

J Pearse  
4 Woodrow Drive, RG40 1RS

**Ref: PA 251221 – Cert Lawfulness – land rear of 302 and rear of 304 London Road, RG40 1RD**

**OBJECTION NUMBER 4: All submitted Sworn letters in Applicant's Appendices 1 – 10 are at least as vague as those referred to in the Planning Officer's report to PA182277 *[Extract below]*. They do not include any supportive evidence including receipt/invoice, dates and/or details of work-carried out.**

Neither has the Applicant provided any supportive evidence of the contents written in these letters, e.g. from his own records the receipts/Invoices, his audited financial Accounts, tax returns, nor any Hazardous Waste Certification *[reference my Objection Number 5]*.

Until 2020 there was a 2<sup>nd</sup> garage/workshop on Planning Unit 2 that was incorporated into the Annexe. Expedience Report RFS/2020/085605, page 9, "7.3 *The conversion of the workshop at the western end of the same building ..*"

These vague letters submitted against PA251221 could easily be referencing that 2<sup>nd</sup> garage/workshop or indeed any other part of the whole site (Planning Units 1, 2, 3, and 4 and/or the 'access area')

I contend that, in accordance with the Planning Officer's report against PA182277 (signed 8 February 2019) the **10-year rule** for a Certificate of Lawfulness Application on Planning Unit 1 should **start from 8 February 2019** , not prior to that date.

**Extracts from Officer Report – PA182277 (refused) – signed 8 February 2019**

**Page 11:** "Land to the rear of 302 London Road

" ... The statutory declarations are dated 9 August 2018 and the application was lodged 10 August 2018 before being validated on 12 September 2018. They variously suggest that the use has been undertaken for 12-23 years and these statements must be taken to include the entire site to the rear of 302 and 304 London Road. As such, whilst it is possible that the land at the rear of 302 London Road had been used for the use detailed in the certificate application and that the buildings did exist, the statutory declarations are not sufficiently precise at best and either false or deliberately vague at worst. Casting further doubt is the fact that there are two separate attached buildings, which might suggest that they were built at different times between 2006 and 8 October 2008.

***The area to the rear of 302 London Road must therefore be excluded because there is inadequate evidence (when accounting for the vagueness of the statutory declarations) to suggest that the use of this area has occurred for the past ten years and what it is used for. The supporting statutory declaration either (a) do not make reference to this area of land, or (b) are invalid insofar as they suggest its use when it clearly did not exist.***

**Page 13:** "Conclusion"

“... The statutory declarations are vague and imprecise, unintentionally incorrect and misleading and they now relate to a superseded plan. The submission of letters that were previously discounted adds little to the weight of information....”

“... The Council has its own evidence that would be sufficient on its own to place significant doubt to contradict or undermine the applicant’s version of events. Neighbours have supported this stance. **It is therefore concluded that the land to the rear of 302 London Road should not be included due to a lack of supporting information...**”

“... Even then, there is also doubt as to the overall use and the continuous nature of the use. .... Further still, there are also questions regarding the mix of uses and when they first occurred and whether, or not, they amount to a material change of use having **the effect of restarting the 10-year time clock.**”