




From: Abi Hudlass-Galley [REDACTED]
Sent: 24 November 2019 16:29
To: Planning <Planning@arun.gov.uk>
Subject: Object P/19/110/CLP

Dear Mr Davis

Yet again the applicant is trying to mislead the planners, Parish Council, residents and general public with these misleading applications.

I have been through the design and access statement and found many anomalies, which I am sure your legal department will pick up on. However I will list the highlights that make all three of these applications for Certificates of Lawfulness Illegal.

This is an application for a Seasonal Workers Hub. In one sentence they say multiple sites in another just working on the one site.

The staffing figures are fictitious and they have provided no basis of proof. They even cut and pasted between applications the staff numbers - these same number of staff produce vastly different numbers of plant trays each season. From less than a million one season to just less than 7 million another and yet still using the same number of staff! One might be lead to believe these figures have been plucked out of the air!

In point 2, they say The Same Occupation is not clearly defined in the 1960 or 1990 Act and yet have gone with the fact that ownership of land, occupants and accommodation do not have to be linked. That multiple sites within the same occupation undertaken by the same business (Proforce or Newey) may be considered within the same occupation! Yet have provided no case history where this has been so. Basically laying down the ground rules for a hub!

As we know, from the start of their applications (P/38/19/PL and P/78/19/CLP for which there were 105 objections including Parish councils) their Intension has been to retain year round use as a workers Village. Originally they went for the full year, then withdrew, next a certificate of lawfulness for ten months which had it been granted would have been followed by an extension of two months to retain empty vans, which they believed would be granted as seemingly not unreasonable once they had 10 months. This time they are going for 11 months use, not moving a single van until every van is unoccupied, and then only moving the vans off the site when 'reasonable and practical' in DECEMBER! Well I think we all know what that means. December will never be a reasonable and practical month to move 31 large mobile home Caravans. Should residents fight for this month, before it has even come to the top of the Planning Enforcement list the month would be up and the seasons would begin again. Therefore they are bamboozling the Council to certify an illegal intention of a year round caravan site - A Seasonal Workers Hub or as Pro-Force call it on their website, a Workers Village.

I appreciate budgets are small, but this needs to be rejected. I am very happy to attend the Planning Committee meeting (and discuss the many other misleading details I have found) which I fully assume this application will be forwarded to.

Many thanks

Abi Hudlass-Galley