



ST

Margate,  
Kent.  
3rd April 2006

Mr S. Thomas.  
Planning Department,  
Thanet District Council,  
P.O. Box 9,  
Margate.

Dear Sir,

6

F/TH/06/0084 East Northdown Farm

I wish to make the following observations and objections regarding the above.

Initially, I am concerned that the applicant is falsely claiming existing agricultural use. The use of the site is currently as an unauthorised and unregulated retail garden centre, with the majority of produce brought in from other suppliers and the applicant's other establishment in Shropshire. The garden centre is advertised extensively as such locally, and also on the internet. Unsightly and inappropriate poly-tunnels now remain in a semi-permanent derelict condition in the Conservation Area. There has been no agricultural use for many years.

The design of the building is in any event an eyesore, and totally at variance with the principle that development within a conservation area must preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. Allowing such a building to remain, and in such a sensitive position, is an insult to neighbours who have to abide by the restrictions placed upon them for living within a conservation area.

The applicant has already carried out many unauthorised modifications to the building to accommodate a multitude of users, including the installation of several additional ground floor doors and first floor windows. This demonstrates that it is the applicants clear intention to subdivide the unit in order to maximise the number of tenants, similar to what has occurred with the three original units which the applicant has subdivided into some 20 plus units without the benefit of planning permission and contrary to conditions applied to the retrospective grant of permission F/TH/97/0857.

Regarding, the question of the suitability of storage use in such close proximity to residential use, the history as evidenced with the existing units, some of which are used for B8 storage, provides sufficient reason for refusing permission. Excessive and uncontrollable noise and traffic movements are readily evidenced from the existing units, and further intensification will add to the misery endured by the neighbouring residential properties. It is also likely that any additional use for storage or the inevitable unauthorised B1 use, will lead to the existing occupiers of units A B & C being encouraged to further use the private lane which the applicant falsely claimed to own or control in 1997. The surface of this private lane has already been destroyed by the illegal use of the road by industrial users.

Finally, I note that the applicant again states that sewage will be to an existing septic tank. Unless there has been new provision, the sewage provision for the entire site is to one small septic tank in the garden of a neighbouring residential property. This was constructed for very limited use and certainly not the use to which it is put now, notwithstanding this further proposed additional use.

Yours sincerely,