

16th May 2022

A/74/22/PL

Dappers Yard, Barn Farm, Dappers Lane, Angmering BN16 4EN

This application seeks approval to install a new mobile home on the site of Dappers Yard, Barn Farm in order to provide a *“management residence”* or *“to provide overnight attendance for management”* due to the *“remote location”* of the site and *“ongoing site security issues”*. I wish to register an objection to this application for the following reasons.

The application states that the site currently provides an open space for commercial car sales. Research into the site's history over the past few years (registered businesses, previous planning applications regarding site usage and actual usage – see 1,2,3, below) reveals a constantly changing and at times confusing picture which is relevant to this Application.

1 Registered businesses

In 2018 – 2019 there appear to have been two businesses registered at Dappers Yard – one described as *“Development of building projects & other building completion & finishing”* - (business incorporated 13/8/18 and dissolved 3/12/19), and one *“Sale of other motor vehicles”* – (business incorporated 2/7/18 and dissolved 26/11/19).

2 Planning application history

- In 2016 planning approval was given for the site to be used for B8 storage and distribution.
- In 2017 Planning Application A/142/17/PL sought approval for a change of use from B8 storage and distribution to use as a car sales yard. On 8 August 2018 temporary approval (apparently lasting up to 31 July 2021) was granted for the site to be used for car sales. The reason given for making this a temporary approval was to allow the Local Planning Authority to monitor the impact of the development.
- No other applications appear to have been submitted regarding the approved usage of the site.

3 Actual site usage

- For a significant time prior to the submission of Application A/142/17/PL in July 2017 (seeking approval for change of use to a car sales site), Dappers Yard had already been used for car sales by a business established in April 2016 and which was dissolved in October 2019. This car sales usage continued while the retrospective Planning Application for change of use was being processed and after the temporary change of use was granted on 8 August 2018. Around the time of this temporary approval both the businesses referred to in 1 above were evidently incorporated by the site owner.
- In 2019 the car sales business activity at Dappers Yard ceased (and the *“sale of other motor vehicles”* business (see 1 above) was evidently dissolved in November of that year). Early in 2020 while talking to someone who was having building work carried out, I became aware that the local independent building company which was undertaking the work was at that time operating out of Dappers Yard. This building company remained at Dappers Yard until around mid-2021. This period appears to have been during the temporary approval that covered change of use of those premises to car sales, and not for building projects.
- Since then, there appears to have been no business usage at the site.

As shown above, the history of this site over recent years and its actual usage appear to be erratic and confusing and give rise to a number of questions. My reasons for objection includes the following.

- The application states that *“The site provides an open space for commercial car sales”*. No company name/business registration number is shown on the application to clarify what business or type of business will actually occupy the site. From the recent planning application history, it is unclear what is the current approved usage. If the temporary approval for car sales did expire at the end of July 2021, did the approved usage automatically revert to storage and distribution? And did the Local Planning Authority in fact monitor the impact of the period of car sales usage, and if so, what conclusions were reached?

- The reason given for apparently needing a “*management residence*” to be installed on what is a small business site is due to it being in “*a remote location and ongoing issues with site security*”. Having lived within some 40 metres of Dappers Yard for many years, it is self-evident that while the upper section of Dappers Lane is rural/semi-rural in nature, it cannot in any way be described as a remote location. Three further properties are sited even closer than mine to Dappers Yard, one of which also shares a border with the area in question.
- There is no information given in the application to support the claim that there are ongoing security issues. The site is enclosed and protected by a high close boarded fence. If there have indeed been break ins or attempted break ins then it is reasonable to expect such things to have been reported to the police, in which case incident numbers would have been issued and these could then have been quoted in the application to support and justify its “*ongoing issues with site security*” claim.
- If the purpose of this mobile home is solely “*to provide overnight attendance for management*” in a bid to improve site security, why is it necessary to provide accommodation with two bedrooms?
- If there is a genuine need to improve the site security then, especially for a small site of this nature, there have to be a great many other possible options (installing security lighting, CCTV, alarms, barriers etc) other than creating a so called “*management residence*”.
- The submitted plans show a structure which does not in any way appear to be mobile but is intended to be built and/or converted on site, as opposed to a normal imported ready-made mobile home built off-site and delivered as a finished product.
- Within the Application there are two different phrases quoted, i.e. “*management residence*” and “*to provide overnight attendance for management*”. Presumably they both have the meaning of providing additional security at night only?

SUMMARY

The recent chequered history of this site, the uncertainty as to exactly what business would operate from it, the lack of any evidence to support the claim that there are ongoing security issues and the rather strange proposed solution of installing a ‘*management residence*’ instead of the more normal processes for adequately securing a relatively small area, all lead to concern that the main purpose of this current Planning Application could be to achieve the first step along a route to eventually obtain approval for a change of use for a permanent dwelling.

If this application were to be approved, it is imperative that in order to comply with the applicant’s statement that the mobile home is purely to “*provide overnight attendance for management*” there should be a condition to ensure that any person who stays overnight in the mobile home is categorically limited to someone employed by the (as yet undefined) business which is operating at Dappers Yard at that time, and that it cannot be used by anyone as a residence (whether temporary or permanent) as opposed to the stated purpose of occupying it overnight for security purposes.

John Adams