untrue in any way; or if any information was withheld.

It is an offence to make a false or misleading statement, use false or misleading documentation, or, withhold any material information in order to obtain a certificate. Committing an offence can result in a fine on summary conviction, on indictment, the maximum penalty is 2 years' imprisonment or a fine, or both.

1) Under site description point 2.1 of their application, they mention that the site is "surrounded by dense hedging". They fail to disclose that immediately following planning refusal under WD/2013/0718/F, the applicants erected a high opaque fabric barrier backed by a dense laurel hedge around the perimeter. The original transparent wire gate was replaced with a solid wood affair complete with security camera and a warning that dogs were running loose.

2) Under point 3.2 the applicants mention, "The drying loft however had some time previously been converted to living accommodation by the previous owner and is believed to have been occupied for long periods of time." However, the applicants must be aware this is not correct as the recommendation for refusal of planning WD/2013/0718/F mentions on page 5, "The application states the previous owner of the land occupied the loft, however he camped there occasionally." This can easily be confirmed with neighbours.

3) We note that the applicants were already "subject to unanswered planning contravention notice" in June 2013 (see page 3 Executive Summary of Planning Refusal WD/2013/0718/F). Hence, following the sale of their house in July 2013 and contrary to their sworn statements regarding living in Snodland till January 2015, the applicants were on the site.

4) They claim the last investigation was in 2014, after which, the applicants claim that works to the former drying loft were completed late 2014/early 2015 and they moved into the property 10 January 2015, whereupon it became their sole residence. However, we understand the site was subject to an investigation in 2016 when presumably they did not declare their residence.

5) The applicants claim residence since January 2015 together with supporting documentation, such as telephone/electric bills etc. yet they only include

2 themselves on the electoral register in May 2021, thus the Council were both deceived and deprived of council tax.

6) If the applicants were living with their daughter until January 2015, they would not have needed a separate TV licence dated 18/6/2014 which is listed under the evidence.

The grant of a certificate applies only to the lawfulness of development in accordance with planning legislation. It does not remove the need to comply with any other legal requirements such as the Building Regulations 2010, or the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) or other licensing or permitting schemes.

In addition to the above:

- 1) On page 6 of the officer's recommendation for planning refusal WD/2013/0718/F, the East Sussex County Council Archaeology Unit mentions the rare Type 28 pillbox which currently has a drying room constructed on top of it. "Although the application appears to comprise minimal ground works, there will be an impact to the pillbox. Archaeological recording will be required." We see from the photographs accompanying the application, the pillbox has been degraded externally with timber cladding and internally converted to a boiler room and should be reinstated to original.
- 2) Although the site is subject to regular flooding, we understand Upper Medway Internal Drainage Board does not condone measures which impede the flow.
- 3) Being in a zone 1 for water extraction, the Environmental Agency should have been consulted regarding foul water disposal.

Letter 5

I wish to object to this development.

Whether the development is within an AONB or a flood area is one matter, however the Building Development on this site has taken place without Planning Consent or Building Control.

The Site has been screened from the road and other publicly accessible areas by green plastic sheeting and dense hedging to stop residents and Council Officials from seeing into the entire area thus preventing any inspection.

The '4 Year Rule relating to the Certificate of Lawful Development for which the Applicant is applying is invalid if there has been any concealment of the development which prevents residents and Council Authorities from seeing into the area, thus not enabling action to be taken.

This is an unlawful development built on a deception to the local authority and to residents. If this is allowed, then all residents would be able to bypass Planning Rules

Letter 6

In recent years there has been a lot of attempts to develop in the Tanyard area, too many to mention here. We feel that this unique valley of the Eridge stream and sandstone outcrops must be protected.

We object to the granting of a Lawful Development Certificate on the following grounds:

1. As the planning history shows, there has been no permission granted for habitable use of any of the buildings on the site. There has been no approval for change of use of these buildings, therefore any permanent occupation is a breach of planning law.
2. As the site is situated on a flood plain which is flooding with increased regularity, we do not feel it appropriate to allow permission for a habitable dwelling without consulting the Environment Agency on matters such as public safety, sewage disposal and pollution etc. There is a photograph of the previous owner being airlifted to safety by helicopter during a serious flood.

