

The Potting Barn,
No5. Hobbs Court,
Bilsham Rd.
Yapton
West Sussex
BN18 OJY

Dec15th 2021

To: Amber Willard Planning Officer Arun District Council

Ref Planning applications for proposed annex nos. Y/154/21/HH and Y/155/21/HH

Ref: Hobbs Farmhouse, Bilsham Rd. Yapton, West Sussex, BN18 OJY .

Further details in objection to the proposal

Dear Ms Willard,

Further details regarding the overall site are now supplied which are alleged to have a bearing on the whole application. Also, in respect of an objection whether able to be included in respect of the application now or otherwise.

As is already known, Hobbs Farmhouse and its environs/curtilage are Grade II listed. It is understood to mean that all buildings in that site are under that umbrella and also setting, and in relation to the proposed annex, that may also allegedly be under review for the same reason unless otherwise confirmed.

1.The large barn shown in the photographs submitted

i) Additional information has been received from a former employee (which they would corroborate), regarding the original farm and the Hobbs Centre formerly in the location area submitted. Also details now included from my own more recent knowledge. This is a property in the same environment and its use and history is also relevant as presented with the other documents regarding the application proposal.

It is a dominant feature as seen from my own neighbouring property. (not far in location from the proposed annex). It is advised that it was allegedly erected in approx. the last 40 years as 'new build'/replacement. It has not been possible to confirm from records that this received planning approval or listed building consent from that earlier time. It is also understood that in relation to listed building consent there is no timeline regarding the need for enquiry and approval into any such construction or alteration in a listed property no matter the timeline of its erection or other detailing. It would appear to be dependent on how such a property was viewed as to whether or not the 4 year rule was able to be applied in such an eventuality.

ii) Originally it was understood used and erected for *agricultural* purposes (cattle) but has been used alternatively in recent times not of an agricultural nature. Also, unable to be sourced, any application requesting alleged possible *change of use*. During this later time, it has been used for the storage of vintage cars and allegedly advertised for a general storage unit. (sign outside). It is understood that the cars have now been removed but no confirmation that it is being used for agricultural purposes again has been able to be confirmed.

((A vintage car has also been stored independently in the outbuilding now requested to be converted to an annex and therefore not used for agricultural purpose, and the former is not owned by the applicants of the proposal)).

In view of the recent planning application for changes to an outbuilding into an annex for domestic use and in respect of the near proximity of the large barn in respect of a listed building and area, it is requested that an investigation is undertaken into the current agricultural or other use of the barn and the outbuilding for proposed annex, and that all applications and consents over time for the buildings in question are confirmed as having been obtained for the main barn and outbuilding's original past, through to its current use including for any change/s of use.

2.The white rendered building adjacent to the large barn but not referred to in any way in the application

i)The white rendered building also on the site but not included into the block plan or photographs, (previously mentioned in the earlier objection details).

ii) Further investigation from a former employee of the farm and centre advised that this was constructed on the site in the last 30 years, for *agricultural* purposes. (They were on site at the time of its construction).

It was constructed to allegedly be a creamery and also for cheesemaking, (as adjacent to the then cattle barn). I was unable to ascertain that this property received planning and/or listed building consent either, for its construction or use as also previously stated. Also in respect of alleged *change of use* to domestic use and other changes to the structure in recent times as also stated.

iii) It is not allegedly being used for agricultural purposes now as the original requirement for use and to date, and since the external/internal alterations were made in recent times.

As above, is understood that there is no time limit on requirement for consents in respect of Gradell listing and environment as/if applicable.

3.General

i) It has been observed that a recent application for the replacement of a derelict shed in an adjacent field (not alleged in the curtilage, nor under Gradell listing) was refused, and also that an alleged false statement was submitted, that the field in which it stands was not being used for agricultural purposes. Irrefutable evidence was supplied that it was and is, the intended agricultural use of it, and the shed too.

ii) In the interests of fair play and so that an even- handed approach is applied, the matters above under 1 and 2 have now been brought to attention for investigation, irrespective of whether or not within the timeline for objection to the planning application for the annex.

iii) There are also aspects of requested review and objection going back as far as 017 for alleged planning and listed building consent infringements of the area of Hobbs Court as part of its Grade II listing and in respect of its association with the Farmhouse as also Gradell listed.

iv) Also observed, that approvals and consents have been required for planning approval and listed building consent for some in the environment, but where alleged infringements have not allegedly been investigated for others.

vi) Recent events have now brought all these matters to the fore, to seek to ensure that everyone is able to be seen to be treated equally. Also, so that any alleged errors that may have occurred from any quarter in the past or present are able to be rectified, and before any other approvals are granted in respect of the annex proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Dilys Lownsborough