For official use only (date received): 21/10/2020 16:51:46

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/L1765/C/20/3256531

DETAILS OF THE CASE	
Appeal Reference	APP/L1765/C/20/3256531
Appeal By	MR NICHOLAS BUTLER
Site Address	Land North of Dradfield Lane Dradfield Lane Soberton Hants SO32 3QD
SENDER DETAILS	
Name	MR HUGH PRINGLE
Address	The Arc Armsworth Lane Soberton SOUTHAMPTON SO32 3RE
ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS	
In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case? Appellant	
☐ Agent ☑ Interested Party / Person ☐ Land Owner ☐ Rule 6 (6)	
What kind of representation are you making?	
 □ Final Comments □ Proof of Evidence □ Statement □ Statement of Common Ground ☑ Interested Party/Person Correspondence 	
□ Other	

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

I submitted objections to the original retrospective planning application and am of the opinion that the local authority reached the correct decision. I wish my original objections to be reconsidered in the appeal process. Nothing has changed to warrant that decision being overruled and the appeal granted. The original application was to justify development of agricultural land with no link to any existing development by allowing the installation of gates suitable for a vulnerable city site where trespass and worse might be expected. The appellant Mr Butler made clear in comments said publicly that he had no time for planning process- demonstrated by his installation of the gates and the destruction and uprooting of several metresof country hedging either side- before being forced to make a planning application through threat of enforcement. His scheme is totally at odds with the locality and remains unacceptable in a rural, agricultural area.

This appeal should be refused and the land returned to it s original character.