

Supporting Timeline statement for 245 Long Road

Related to DC/19/5063/VOC

The first submission in 2004 for two detached bungalows with garages was refused. In 2005 outline permission was granted, however the plot 1 footprint was noted that it had to take greater account of the relationship between existing dwellings to ensure the development did not result in loss of privacy for surrounding properties.

In 2010 previous permission had lapsed, the developer then sought one and half storey plot 2 and plot one will be a detached bungalow 166m². On the 31st March 2010 chairman comments three homes on relatively small plot is too much and blatant profiteering!

Despite above plot 3 is a massive 4 bed house

Plot 2 is a one and half storey house built onto my parents land. Please refer to the letter and photos submitted from Mr Jason Dye 14 June 2014. Despite site visit, evidence supplied to planning, no action was taken.

July 2018 revised plans for plot 1 is a house and double garage on 245 boundary are submitted. Amended after 245 highlights as always the errors in architectural plans which are always incorrect in favour of developer.

Nov 2018 planning committee uphold refusal.

June 2019 revised plans. Footprint 40% larger than that approved. Submission withdrawn

Dec 2019 I believe this is when Mr Sinclair, developer dies, his wife Margo Sinclair then pursues the development. Please note she has been present in many dealings with my parents.

Jan 2020 revised plans submitted, amended twice following comments from 245. Plans still incorrect.. is this architect actually qualified?

Over a period of 16 years this proposal has been resubmitted with amendments countless times but in excess of 50 times as the developer apparently "changed his mind"! He didn't change his mind, he manipulated planning policy to get what he wanted bit by bit. He subjected my parents to years of intimidation wanting their own land to further develop. When they were not forthcoming to his threats "he would have their land" he attempted to drive them from their home by building right on top of them the biggest most overwhelming overshadowing bulks of bricks to make their lives oppressive, in the hope they would move. I have attached a copy of MapSearch Snapshot. which shows that plot 1 243 Long Road holds the land in green which is a driveway leading up to the back garden of 245 where this developer has always said he would build through, garden grabbing even more land to line his pocket. Why would plot 1 own this piece of land outside plot 3 other than to prove this was his intention

When plot 2 was built, my father sort advice from his solicitor (Chamberlains) and was assured unusually that 245 owns both boundaries. The developer ripped the hedgerow from the boundary and the stakes my father had placed to show the boundary line. The men who were installing a fence were pulling out plants from a rockery in 245 so they could dig holes for fence posts. The police were called, but stated this was a civil case. They could only make the fencers lay on their stomachs to not stand on more of my parents land to install the fence, which had grabbed my parents land, probably close to one meter. The builder even acknowledged that the developer would not have been able to build if he had not stolen my parents land. The planning officer at the time Dickon Povey, MP, Peter Aldous, my parents and brother all met on site to discuss the obvious flouting of planning regulations, oversight etc. At that time the developer shouted at my mother saying he had a right to be there. He said to my mother " old lady, you don't know who you are dealing with, I get what I want, I have everyone in my pocket!" This statement screams bribery and corruption. Given what I see now and how this development has been given permission I cannot help believe there is truth in this mans claim. The side elevation was not on the plans of the original plan for plot 2, this was not picked up by planning. Subsequently a window overlooking my parents was put in and this was identified at the site visit and only afterwards was an amendment put in. Dickson Povey sided with the developer with no regard to the residents of 245. The plot was elevated when the plans clearly showed ground level. This was photographed and submitted to planning, no action was taken. When the developer moved into the completed property for his period of time before he sold on, to avoid tax, he laughed at my parents and said " i told you I always get what I want" and " I will have your land".

Now the saga continues with plot 1.

Currently my elderly mother who is in isolation and alone as we lost Dad July 2018, is having to face this stress again. At a time of national emergency, the biggest this country has faced since

WW2 we should not be putting our vulnerable through this. My parents should have been supported equally by planning and they were not. They, like many others in their generation were unaware of what they could do to oppose this application. They did not oppose through fear of what the developer would do given the intimidation they were under. He threatened them and I very much suspect he used corrupt measures in the planning Dept. My brother and I were unaware of this until plot 2 was being built. I have attached details of this in the letter from Jason Dye 14 June 2014.

I accept that comments made are hear say. I have no reason to not believe my parents statements. I believe it is evident from the history of these submissions and proof of the land leading to 245 garden that this developer has manipulated planning laws for his own profiteering. He has manipulated tax laws for his own gain. It would appear he has also in his words got people in his pocket, otherwise I fail to see how a planning Dept could approve such a development. What surprises me more is they are continuing to do this. Mathew Gee had already made his decision to approve plans before he came to discuss objections at 245. Despite two amendments to plans which planning officers have seen, they are still incorrect!! if this can be seen by a novice how can this be passed by supposed experts??? Given all of the above and attached evidence I appeal to you all to refuse this proposal, to review all subsequent builds in line with planning law, to investigate corruption within the planning Dept and to revert this proposal to a single storey bungalow.