26th February 2024

Dear Mr. James,

Reference your email of Friday I do understand what you say I am struggling with a mountain of paperwork this and the previous file and to collate this into a considered unbiased and balanced objection. I have already raised albeit in a general way, but requested a review of the file, serious issues to include Human Rights Del Brenner v Hackney Borough District Council and consultation. Your Council is already on notice that there is a problem.

The responses that you have received plus that from the Parish Council illustrate that the only aspect of this that is being addressed are the Events 30 days or not as the case may be from the Parish Council and not even a comment about anything else including the permanent nature of the cars parking. The extras on this are a mystery and that is because of the lack of awareness as to what this is all about. .

Can you advise me as to the status of the letter submitted by the Agentsin relation to its conflict with the development proposal as set .in the appropriate Box (and advertised) and the content of the letter from Nexus referred to in the following Box on the Application form relating to Existing User. Other than where it refers to the documents enclosed and the cheque?

With regard to consultation, the Statements contained in both the Planning Statements (Section 3) submitted by Hywel James / Nexus Planning is not correct. See copy email from the Clerk and Chairman of Shalbourne Parish Council attached. Contemporaneously with that enquiry I requested Mr. Hywel James to advise me of the evidence he had to support the Statement of Community Engagement (a requirement of your Council's Validation process) he has not replied.
The implications of this are serious and damaging to the community and Shalbourne Parish Council and your Council by whom they have been accepted as being in compliance with by your validation requirements. What is the position now and action does your Council propose to take with regard to this?

In addition, although my objection will range wider than the above and this. The Contamination Statement that has been filed has not been updated and examination remains as per the plans attached to the statement as at the time of its then submission. You may recall the exchange during the the pre Consent stage prior to the extant Consent (Hywel James) on my observation of the difference between between the site as identified by the then Location Plan and that of the site plan proposed ,, the omission of the large area omitted forms part of that now sought to be included in the present Application.

That was a pertinent observation on my part, and although correct the Location Plan was not amended at that time which would have been appropriate and essential to ensure the development could proceed as authorized within the Location Plan red line site. That omission and the construction of the Development knowing that the two did not coincide is extraordinary. And can only be met now surely by an Application for Retrospective Consent for this and other breaches unless it is truly the Applicants intention to demolish the existing buildings and rebuild? Which obviously they do not. .
Why please has the Application not been described as Retrospective in relation to the subject matter to which that applies The miss siting of the new building and other breaches in the build element etc. Could you please explain ?

On the excluded site then stood a large Dutch Barn to be re clad and retained for ancillary winery storage and a large commercial greenhouse then said to be used by the Shalbourne Community Growers CIC s and also to be retained. That area excluded from the location plan as it was, was not included in the area of examination undertaken by the authors of the Contamination Report. In communications passing between John Freegard /Peter Nobes and yourself it appears to have been acknowledged that contamination (asbestos) might be present. Between the time of that Report and the present Application those buildings have been removed , apparently without any Planning Consent/ Pre Notification to your Council and therefore without compliance with conditions which almost certainly would have been attached to removal.

With respect the requirement for a Contamination Report / Remediation Report in respect of the present Application has not been complied with as the Report presented only relates to the red line location plan on the extant Consent not the red line location plan of the present Application. ,

Quite outside any Planning objection or otherwise in relation to n the Application I am concerned and I expect yourself also that a community group and young children should have been permitted the use of a building which might have been and possibly was contaminated by particularly asbestos,- and in circumstances where ground and building apart, there was a large old decrepit greenhouse heater which I now know was likely to have been insulated with asbestos. In my opinion the exclusion of that area which also possibly included the picnic area shown on one of the plans lodged with that Application and the circumstances of removal are strong indicators that the land was known to be or considered possibly to be contaminated. The Report does not satisfy the requirements of this Application. r

I attach a copy of the Company House Registration for Carvers Hill Estate the first two entries are to be expected planting vines and processing grape into wine but not the third *"operatioin of warehousing and storage facilities for land transport activities "* a registration that indicates there will be far greater vehicle activity, particularly HGVs and large vehicles is to be expected at this site. That does not sit comfortably with what has been disclosed and the very limited user stance maintained by the applicant and very necessary to take into account, This affects both the village other users of the highway and those who might walk or cycle or take a horse down Burr Lane. Horses are kept towards the bottom end of Burr Lane and adults and children ride in this Village and environs. .

My objection will follow a soon as possible [redacted]

Such is life ,I can no longer drive and will be a foot traveler beset by not just the vehicles that pass through here but also the dreadful condition of our Wiltshire roads.

If Carvers Hill Estates had followed the Consultation policy and the Major Application requirements/Protocol most of the queries raised would have been addressed pre application a requirement that is clearly necessary for the applicant to observe for the very sensible reasons stated in that document , assist you and the general public..

Yours Sincerely

Lesley Green