



Please accept this email as my formal objection to Application No 2016/3488

The planning department know full well the extent of the feeling and mistrust that the residents near to this property have in respect to both the developers and the Council Planning department.

This is supposed to be a building protected by the Council. It is Listed and also subject to Conservation protection.

To date the Council has failed to protect this building from the developers who are intent to destroy, or at best ignore, the obligations they have to protect this building.

Arguably the Council has facilitated, certainly not governed, the damage to this building.

Detailed objections have been provided to you in the past. The current planning request simply compounds the issue. The Council has allowed building practices that I understand should not be approved when coupled with an old building such as this, they have allowed new structures to be put into place that are different in looks and design to items such as the shop windows that should have been repaired not destroyed and replaced, allowed a listed wall to be demolished and an inappropriate wall put in its place. When it was found that building at the rear was built higher than agreed the council compounded their mistakes by allowing the inappropriate boundary wall to be made even higher, just to act as a compromise to hide the malpractice behind.

The new application is simply a facility by the Developer to try to get the council to allow the incorrect windows at the front, and to allow the overheight building at the rear. It may be just a delaying tactic.

Is planning really this much of a joke!

The Council has failed to protect the building and keeps seeking compromises with the Developer so that it does not have to take legal action against the Developer. Are you scared of taking action or are you purposely allowing the destruction of a Listed Building.

The Council has explained to residents, during discussions with

residents with their own planning requests, that if a part of a building is part of the original structure then the resident can do nothing to modify it? This was challenged when explained but we now have a situation where if ANY part of the original building at Number 108 has been modified under Council approval, then the Officer who told another resident that an internal wall could not be modified, must have been denying an application falsely. From what I can see at Number 108, that other resident should now be due compensation for malpractice.

The most obvious path of action by the council is now to deny approval for this new application, to take the Developer and owner at 108 to Court regarding past malpractice, and to ensure the past works are corrected.

Please remember that you are close to a review by the ombudsman due to your perceived failures and what looks like inappropriate collusion with the Developer. You appear to have no intention whatsoever to fully protect the property.

Please also remember that you do not have the last word regarding the building works where Listed items are concerned and there is no time limit in which the errors need to be identified and corrected. If any future owners of this property are faced with expensive building works as a result of your failures, I would expect significant claims to compensation to be in question.

None of us want this episode to continue but it does entail the Council taking control of the issue, stop the Developer playing games (it does not put the Council in a good light), and having past misdemeanors corrected.

Please, please sort this matter out.

Graham Oven
[REDACTED]