3. As the site is in an AONB and outside the village development boundary we believe no application should be considered without having first commissioned a bio diversity survey as was the case for the Tennis Club next door.
 4. Having been refused planning permission in 2013, an opaque plastic screen and laurel hedging was installed behind the existing deciduous hedgerow. This meant that the previous view into the site was now prevented. We believe the erection of this barrier and its ongoing effect has meant that residents and the public could not inform the council of any noticeable concerns they may have had as regards habitation or development, thus removing our right to be represented by the planning authorities. We believe that the screening and its ongoing effect coupled with the simultaneous breaching of planning law continuing on the site constitutes deliberate concealment.
 5. We believe the time limits imposed under the 4 year rule to which the applicant refers can be challenged by the use of an enforcement order according to the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 where there is a case of deliberate concealment.
 6. Despite the applicant stating that they have been in permanent residence over 4 years, as the solid high gates that the applicant installed are always closed when we pass by, which is pretty much on a daily basis, we are prevented from seeing evidence of occupancy.
 7. If permission is granted in this case, it would allow the new owner of the adjacent land which has been recently landscaped, and any other prospective developers to use precedent in any future planning applications.
- We hope our comments are helpful and will be taken into consideration.

Letter 7

We wish to object to the above application, for the following reasons:

The site is within the High Weald Designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is outside the Groombridge Boundary according to the Local Councils Plan.

The land is in a natural flood plain and, during our 23 years living locally and using the Tanyard road on a daily basis, we have seen the impact of consistent and heavy rain, which appears to be occurring with increasing frequency. Presumably the site must flood unless the owners have made adjustments to the adjoining river, in contravention of the Environment Agency rules.

On purchasing the land the owners erected screening which prevents anyone from seeing in. The Statutory Declarations of residency provided by the owners are tenuous proof to say the least. That they were all witnessed by a solicitor at the same time appears to be rather questionable.

As members of the adjoining tennis club, we were under the impression that the owners were using the land and staying the night only "occasionally".

We have recently become aware of the intricacies of the Lawful Development rules and feel strongly that the owners have undoubtedly concealed the development of the land, thus preventing any of the general public or authorities from observing any changes to the property.

Having personally made applications to Wealden Council to make alterations to our own property, it is especially galling that the owners of Upper Tanyard do not feel that the regulations apply to themselves. We have found the local authorities both helpful and consistent within their systems and we hope that both Withyham Parish and Wealden Council will reject the application. If the application is granted permission, we feel it would make a mockery of the local Planning rules, which the vast majority of people adhere to. If the application is rejected, it will deter local residents from developing their properties without going through the official procedures.

Letter 8

I wish to object to the above application for the following reasons:-

1. Following the refusal for planning permission to build two tree lodge holiday units, jacuzzi, use of second stable for associated equipment store, addition of a welcome room, car park and nature trail, shouldn't the land legally be an equestrian paddock and stables as outlined in their initial 2013 application.
2. The pictures and documentation attached to their current application clearly show that building works have been undertaken without any building applications/approvals and consents. This has therefore set a precedent for other individuals within the area to carry out works without these consents etc.
3. Given that the area is on the flood plain, it is flooding with more regularity. Any change of ownership resulting in a residential dwelling would place the occupants in danger.
4. The large high gates and surrounding green plastic screening restricts observation and prevents officials from carrying out any legal inspections.
5. The documents attached do not provide clear evidence that the applicants have been living on the land. The utility bills attached have been heavily redacted and the usages are not shown as it could be the case that only nominal charges have been levied.
6. The statutory declarations submitted by the applicants in support of their application is requesting the planning authority to accept their evidence as true for the purposes of satisfying some legal requirement when no other evidence is available. However, in 2015 when they say they took up residence, the full planning history was available to them so they must have known that they were wilfully contravening planning law by residing there. This seems contradictory.

