

9he Potting Barn,
No.5, Hobbs Court
Bilsham Rd.,
Yapton,
West Sussex, BN18 OJY

Nov. 29th 2021

To: Amber Willard Planning Officer Arun District Council

Dear Ms Willard,

I am writing in response to the application to Y/154/21/HH and Y155/21/HH, in relation to a proposed alteration to an outbuilding for accommodation for an annex, to Hobbs Farmhouse, Bilsham Rd., Yapton, West Sussex, BN18 OJY.

Your records will confirm, that approx. 3 years ago when this application was first submitted, I felt able to be in support of it. Attendant matters that have come to the fore intervening, mean that I am no longer able to be in support of it anymore.

I am grateful for the opportunity to assess the *present* situation. My comments and objections in respect of the proposal are as indicated:-

General

It is understood that the reason for a planning application to be publicised is as follows: That the details surrounding it for review, are accurate, relevant and correctly represented, as those aspects form the parameters on which any ultimate planning decision is based. It is a concern and objection that some of those in this application are allegedly misleading, inaccurate, absent, or insufficient in detail.

1.The Block Plan agent's submission :

- a) The block plan submitted is outdated, (allegedly approx.15years) and not allegedly representational, of the area around the Farmhouse and Hobbs Court as it is today. Also, in relation to existing neighbouring properties, in context and setting, and giving an allegedly misleading impression instead.
- b) It is also unexplained, why such an outdated block plan would be submitted with the proposal, allegedly indicating that it is current when it is not. It is representational of the pre- development of Hobbs Court and surrounds instead. Up- to- date and confirming details are understood to be readily available from Land Registry and deeds. (O.S not always current).
- c) It is observed that my own property is indicated in the plan merely as '5,'and shown in its pre-development stage footprint. At that time, it was a lean- to derelict pigsty in a field. The plan presented, indicated this is still its present status, and as if not relevant, regarding the present proposal in result. As records will confirm, it was converted to an 'L' shaped domestic dwelling and purchased in March 016.

d) Also noted by way of alleged exclusion now, the absence of its proper name and present status as, 'The Potting Barn', and as if not included in Hobbs Court at all at this time (the other properties are all named and recognised in the plan). By way of correction, my property is confirmed as being part of Hobbs Court for approx. 5 and a half years. It is also noted that Hobbs Court also stretches North as well as to the West to include it, but as only referred to in the latter way in the proposal details.

Also absent from the block plan and in Hobbs Court, is the additional new build 5 bay garage block also constructed at the time of the development of the site and should be shown adjacent to the long side of the 'L'-shape of my property. If any form of 'setting,' is submitted in details of Hobbs Court, it would seem necessary for it to be fully representational of the present.

e) In the area shown above Dovecote in the plan it states, 'Hobbs Court', as if in the 'grounds' of the Farmhouse, which is incorrect. Hobbs Court is in the area to the West and North and where the other properties are named. The 'driveway' in the plan is also incorrectly configured and allegedly appearing to indicate that it goes into the Farmhouse land but the former no longer exists in that location.

f) Also, please be advised that my own property is not Grade II listed and neither is the garage block, although this is not made clear in the submitted details.

g) Towards the Southeast of the block plan, outbuildings are indicated. Excluded from the block plan, but also present, and not far from the large modern barn, which is referenced to the East of the proposed annex, is a *further* outbuilding to the East, of which more details, later in this document.

f) Also in the block plan, is a definitive blue line, which passes '5' as indicated, and goes further North and then turns to the Northeast. *It is advised that this is the boundary between my own property and that of the Farmhouse.*

g) Also, that the Farmhouse is not allegedly as described, as a stand- alone detached property, it is allegedly joined to an end wall of Dovecote as able to be seen from Hobbs Court's communal driveway.

h) It would appear to be an unfortunate omission to allegedly discount an immediate neighbour to the Farmhouse, both in terms of domestic property and boundary as indicated above. Also because of proximity to the proposed annex, to allegedly be most likely to be affected by the proposal. Also, by any other changes in connection with the Farmhouse and its surroundings over time, but which may also reflect on the proposal now for the annex and any objection to the proposal for it.

