For official use only (date received): 22/08/2024 16:09:21

## **The Planning Inspectorate**

## COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

## Appeal Reference: APP/Q3115/C/24/3346856

DETAILS OF THE CASE	
Appeal Reference	APP/Q3115/C/24/3346856
Appeal By	MR DARREN SMITH
Site Address	Emmanuel Ranch Windmill Lane Towersey Oxfordshire OX9 3QQ
SENDER DETAILS	
Name	
Address	
ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS	
In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?  □ Appellant □ Agent ☑ Interested Party / Person □ Land Owner □ Rule 6 (6)	
What kind of representation are you making?	
<ul> <li>□ Final Comments</li> <li>□ Proof of Evidence</li> <li>□ Statement</li> <li>□ Statement of Common Ground</li> <li>☑ Interested Party/Person Correspondence</li> <li>□ Other</li> </ul>	

## YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

The Planning Inspectorate Temple Quay House 2 The Square Bristol BS1 6PN

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Objection to Planning and Enforcement Appeals - APP/Q3115/C/24/3346856 and APP/Q3115/W/24/3346849

I write to formally object to the above-referenced planning appeals and to strongly support South Oxfordshire District Council's (SODC) refusal of planning permission as well as their enforcement action, which mandates the restoration of the land to its original state as a biodiverse paddock. I would like to add to my previous objection submitted to SODC on 15th April and request that my original comments be fully considered in this appeal, alongside the points outlined below.

Support for SODC's Enforcement Action

The enforcement decision by SODC is not only appropriate but essential to uphold the integrity of planning law and to remedy the significant environmental damage caused by the applicant. The site in question has been subjected to extensive and illegal modifications, including the removal of hedgerows, grasslands, and meadows, which has led to a considerable loss of biodiversity. The applicant's actions have introduced severe light pollution, further degrading the rural character of the area and negatively impacting the local environment.

In addition, the applicant has covered nearly the entire site with over 2,000 tonnes of crushed concrete. This act is not only environmentally destructive but also strategically designed to complicate any future enforcement efforts. The cost and complexity of restoring the site to its original condition now fall unfairly on public resources, a burden that should not be placed on the taxpayer.

Applicant's Disregard for Planning and Common Law

The applicant is attempting to exploit the perceived shortage of land for gypsy and traveller sites as a justification for their actions. However, this appeal must be seen in the context of the applicant's flagrant disregard for planning law, as well as common law principles. The actions undertaken by the applicant are not merely breaches of planning regulations but constitute a wilful and systematic violation of legal norms designed to protect both the environment and community.

The applicant has consistently ignored legal obligations, as evidenced by the unlawful development activities that have taken place on the site. Moreover, the applicant's appeal is replete with inaccuracies and misrepresentations, which starkly contrast with the observable reality of the damage inflicted on the land. It is clear that the appellant has no intention of complying with planning laws or court injunctions and has instead chosen to act with blatant contempt for the legal process.

**Environmental and Community Impact** 

The activities on the site, including frequent bonfires and the burning of materials that produce dense black smoke, are causing significant environmental harm. While these may fall outside the strict boundaries of planning issues, they highlight a broader pattern of environmental degradation that must be taken into account when considering the appeal. The noise pollution, combined with the other aforementioned activities, creates an untenable situation for local residents and further underscores the necessity of strict enforcement.

Request for Site Visit and Dismissal of Appeals

In light of the above, I strongly urge the Planning Inspectorate to conduct a site visit to witness firsthand the extent of the damage and the current state of the land. The applicant's submissions are not reflective of the on-the-ground reality and should be recognized as attempts to mislead the appeal process.

I respectfully request that both appeals be dismissed in their entirety. Upholding SODC's refusal of planning permission and enforcement action is crucial not only for restoring the land but also for maintaining the integrity of the planning system and ensuring that such blatant violations do not go unchecked.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.