Letter 9

Upper Tanyard – WD/2021/2114/LDE

We wish to object to the above Application for the following reasons:

1. The area is within the High Weald Designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
2. The Site is outside the Village Boundary as stated in Wealden District Councils Local Plan which I believe is still in force.
3. The Land where the unlawful development has taken place along with the whole of The Tanyard is on a flood plain, which in recent years has flooded with increasing regularity. This makes it totally unsuitable for habitation unless of course the applicant has built a bund or retaining wall alongside the adjoining river bank which would be in contravention of the Environment Agency. I have photographic evidence of flooding which occurred both in recent years and around 2000 when the entire site was under water.
4. Any Building Development on this site has taken place without Planning Consent or Building Control. By what means is any sewerage being disposed of bearing in mind it is on a flood plain.
5. The Site has been screened from the road and other publicly accessible areas by green plastic sheeting and dense hedging to stop residents and Council Officials from seeing into the entire area thus preventing any inspection.
6. The Documentation providing evidence of Permanent Occupation is at least questionable. Two declarations from Tradesmen that they have visited and worked on plumbing and electrical installations over the years does not constitute proof of uninterrupted permanent habitation since 2015. Neither do invoices from Electricity, Water and other suppliers whose services are certainly on site but again do not constitute proof of continuous permanent residential use.
7. Whilst it is true the Applicants are frequent visitors to the Site they have always implied to us that they use the land for Recreational purposes, certainly staying overnight on many occasions judging by the light we can see from our property but have NOT lived there permanently for the last 4 years or more.

8. Finally, having done some research into the little known 4 Year Rule relating to the Certificate of Lawful Development for which the Applicant is applying it seems that it may not be permissible for two reasons:

- a. As the Site is in an AONB where Special Conditions apply.
- b. If there has been any concealment of the development which prevents residents and Council Authorities from seeing into the area, thus not enabling action to be taken.

This, in our opinion is far from being a Lawful Development but a calculated attempt to deceive both the Local Authorities and Residents by bypassing the Planning Rules and if allowed would set a dangerous precedent in the area and indeed makes a mockery of the The Local Planning Regulations.

Letter 10

We object to the proposal for the following reasons:

1. The building is in a flood plain and has flooded during the time we have lived here (since 1998). It therefore seems rather unwise to use this barn as residential housing.
2. The whole area is an AONB. For example, the tennis club which is next door to this potential development, has had applications rejected for various reasons including light pollution which would be an obvious issue with any residential housing. Equally the recent work on the train embankment was delayed due to potential damage to the eco system for great crested newts.
3. It would appear from the documents submitted that the building has been used as a dwelling in spite of this being contrary to regulation.

Letter 11

We are writing to object to the planning application WD/2021/2114/LDE.

We have reviewed the 5 Statutory Declarations which raise a series of fundamental concerns and questions:

1. The land and buildings have never been classified for dwelling purposes and it was our understanding that the stables and drying store were being used by the purchaser for recreational purposes at weekends and holidays only.

This was clear from initial sale and purchase of the land and buildings to Mr Lovell and reinforced by the subsequent failed planning application WD/2013/0718F. How is it that works have subsequently been carried out to complete a residence disregarding all planning regulations?

2. The Statutory Declarations supporting the application have been signed by 3 members of the Lovell family and two paid contractors none of whom live within or are engaged with members of the local community.
3. We are concerned about the secret and unspecified works that have been carried out by the Heating and Plumbing Engineer and the Electrical Services Company presumably in contravention of current planning or building regulations and with no consideration for any due process. In addition, what provision has been made for sewage treatment given the proximity of the property to the Eridge Stream. Does this fall within the General Binding Rules relating to domestic sewage treatment?

4. Given this is a designated area of outstanding natural beauty development applications have to undertake careful and detailed ecology reports relating to the sensitive nature of the area, eg works to the nearby railway cutting under the Corseley Road bridge were subsequently suspended for six months. This is another concern.

5, The flooding at the adjoining Tanyard Sports Ground and Tennis Club is a significant issue particularly in recent years, How can the land and buildings not have been flooded in the same way as both used to flood at the same time?

End of Appendix