

E Mail

Sent 29.3.2017

Dear Ms Simkiss,

I write following our telephone conversation yesterday. My Parish Council agreed a response and comments concerning the evidence relating to the above application and this will be sent to you under separate cover by our Parish Clerk.

My understanding of our discussion was that ;-

1. You agreed to accept information from neighbours and local residents that was pertinent to the evidence required to decide this application. You will obviously be aware of the DCLG planning guidance precisely on this point which states that it is reasonable for a planning authority to do so. I advised local residents who attended last night that they should send any information to you, and no doubt you can pass it on to the relevant decision maker. Certainly one local member had spoken to one of your staff previously and had been given the same initial advice that I had ,that no account would be taken of their information.I certainly made it clear last night that this was not a planning consultation and information had to be evidence based.
2. I said that we wished for the decision to be taken in Committee and you made reference to your officer scheme of delegations. These are delegations given to officers by the relevant committee and it is always possible for officers to refer a matter back to committee. I am aware that this would be unusual , but this is an unusual case because of its history and the status of individuals and their connections to SDC. I would be grateful if you could seek advice from your Monitoring Officer and let me know in due course how you are proposing to proceed.
- 3.I raised with you that not all of the evidence submitted by the applicant was on the web, and your case officer told me that this was because the information was" private and confidential". I am not sure why information submitted primarily to evidence usage of fields should be so designated or why any confidential material could not be redacted. In any event the identities of all the witnesses are recorded on the applicant's supporting statement. Please could you let me have your justification for not making this evidence available, as it has hampered our ability to challenge any evidence ( as we have not been allowed to see it).

On a more general point could you advise us concerning the status of any other equestrian businesses on this site. Are you aware of any? Do they require planning consent? Have you requested that an application is lodged? If an application is not forthcoming will you be considering enforcement action? If not , why not?

We also note that the applicant's supporting statement references highway issues and comments that there have been no significant problems .We are aware that highways issues are not relevant per se to the application , although the original planning consent was conditioned precisely because of concerns of the effect of intensification on the local roads. We , however , do believe it has been a factor in your decision to pursue the rectification of this difficult situation by way of the certificate route as you did not consider that the highways issues were severe enough in the context of current planning regulations. You may therefore wish to check with your police colleagues as we have been told today of at least four

serious accidents on the A46 on the junction with the lane leading to Barton End in the recent past , one only 10 days ago involving one of the applicant's witnesses , and at least two others involving staff at the equestrian centre. All required police attendance and cars were written off. I have asked for this information to be conveyed directly to you, but please accept this as a formal request for you investigate in any event.

My Parish Council reserves its position on this application and will be considering the matter at our future meetings pending the outcome of your decision.

I look forward to hearing from you .

 Kay  
Vice Chair  
Horsley Parish Council