

## DC Admin

---

**From:**  
**Sent:** 21 January 2025 12:23  
**To:** DC Admin  
**Subject:** Objection to Planning Application 2024/93556

**CAUTION:** External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I strongly object to this application.

Work on this new area of car parking – in a designated Green Belt area - has already been completed and it is already being used by customers – all without planning permission being obtained.

A resident of Bolster Moor spoke to the owners of the farm shop regarding this development and was informed by them that the Certificate of Lawfulness had expired and they had applied for and been granted permission to extend the car park. At the time of this conversation, this was not true – a planning application had not been made.

The applicant is well known locally for carrying out developments incorrectly or without obtaining any planning consent beforehand. These are some examples:

- Application Nos 2008/90662 and 2008/93486. Livestock building not built correctly to plan and modified proposal had to be submitted.
- Application No 2014/91515. The Decision Notice states “NOTE: The Local Planning Authority does not hold any record of planning permission being granted for the erection of the existing decking, which is indicated to be retained on the submitted plans. The granting of this planning permission does not authorise the retention of this structure for which separate planning permission may be required.” I cannot see that separate planning permission has subsequently been applied for relating to this decking.
- Application No 2015/93855. Work on a double garage was completed in February 2015 without obtaining planning permission. A retrospective application was submitted in December 2015.
- Application No 2022/93967 states the number of on-site parking spaces is 70. This latest application (No 2024/93556) states the number of on-site parking spaces is 89. I am unable to find a planning application for these additional 19 spaces. Could it be that, between 2022 and 2024, the applicant has encroached further into the Green Belt, without permission, and created these 19 spaces?
- Application No 2023/92537 – the applicant has ignored the conditions contained in the Decision Notice. It should also be noted that in the Delegated Decision document relating to this Certificate the applicant’s agent states that over 80 farm shop/café staff currently park on the roads. There is no mention that the cars on the roads belong to customers.
- Application No 2024/91484 – contained numerous inaccuracies as highlighted by objections submitted.

- Picnic tables can clearly be seen in Figure 2 of this latest application. There are now eight picnic tables which have been a permanent fixture in this Green Belt field for a number of years, yet I cannot find a planning application relating to a Change of Use for creating a pub garden style area in a Green Belt field.

Having carefully read through this latest application, I note that the applicant states that the work relating to the car park extension was completed on 31 August 2023. This is incorrect – the work relating to the car park extension was completed on 19 September 2024 and this area of parking has been available for customers to use since that date and it has had no effect on reducing the number of cars parked on the roads. Even when the car park has numerous spaces available, cars are still parked on the roads. This is because these cars belong to the applicant's staff, not to customers.

The application states that the proposed development does not require any materials to be used externally. This is not correct as the “proposed development” has already been completed and man-made materials have already been used to convert this field into a car park. The work already carried out includes extensive resurfacing of a field and destruction of landscaping.

The application is for an additional 37 spaces in a designated Green Belt field. As I have stated earlier, these spaces have already been created without any planning permission being applied for or granted and these spaces are already being used by customers, with no reduction on the number of cars parking on the roads in the vicinity of the farm shop being seen.

The application also states that, once granted, this new area of car park will remove all parked cars from surrounding roads. It is leading people to believe that these cars belong to customers of the farm shop and café. This is incorrect. The cars parked on the roads in the vicinity of the farm shop/café belong to the applicant's staff as he does not allow them to park on the farm shop premises. The applicant obviously wants to keep all the car park spaces free for paying customers, and is extremely unlikely to ever allow staff to take up these valuable spaces. Therefore, even with this additional car park, the traffic hazards highlighted in the Planning Statement will continue as the staff will still be ordered to park on the roads.

Therefore, based on the evidence already seen since September 2024, this car park will have no effect on reducing the number of staff cars parking on the roadside. It has already increased the amount of traffic coming into Bolster Moor, contrary to what is said in 3.11 of the Planning Statement, as more customers are realising there is more parking available on-site.

The further encroachment into the Green Belt by this applicant can only be deemed as unnecessary development in the Green Belt and will not have the stated effect and this application should be refused.

Given the applicant's history of riding roughshod over planning regulations, the planning application should be refused, all building materials used to create the new area of car parking should be removed and the Green Belt field should be returned to grazing land.

In the event the Council ignores all the reasons this application should be denied will they take on the responsibility of monitoring the parking situation on the surroundings roads for a prolonged period of time to ensure that further inconvenience is not suffered by local residents?