



RE: 2013/6672/P

Dear Mr Gardiner,

I'm writing to you in relation to the above mentioned planning application. As I mentioned in our phone conversation some days back, I am the proprietor of a part of the land that the development proposed in this application is supposed to occupy.

As much as you were adamant that you are within your rights to grant planning permission to persons on land they do not own, I would still like to make it clear that I did not and do not consent to this application being granted on my land.

Moreover, it is my understanding that the applicant has lodged this application claiming he is the owner of the said land (contrary to his claim in 2013/3568/P). I find it contradictory that he should be required to make this false statement if it's really true that, for the purposes of planning, (as you've indicated to me in our phone conversation) no proof of ownership is required.

I would also like to point out that my earlier objection to 2013/3568/P on similar grounds, is no longer visible or available when viewing this application on line. It was my understanding that my comment would remain visible as part of that application on your website indefinitely.

I thus now technically have no proof of having ever lodged that earlier comment. Hence I'm submitting this comment using e mail so I can have a record of it.

I'm not sure if your protocol dictates a reply to this e mail, but any communication would be much appreciated.

Thank you for your consideration.

Kind Regards

