

Mr Robert Thain
Development Management
Civic Offices
Bridge Street
Christchurch
Dorset
BH23 1AZ

Dear Sir

Re: Application 8/18/1070/FUL – Retrospective application for the erection and retention of hoardings at Jesmond Avenue, Highcliffe, BH23 5AY - OBEJCTION

The ‘temporary’ (and illegal) hoarding was erected on 15 February 2016, approximately 850 days ago, without planning permission, although the developer knew it was required. He cited the need to erect the hoarding was at the behest of Christchurch Borough Council under Health & Safety legislation, which was untrue. Part of the hoarding to the Eastern side of the site was removed because it had been erected on someone else’s land. The hoarding there was replaced with low level open wire fencing, presumably adequate for purpose, undermining the current application for two metre high hoarding around the rest of the site. Be that as it may, the developer was instructed to reapply for planning permission ‘as soon as possible’, which he has now done, albeit eight months later – hardly ‘ASAP’!

The site is a mess with abandoned fencing, demolished outbuildings and overgrown foliage, significantly lowering the ambience of the Wolhayes Garden Estate and, arguably, ‘blighting’ the adjacent properties for nearly two and a half years. The developer has shown the residents and Council minimal respect throughout the process.

It is believed there are sufficient grounds to object to this planning application.

Section 3 Description of proposal – states the development started on 1 June 2016 and completed on 1 July 2016. UNTRUE – the ‘temporary’ hoarding was erected mid-February 2016.

Section 5 Pre-Application advice – States ‘No’. UNTRUE – as the developer has stated in public that he was required to erect the hoarding by CBC, which the Council has denied but who to believe?

Section 6 Pedestrian & vehicle access, roads & rights of way. There is a wide gate at the western end of the site which has been used for vehicular access along a public footpath which links the Wolhayes Garden Estate with Lymington Road. Bollards have been removed and dumped on adjacent land. The developer’s answers in this section are therefore UNTRUE.

Section 13 Biodiversity & Conservation – The answer of ‘No’ is UNTRUE as previous objections by wildlife and other conservationists and local residents, against application 8/17/0763 OUT, have raised issues such as tree preservation, bats, lichen, hedgehogs and snakes. The pummelling of the site by heavy machinery has done much to harm the biodiversity but a grass snake was observed on the eastern end of the site only last week where the open wire fencing was erected. The very existence of the hoarding is inhibiting free movement of wildlife through this land, designated as a ‘Green Corridor’ and is therefore breaching the Council’s policy and local plan (Policy ENV15) on such matters.

Section 15 Trees & Hedges – ‘Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character? Developer’s answer ‘No’ is UNTRUE. There are over 200 mature and attractive trees on land adjacent, so this answer cannot be correct. There is a comprehensive Tree Protection Order in force covering the immediate site and adjoining land, which underlines the importance of the woodland character.

It is considered that, in accordance with best practice, the fence posts should have been sheathed to prevent leaching into the adjacent soil. It is noted that when the hoarding to the Eastern end of the site was ‘removed’, the bottoms of the fence posts were merely sawn off and not removed in their entirety. As previously stated, the site contains much unsightly and discarded material, presumably contrary to law and regulations?

I OBJECT to this application and ask that it be rejected by the Planning Committee on the grounds stated.

Yours