

OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2025/91236

I wish to highlight an issue regarding the classification of applications on the Planning Portal. It appears that there is a degree of inconsistency, effectively making the process somewhat of a lottery, depending on how the hamlet name of Stocksmoor is entered on the application form.

Specifically, the correct spelling is "Stocksmoor" as a single word. However, if an applicant spells it as two words, "Stocks Moor," searches for "Stocksmoor" do not retrieve the application. This inconsistency may lead to important applications being overlooked or misclassified, which could impact the planning process with interested parties being unaware of proposals. I would respectfully request that the application is reclassified as Stocksmoor and the comment period re-started.

Applications relevant to 2025/91236, which are in close proximity to its location, have previously been submitted. Application 2001/60/93858 (Application form shows Stocksmoor) A similar application was refused with issues of being within the Greenbelt with detriment of character, appearance and amenity of the site being cited. Application 2019/62/90847 (Application form shows Stocksmoor) 'Formation of Access' identifies the land in question as being farmed grazing land.

The current Application form has been submitted under Stocks Moor and does not appear when searching for Stocksmoor. Application 2025/91236 (Application form shows Stocks Moor) The site is prime agricultural land and is located in the Greenbelt. There appears to be no justification to build on this piece of greenbelt and the building of just one dwelling would adversely affect the openness of the site. The land has not previously been developed so there is no justification to classify this land as building land, a brown field or grey belt site; it is grazing land for use in the food production chain

I strongly urge the council to refuse this application, as it constitutes an inappropriate development within the Green Belt. Such development would not only compromise the openness and visual amenity of the area but also set a concerning precedent for further encroachment on protected land.

Thank you for considering my objection.