2. Photographs

a) The front elevation photographs submitted of the Farmhouse are also allegedly 'historic', (from approx. 30 years ago), and not representational of its present status, which is substantially altered in external view since then. There were no recent photographs of the front elevation and surrounds of it, allegedly unavailable on the website.

b) Not apparently included with those details, was any reference to the existence of a large duck pond to the front of the Farmhouse, which has also been in existence for approx. 30 years which was allegedly created subsequently to the photograph. It was not possible to access any Ecology Survey details with the proposal in respect of the pond, and surrounding area (only allegedly mention of bats) or in relation to flora and fauna in connection with it.

Also, not apparently considered, as to how any proposed building activity or any works vehicles may affect the ducks during the breeding and nesting seasons especially, also at other times during any building process. IF not already attended to, it is suggested that such a survey is undertaken of that area in connection with the proposal and any remedial action taken in result of any proposed works and ecological investigation as necessary.

c) Although other farm buildings are shown in accompanying photographs, ie., the large modern barn, there is apparently one notable absence. Adjacent to the Farmhouse and the barn although not identified in the plan as stated, but behind it and perhaps otherwise out of sight from that location, is a white rendered outbuilding, which is clearly visible from my own property.

d) ((From my property, I am able to see in location, (apart from the Farmhouse more distantly behind), the existing outbuilding intended as annex, (but currently largely screened by a high hedge) the front elevation of the large modern barn, and to one side of it the rendered white building, which was not in the same form of domestic use as presently, when I purchased my property in 016 or allegedly when the first proposal was put forward for the annex in 018)). Item 2 is raised as an objection as not representational of the present situation as stated.

3. The CIL

a) I understand that this is a declaration in respect of an exemption for property owners living in a property that they are intending to build on their land for their specific accommodation and personal use only, (for 3 years). Not for the use of others, or for rental during that time. It allegedly indicates only *one* domestic property being involved on the site in connection with the CIL.

b) It is requested that if the proposal is approved, that there is a condition, that the annex is not to be used for rental subsequently at all, unless a formal application is made to do so after the 3year period, (because of the Gradell listing aspect and environment).

c)The proposal indicated that the annex was the only property addition for domestic use in the location, but unless otherwise confirmed, it would appear to be the second.

d) It is a concern how an *additional* 'domestic' property (not confirmed as allegedly having planning consents as stated, and already in existence and in use on the site), may affect such an application and CIL exemption in outcome.

e) Also not apparently considered, is that for future use (after 3 years) that there would be increased vehicular traffic anticipated, either from other occupants or rental

of the annex. This is also a consideration in respect of any additional traffic to Bilsham Rd. in the same way as it was raised with the recent Hyam's proposal that was rejected.

f) Also a consideration, but not explained at this time, what is intended to happen to the Farmhouse over the next 3 years in relation to its use if the proposal for the annex goes forward. If it is intended to be rented as an outcome, that would appear to be a change of use and a possible complication also regarding item 6 and possible other planning restrictions.

4. The white building adjacent to the modern barn not as otherwise referred to in the submitted details

a) It is located to the East of the modern barn but not shown in any details submitted.

b) Other properties have been included and detailed as part of the location and site, but not the white one. I object on the basis that this factor does not appear to have received consideration in the same way as elsewhere in the location under review, and as part of the whole Grade II setting and as part of the application details.

c) It has allegedly received some structural alterations in the last approximately 2 years and other remedial work, including the insertion of 2 large picture windows, to the Northern elevation of it, overlooking my property. The building is observed as having been used for domestic purposes. It is also understood to have its own water and electricity supply allegedly 'tapped off' from the large barn adjacent. There is also no indication able to be found that the inclusion of those services/additions, are compliant with Building Regulations.

Although not over large, it is also of concern that allegedly, the white property could be made as a permanent habitation with little further addition (Saniflow).

e) It has also not been possible to confirm, that any form of planning or listed building consent was obtained for any alterations or inclusions to that building. Perhaps an additional planning application is required at this time for its present and future use, or confirmation that one exists, to encompass any such more recent changes.

As this is allegedly another building already used domestically on the site but not mentioned/included otherwise, in any photographs, text or plan, regarding its presence or use, it is included with my objection. It is allegedly in the curtilage of the Farmhouse (and in proximity anyway) and may have a bearing on the 'development' of the area, as within the setting of a listed building and in connection with the proposed annex additionally.

