

RECEIVED

25 JUL 2016

Dear Sir

Ref: P/2015/0773

I write as an alarmed resident living in Southsea, near to the proposed gypsy site.

- 1) Planning permission for residential use has been refused, and subsequently dismissed on appeal. A further appeal on grounds a) and g) was also dismissed. The Enforcement Notice was varied to allow 18 months for compliance; this notice was issued 24 months ago, and yet the site is still occupied in defiance of this Notice. The Enforcement Notice is evidently ineffective against certain members of our society.
- 2) The reason for my alarm is that, since rules set out in the National Planning Policy Framework can seemingly be broken at whim by certain sections of the community without fear of enforcement, this case will undoubtedly set a precedent for any other members of this same section of society wishing to flout similar Enforcement Notices.
- 3) Since the site has been in its present, unauthorised use, we have had occasions of flooding across, and closure of, the B5101, by ground water flowing off the site, instead of soaking into the ground as hitherto, caused, one fears, by the covering of several large sections of the site in tarmac, or concrete, or hardcore.
- 4) In addition, there is the question of rubbish that frequently appears to be left adjacent to the site entrance, usually in black bin-bags, that inevitably get torn open by scavengers. The most recent occurrence being of a bag of discarded children's clothes which are presently strewn north, along the B5101 and then east, up the approach road onto Heritage way. Such rubbish may, of course, not be attributable to the occupants of the site, but such occurrences were never seen prior to the site's present occupation by travellers.
- 5) The existence of the tall fence along the footpath bordering the site obviously obscures the view of what was previously a tranquil and pleasant grazing paddock, robbing it of any visual amenity. It also so encloses the footpath to such an extent that it is less frequently utilised by individuals seeking a path up to Brynteg, and then only with trepidation, as the view beyond the bends in the path are now obscured. In addition, the footpath is patrolled, in the region of the access gate, by a small, but aggressive, dog, who terrorises children and menaces adults.
- 6) A business of sorts seems to be carried out on the site, if the periodic presence of vans and pick-up trucks and occasional heavy machinery is any guide. In addition, there are more mobile caravans now present on the site than as stated on the original, and subsequently denied, Planning Proposal, which would again indicate the occupants' disdain for Planning Permission, and also their intention to turn the site into a Gypsy and traveller site, with all the concomitant transient community, noise, dirt and environmental pollution that inevitably occurs.
- 7) Although the Office of the Secretary of State for Wales has previously cautioned Councils to accede in contested planning disputes involving the Gypsy and travelling Community in these times of austerity and Local Government cut-backs, due to the inevitable high costs involved, and the deep pockets of the Human Rights Movement, who often fund the defence of such disputes on behalf of the Gypsy Community, I have no need remind you that costs may now be awarded against the appeal applicant if the appeal was frivolous or employed as a delaying tactic.
- 8) There is a chalet now on site which is larger than proposed on the original refused planning application P/2011/0670, and I fear that this would remain in position in addition to the alternative in the revised plan, since the applicant appears to do as he pleases, regardless of Enforcement Notices.

I would urge that the Notice be enforced forthwith, so that our local community can have its faith restored in the Planning procedure, and the Rule of Law.

Sincerely ✓

(20.07.2016)