

Postal Address:
25 Lamberhurst Road,
London SE27 0SD

Regarding Location:
Structure 589 Metres West
Caesars Camp Boarding Kennels
Crete Road West
Folkestone
Kent CT18 7AB

19/12/19

The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3B
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Application No: Y18/1139/FH
Appeal No: APP/L2250/X/19/3220694

Dear Ms Parfray,

In regards to your start letter dated 08/10/19, please find below my statement providing response to the Officers Report and filled Questionnaire provided by Ms Lilian Stubbs on 14/11/19:

I very much welcome your agreement that our appeal on this matter is valid, the crux of the disagreement being whether the front fencing is classified as adjacent to the highway. Whilst I understand in planning law the definition of 'adjacent to highway' may appear subject to interpretation, it was during a pre-planning meeting with Folkestone and Hythe Planning Officer Julian Ling (who had previously visited the site) that he suggested we improve our site with a 2m fence, and that this should be applicable under Permitted Development. And I don't see any reasonable argument or justification in the presented response that justifies the overturning of our application.

In the Planning Officers report, whilst giving clarification as to what defines being 'adjacent' to a highway, Ms Claw then goes on to describe how the fence would be 'between the back of the verge at the side of the highway and the applicant's land.' This indicates in her own language that our boundary is adjacent to the verge, which in turn is adjacent to the highway, rather than adjacent to the highway itself. The verge itself is 1.75m wide and is uneven, sloped and covered in thick grass and shrubbery which doesn't appear to be maintained. I don't think the verge itself could be classified as any type of highway.

Also, under the summary of Human Rights, Ms Claw describes finding a balance between 'the interests and rights of the applicant...and the interests and rights of those potentially affected by the proposal.' In relation to this, I feel her decision greatly affects our rights to 'enjoy his land subject only to reasonable and proportionate controls by a public authority' as, so long as the site remains easily accessible by intruders and passers by, we can bring no security to this remote site as it will still remain liable to vandalism, theft and trespassing.

We have paid £25000 for this parcel of land in which there is a nuclear bunker. The bunker itself is the only thing on the site of value, and this proves of constant interest to many people, and unless we have some sort of deterrent to them, they will continue to access our land and try to break into, and steal from the bunker which then effectively damages our property. Every time we visit the site we find evidence of this, and we have police records to demonstrate this. This in turn can be stressful as we never know how we will find the site when we visit.

In regards to the rights of those affected by the proposal, I find it hard to see who this might be. A 2m fence at the front would make no difference to passing vehicles as it is at the hip of a winding road, so it will never affect visibility. The only footpath near the road is set back down the hill on the opposite side of the road, so there are no views to be enjoyed over our property. And as for neighbouring properties, all are at least several hundred metres from our property, and set to the North, West and East of the property so the front fencing to the South wouldn't even be visible to them. As for the landowner who owns the adjacent farmland, we have been in touch with him and he has no concerns with our plans.

To summarise our position, we are a family with 2 children who bought this site with all our savings as a chance to enjoy the countryside and outdoors, away from our home in London. When the MOD developed this site in the early 1970's it was regularly maintained, with a tidy landscaped appearance but since going to private ownership in 1991, it has fallen to neglect and nothing has been replaced or repaired since it's original construction. We are simply trying to bring necessary maintenance and improvement to the site whilst being sympathetic to the local area which we enjoy so much. But the first hurdle to overcome is making the site secure which we want to do through the use of secure but attractive fencing that does not obstruct views or appear aggressive such as green welded mesh fencing which could then be softened with the use of planting.

In regards to the widening of the gate, this is a matter of practicality. Given the narrow width of Crete Road West, it is a very tight turning circle to access the gate as it currently is and often requires several manoeuvres to get in or out which isn't ideal when vehicles might be approaching from either side. Note this was built in the 1970's when cars were generally smaller.

I do hope the above statement, viewed alongside the material previously submitted both under the initial Certificate of Lawfulness application, as well as the appeal application, provide enough evidence to support our argument in this case. Having waited nearly a year to have our appeal heard, I do look forward to hearing your response on this matter in due course.

Kind regards,

Ben Watts