Commented [dl1]:

5. The plans of the property as submitted.

a) It is observed that they are somewhat sparse in content and context, and more in the nature as anticipated for outline planning, rather than for full planning approval as understood requested now. The 'scale' indicated does not assist with actual measurements which could easily be added so that the exact size of the proposed annex can be seen at a glance. It is not anticipated that it should have to be 'worked out' otherwise.

b) Externally:

There is allegedly no plan as available to view on the website containing any notable existing features in connection with the whole surrounds to the proposed annex. Or whether they are indicated to remain or to be removed. Such features allegedly omitted as to intended outcome for them include: old walls and a decorative permanent brick feature, (why is a historic roundel intended to be removed apparently without reason from a Gradell listed area?), existing mature trees and shrubs and a screening hedge.

c) The proposal does not show or refer to the present or proposed immediate *setting* of the annex at this time, in relation to the neighbouring farm buildings, in that location and Farmhouse. A further plan to the proposal in respect of this is suggested for review as it is allegedly impossible to ascertain what such intentions are from the details submitted in that respect.

d) Without, it indicates that if any approval were granted that there would be no restriction at all as to what would be the intended outcome for the surrounding area, in respect of either existing or additional features. For example, an indicative car is shown, but there is no provision indicated as to whether there is to be hard- standing for parking, area size, or composition. It is also unclear whether the metal roof section is intended as formally to be a 'garage'/carport in its final outcome, or a store. Flower beds, trees, shrubs and grassed areas or other intended landscaping are not indicated as for the future, or those that are present in the vicinity, rather than as 'indicative' trees for example.

e) As it stands, it appears to be left 'open ended' regarding such details and actions, unless there is some indication on any future plans regarding intentions for that area of the site and as Gradell listed, and so that any approvals or objections can be lodged regarding them if necessary.

f) Presently there is a beech hedge screening the existing outbuilding structure from view from my property. Full height windows/doors are shown to the Northern elevation of the annex and facing my property. There is no indication that the existing beech hedge is intended to remain as screening. It is requested that it is required to remain, if the proposal is to be approved otherwise.

g) Any windows/ glass doors in a Northern elevation would impact on my property and privacy. It would be significantly exposed by any such addition without constraint otherwise from its present status. I.e., the retention of the beech hedge in front of them to obviate this.

h) Forward to the proposed annex is currently a large area of lawn, (also not identified) which is assumed would be the intended 'outlook' from the annex if windows were intended to be added without screening as advised.

i) Because the Farmhouse is the main living accommodation currently, and has alternative garden space, this (new) area is presently seldom used, but this is likely to change if the annex is to become full-time living accommodation.

j) The boundary fence is currently only post and rail to the East and North of my garden and to that of the Farmhouse. I have instigated 'planting' for some privacy over the years, but it is not reciprocal to the Farmhouse side in the same way. This would be considered completely insufficient unless some form of remedial addition was in place.

k) If the hedge is *approved* to be removed specifically, then It is suggested as a condition to the application, for a 1.8m close boarded fence to be installed to cover the complete length of the boundary to my property from South to North and also across the area of my orchard to the North and Northeast. (See blue boundary in the proposal).

It is requested as a condition that the post and rail is replaced by said fence by the applicant at their costs and installation. I would not be in support of any financial contribution for myself, because the annex and any 'change' by way pf the proposal application is not of my intention otherwise.

l) It is recalled from an earlier time that the applicant requested me to retain the openness of the two properties especially in the North and Northeast, in order to see the donkey field and the animals contained therein, beyond and across from my property in order to do so. I complied with this request, but now the parameters are intended to be different, and the donkeys are deceased. Occasional opportunity to view being entirely different from daily and ever- present garden activities and a total lack of privacy and security, and as there has already allegedly been unauthorised access into my property because of the post and rail in the past.

m) The proposed positioning of the annex, and in respect of the garden area, would mean that without such fencing it would be possible to stand in the annex garden, and look directly into all the living accommodation of my property including the master bedroom and the whole of the rest of the garden too.

n) It is also observed that without this and from my own garden and orchard I would also be able to see into the main living area of the annex.

