

Butterlees Barn  
Pagham Road  
Lagness  
PO20 1LL

BY EMAIL

27<sup>th</sup> November 2019

**Reference: P/19/110/CLP**

Dear Mr Davis,

Please accept this letter as my formal objection to the above application.

I strongly object to these three linked applications, on the grounds that they are simply unlawful under permitted development.

The outcome – if a certificate of lawfulness should be granted – would, in no doubt, be a permanent caravan site with permanent infrastructure, bussing workers all over Sussex. It would lie within the curtilage of residential property, ruining the homes and lives of local residents, endangering them and road users to a significant degree. This is a back-door attempt at getting such a workers' site under the radar of local planning, circumventing due process, disclosure and scrutiny.

The questionable definition of the applicant's overlapping seasons means there is just a single month – December – during which the caravans and all infrastructure would be required to be removed from the site, returning it to its pre-development state, as soon as is reasonably practicable. If any year is like our current winter, the wet and muddy nature of the surrounding fields and the land in question means this wouldn't be practicable, and the caravans and infrastructure would stay. This is no doubt the intention of the applicant, to rely on this clause, and maintain a permanent workers' village on this thin strip of land so close to the current residents. It is a deceitful way to try and usher this through under the nose of Arun planning, with no respect for the proper due process or the planning office itself.

I have confidence that the Council and the planning team in particular will not allow themselves to be deceived by the nature of these applications, that they will see through this charade, and not allow the wool to be pulled over their eyes – be that in the form they are presented in, or the blatant untruths that litter the application documentation.

There is a reason that the applicant has decided to pursue this – multiple times – via permitted development rather than a full planning application. The scrutiny and consultation that a full application would entail would certainly call into serious question any approval. And the applicant knows this. They are therefore trying to circumvent this, making a mockery of local planning regulations and policy.

If the applicant themselves are afraid that this would not pass a full planning application, then this can certainly not be allowed to pass the lower threshold as a permitted development.

Finally, it would be remiss of me not to call out the potential impact to life that approval of this would entail. If this were to be approved, Arun Council would be tacitly sanctioning the regular use – in the light and in the dark – of large groups of pedestrians on an incredibly busy and accident-prone

road, as they attempt to reach local facilities. Up to 180 people on this isolated site, with no access to proper facilities, will of course seek entertainment, sustenance and provisions outside the site. The only way is via a fast, unlit road, with no pavement – not even any side embankment – to walk on. Pedestrians – perhaps in groups – will be hit by fast moving vehicles. It's just question of when and to what tragic end.

Please don't let these applications make a mockery of our planning laws. Don't let yourselves be deceived by the form of this application. Stand up for the authority of the planning office, and what that means for the protection of local residents and the unique character of our part of the country.

Yours,

Dr. Ed Simpson