

APPENDIX B

LONG COPSE LANE

The name describes it – it is a country lane, not a busy highway. This proposal is the latest in an historic wrangle which started in 2014. In 2015 there was an enforcement complaint lodged regarding a mobile home being brought on to the site. The matter was investigated and a planning contravention notice was served. It was said at the time that the applicant had no intention of occupying the mobile home other than to stay as necessary for the horses welfare.

In 2016 an application was made for change of use from private equestrian yard to a mix use comprising equestrian yard , two private caravan pitches and two mobile caravan pitches. This was refused and is now pending appeal.

Currently the application is for one static and one touring van and an amenity block. But on the site there is a static van which is in use and a touring van neither of which are there with permission. The recommendation from the head of planning is to grant permission with 13 conditions attached .

I am strongly opposed to the application.

Long Copse Lane is an unlit, single track country lane, partially residential and which is totally unsuitable for caravans or heavy traffic.

The site was originally a simple field for grazing cattle and then Equestrian activity with a stable which sits well within the area. Now it has flood lights in use, although no authorisation has been granted. These lights are already causing a nuisance to the nearby residents.

A hedgerow has been removed from the roadside boundary which has obviously been done for better vehicular access to the site indicating that more vehicular traffic is anticipated.

It can be seen from the history of applications and use of the site that it has grown surreptitiously from a stable with one touring van unlicensed, to an unauthorised static caravan, and now to an application for what can only be described as a caravan site.

Irrespective of the many letters of objection to the proposal from local residents and neighbouring areas the Head of Planning is recommending that permission is granted, but it is interesting that the permission has thirteen conditions imposed, several of them being conditions which have been broken before.

Who will ensure that these conditions will be met, and surely if thirteen conditions are needed and with the past history, the application should be refused.

I recommend that you reject this application

END