

Planning Application 242063

Wind In The Willows, Islandstone Lane, Hurst, RG10 0RJ

Full application for the material change of use of land from agricultural to provide an enlarged caravan site and alterations to provide 4 additional pitches (total of 6 pitches) with associated hardstanding and ancillary day rooms

Submitted by: Jean Dolinski

Address: 34 Martineau Lane, Hurst, RG10 0SF

Letter of Objection - 13 November 2024

I wish to raise concerns about several discrepancies that I have noted between the application form and the planning documents submitted.

Parking

The application form indicates no change in car parking spaces on site i.e. one existing space and one proposed space. However the revised site plan as submitted following the re-validation of the application indicates approximately **20** proposed car parking spaces (three spaces per pitch and an unquantified number of visitors spaces - assumed to be a minimum of two). The ET Design and Access Statement indicates two car parking spaces per pitch when in fact the site plan includes three car parking spaces per pitch. It is impossible to ascertain exactly how many car parking spaces are envisaged for this site as the documents submitted provide conflicting information.

Flooding

The application form asks the following questions:

- Is the site within an area at risk of flooding? Answered “no”
- Is your proposal within 20 metres of a watercourse? Answered “no”
- Will the proposal increase flood risk elsewhere? Answered “no”

I would query whether the answers to all three of these questions should have been “yes”.

- Question 1 - the site is located in Flood Zone 2, i.e. with a medium risk of flooding.
- Question 2 - the site plans show a watercourse running along the north western edge of the site and immediately adjacent to it.
- Question 3 - the corner of Islandstone Road and Nelsons Lane floods at least once every year, therefore development of this site would undoubtedly increase flood risk elsewhere.

The Flood Risk Assessment states in Paragraph 2.1 that the site was visited in late November 2009. I would query whether this is a typo, or whether the applicant is really trying to rely on a flood report which refers to a site visit from 15 years ago?

Can the site be seen from a public road?

The application form states that the site cannot be seen from a public road. The site is quite clearly adjacent to a public road and therefore can obviously be seen from it.

Foul Sewage

The application form answers “unknown” to the questions as to how foul water would be dealt with and also whether it is proposed that the development be connected to the existing drainage system. Such vague answers should be unacceptable, as there must be an adequate drainage and sewage strategy included in a full planning application.

The application form and application documents appear to include several inconsistencies and inaccuracies. Basic validation procedures should be applied to ensure that information which the public and the Council themselves are being asked to comment on, and which will ultimately form the basis of decision making, are reliable and consistent.