6.Wastewater and Sewerage from Hobbs Farmhouse into Hobbs Court

a) This aspect has not apparently been addressed in the proposal and application. It is considered important because the wastewater from Hobbs Farmhouse is part of a combined system and pump with that of Hobbs Court. It was not an issue 3 years ago at the time of the earlier proposal as is later explained.

b) The wastewater pipes are from all 5 properties at Hobbs Court, *and one from Hobbs Farmhouse additionally*. They connect into a combined water pump in Hobbs Court, that sends the wastewater through another combined pipe to the main sewer external to all properties.

c) It is not possible for any of those properties to be separated from that combined system, or the Farmhouse at this time.

d) At the time that all the properties at Hobbs Court were purchased and the Farmhouse prior, the system was owned and run by the then Management

Company, Hobbs Court Management Company Ltd. (later with name change to include (Yapton). At that earlier time Mr. Tom Elliot developer of the site by Herongate Homes Ltd., and owner of the management company then, paid for all the incidental bills for the site including for the pump and its electricity to run it and before the earlier planning proposal was submitted in 018.

At the end of 018 he declined to do so anymore, and all the residents were billed for services to the Management Company thereafter. Payments were made by the properties at Hobbs Court and the Farmhouse to the management company both for the maintenance of the pump and also collectively with a 6 -way split for electricity for its use, between the 5 Hobbs Court properties and additionally the Farmhouse as the 6th. (As on record from invoices sent out at that time).

e). On May 6th 2021 Hobbs Court Management Company (Yapton) Ltd. was taken over by another resident at Hobbs Court.

Subsequently, a decision was allegedly reached by the directors of the company and independently of the other residents of Hobbs Court, that the residents would now pay for the electricity usage of the pump entirely and the Farmhouse would pay nothing, only towards a portion of the combined maintenance payment instead. Such a decision and outcome has been under review with a solicitor since, which aspect cannot be discussed further here.

f) In respect of the annex which is shown to have bath, toilette, and kitchen facilities to an *entirely additional and separate property to the Farmhouse and its use*, it would appear that under present circumstances, the residents of Hobbs Court would collectively be anticipated, to pay additionally, for the service usage for the pump and electricity to that service for the annex as well. If ultimately intended to be used for rental, they would allegedly be contributing to the advantage, of a business venture in addition.

The property deeds only refer to the Farmhouse itself in respect of the pump, not any additional property service provision to any other property in the grounds of it.

g) The proposed annex would allegedly be linked into the same wastewater system as Hobbs Court, unless an alternative was created, ie., a cesspit or septic tank to the Farmhouse/annex or separate pipe to the main sewer, which has not been suggested as being included in the proposal.

h). As this aspect of wastewater would unavoidably affect everyone at Hobbs Court, without any responsibility for change being undertaken, it is considered an important and significant factor, which should allegedly have been included as referred to in the application proposal, and how that matter was intended to be addressed. It would seem, that any aspect regarding wastewater applications regarding the proposed annex including any additional costs in usage, should not be deferred to other properties and is objected to on that basis too.

i). If the Farmhouse made alternative arrangement for sewage/ wastewater and in respect of the annex for it, that I (and others) would *not* be anticipated to financially contribute towards, then that aspect of objection could be resolved. Ie, that the

Farmhouse undertook separate sewerage arrangement entirely from Hobbs Court, which is attributed to in the deeds as a possibility to include as an alternative, should the Farmhouse decide to do so.

7.In conclusion

It is observed that there have been and are intended to be, changes in ownership of property at Hobbs Court in recent times. Also, one property is due to complete a sale before Christmas, and any new property owner in recent times as incoming may be totally unaware of some of the detailing submitted herein or its significance.

Also, that one resident is often absent with business commitments abroad. Those unaware of such details would not be able to make the same informed decision regarding the proposal and application in the time of the consultation period. Also allegedly possibly disadvantaged because of this. The absence of any contribution in response to the application, taken as no objection or assent because of this too. It is suggested that for those reasons the outcome from the opportunity for any objection may not be able to be fully representational of the immediate area in respect of the proposal at this time.

It is also advised that a meeting was offered with date and time in writing, to discuss matters of concern with the applicant on Nov.21st 2021. It is very much regretted that this offer was not accepted, by return email. However, it is accepted that it is a personal decision not to engage if it is not wished to do so.

It is requested that my response to the application proposal is registered as a total objection at this time, and in the hope that more definitive, accurate and up to date details are supplied in due course for all to review, by all those who may be affected by this proposal and in order to make a proper balanced judgement in outcome.

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsborough