

I and my wife and family have since 1994 lived at Mallow Cottage, Broad Oak, immediately opposite the field of which the site forms part, on the South side of Broad Oak.

We have a good view of the site from the South boundary of our garden which is on a similar level as the field, some 3 meters above the level of Broad Oak road. This view was until about 2 years ago, when a fence and hedge were erected on the southern boundary of the field, unobscured. This has enabled me to have a clear view of the site from my garden, something which I have regularly done since the development of the whole of the CCW Services site has accelerated, begun to expand onto strategic gap land and become considerably more intrusive since 2008.

I cannot comment on the applicant's contentions regarding the engineering works comprising the installation of membranes, hard core and grasscrete, other than to make two observations:

- a) examination of historic ariel images of the site before and after 2006 does not suggest any changes in the appearance of the surface; and
- b) examination of historic ariel images of the site since 2006 until it was tarmacked in 2020 do not reveal any visual difference between the surface of the site and the rest of the field.

With regard to the second part of the application, regarding the use of the site I can comment with confidence based on my observations over the last twenty years.

Between 2000 and earlier and 2018 or so use of the area of the field comprising the site was minimal and sporadic, during the 2000's the main use was the storage of stacks of pallets and occasional vehicle parking. The majority of the time the site was vacant, suggesting it was used as an overflow pallet storage facility.

More recently the site was used for vehicle parking but this was sporadic and not a regular occurrence, furthermore access to the site appeared to be obtained from the south end of the field meaning that bare grass land with no foundation had to be used to access the site, there was clear hedge/tree boundary running down the west side of the field dividing it from the 'developed' part of the overall site.

In 2020 I witnessed tarmac tankers and other surfacing vehicles entering Broadway Farm and, as explained in the applicant's planning statement the site surface was topped with impervious tramacadam. Since then there has been a major increase in the use of the site for parking lorries, trailers ambulances and other vehicles on a regular basis.

It became obvious to us that this appeared to be an unauthorised use in breach of planning legislation and in March 2021 we enquired of the Eastleigh Borough Council Planning Authority as to whether this was an authorised use. We were advised on 14th April 2021 that following an inspection it could be confirmed that there was a breach of planning and that the applicants had been given 21 days to submit a retrospective application for permission.

Having heard nothing further we made enquiries in August and September and were then advised that a retrospective application had been made on the 4th November 2022 – on 15th March 2022 we were advised that this had been withdrawn and that a further application was to be made by April 2022. Further enquiries in May revealed that the applicant was meeting with the Parish Council – further applications were made unsuccessfully.

Examination of historic ariel images of the site on Google Earth (see appendix) reveal the little or no use of the site on a regular basis before 2020.

In conclusion, whilst I cannot comment with any authority on when the grasscrete was installed, if it was installed as the application states, to facilitate parking on the site, my own observations and the evidence of Google earth images shows that there was no regular parking or vehicle storage on the site until 2020.

On this basis the applicants have clearly failed to demonstrate by adducing any independent evidence that the site has been used for continuous, or even regular, parking of motorised vehicles for any period longer than three years, during which period the use had already been established in breach of planning and which, on my understanding of the law, cannot therefore be used to count towards the time accrued in support of an application under s191 of the TCPA 1990.

In these circumstances I would respectfully request the Council to reject the application for a Lawful Development Certificate.

A. Rhodes