

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 BEN PEARCE

Address
Tiggers Pond Church Road
Newtown
FAREHAM
PO17 6LE

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

After reading the Planning, Design And Access Statement (PDAS) and subsequent appeal forms submitted there are many mistruths I hope the authors/landowners intention is not to mislead anyone reading the document into the environmental impact of the work completed and the future intentions for the site. I will highlight a small number:

Appeal forms - The use of the trailer and shipping container are not used for agricultural reasons. the container contains building tools which have been used in the destruction of the site, hedgerows and erection of fencing without planning. the trailer is empty and has been documented by the applicant as his next tiny house conversion project. he has clearly stated he will be bringing up to 10 trailers on site to convert into homes to rent out and live in himself. this was publicised by the applicant on his social media channels.

PDAS 3, Relevant planning history - none. Incorrect, the site has recently had a planning application for 2x barns to be constructed. - ref. 20/00117/FUL

PDAS 5.2 & 7.1, states the hardcore and replacement pipes would be allowed under PD according to Schedule 2, Part 6, Class B of the GPDO. I would suggest that Schedule 2, Part 6, Class B.1 (b) of the GPDO is reviewed. B.1 Development is not permitted by Class B if- (b)the external appearance of the premises would be materially affected; I think it is safe to say the appearance has been greatly affected by the large hardstanding areas. Any reference to PD on this land should be disregarded from the PDAS regarding the hardstanding inside the gates. Furthermore, the size of this area should be published as I believe it falls outside the stipulated square meterage to be included as permitted development removing any ambiguity.

PDAS 6.2/8, the gates are not in keeping with the rural character. Planning has stipulated the use of open fencing on several occasions in recent planning applications. There are no other comparable gates on Dradfield lane or anywhere in the local area which match either, width, height or style.

PDAS 6.4, The gates are of a good low key design, appropriate to a rural setting. Incorrect, they are as low key as a battleship. They detract from the rural setting.

PDAS 6.10, the retrospective access works have not affected trees, hedges, or ecology on site. - complete mistruth. The hedges have been scrubbed out around the entire site to give more space inside the field. This was carried out during nesting season on the guise of removing brambles which would not exonerate the applicant. If the applicant was removing brambles, he would have seen fit to remove them from both sides of the hedge (Dradfield lane side and his field side) and not hack away at the hedge with a digger. Finally, a significant amount of hedgerow was removed, and all waste burnt on site.

PDAS 8.1, the scale of the gates are completely out of character, there are no matching examples anywhere in the area. There were never any issues with entering or leaving the site historically and no one had a low speed collision with farm machinery at this junction. If as stated (2.3) the trailer and container are for security of agricultural holding, is this not security enough? I would think a giant steel box is tougher than a pair of gates?

PDAS 10.1, sustainability, again we are told that national and local planning policies encourage new developments to be sustainable, is this really a new development or more likely the precursor to one? The location, method of construction and ecology has all been disregarded in this unlawful development. The storage of hay on site would need to be driven into the site as the site cannot sustain its own hay due to the waterlogged nature of the field. All talk of sustainability in the PDAS should be disregarded.

Mr Butler has stated to me in person that he has not spent 150k on a field to graze animals and intends to use the site for financial gain by adding 'tiny houses'. On further questioning 'tiny houses' are converted articulated lorry trailers which can include up to 4 bedrooms. He stated he would be living on site in one and he would rent the others out. From Mr Butlers social media posts, he has indicated he would look to add around 10 trailers. These gates are undoubtedly a precursor to this.

PDAS 9, it's the countryside, mud does get on the road occasionally. If the applicant is averse to a bit of mud I would suggest a nice town house in a more urban setting.

What has been placed on the land is of a very low quality in design, material and finish, the applicant has already run water piping and large black conduit with rope through to enable further services to be pulled into place at multiple points in the field.

The PDAS appears to carry the weight of a much larger application than the one submitted. The precedent that any approval on this site would set would be of a great detriment not just to one small village community but a much wider area. If development of this site is allowed in this manner what stops a land grab and retrospective applications for trailers all over the county. If we are looking only at a pair of gates which are unsuitable for the location, a hard standing which is much too large for any agricultural requirement and a concrete apron leading to a narrow country lane we should ignore the incorrect and unquantifiable detail of the PDAS and judge this retrospective application for what it is, a precursor to further work, an illegal development and ecological and social disaster.