Paul Abbott 38 Goodwood Grove off Tadcaster Road York YO24 1ER

Mrs Val Dilcock
North York Moors National Park Authority
The Old Vicarage
Bondgate
Helmslev
YO62 5BP

11th November 2009

Dear Mrs Dilcock

## **Objections To**

## Non Material Amendments to the Proposed Replacement Building On Agricultural Land to the Rear of Tamarind, Church Lane, Fylingthorpe

This Planning Application has been Fraudulent and Unlawful from the beginning.

## In the NOTICE OF DECISION. Points against

- 2) The new building does not conform to application plans ie
  - a) Its meters off the original agreed footprint
  - b) It is not shiplap boarding over a timber frame
  - c) It is not on a plinth of dark red brickwork
  - d) The building is significantly greater in length, width and height
  - e) It is clearly visible from Thorpe Bank and Sleights
  - f) It is not fit for purpose see H Saunders letter 16/09/08. Detailed account of Stable element. Demanding equine facilities and excluding windows etc
  - g) It is unlawful built on a paddock, not domestic curtilage H Saunders letter 16/09/08 part 8. Only R2-Domestic Horse Related Development is permitted.
  - h) H Saunders letter 16/09/08 openly admits in first para professional negligence. Quite clearly she states without ambiguity she failed to study the application. My actions prompted this letter!

## In the REASONS for CONDITIONS. Points against

- 3) The new build is bigger than a Bungalow. Highly Visible detracting from the character not only on the site but the wider area too. It is definitely not domestic curtilage. It is built on a Paddock.
- 5) The intended use does not comply with saved policy R2 of the local plan. Which states development outside a domestic curtilage does not enjoy permitted development rights. In essence the new build is so big it cannot be reasonably described for domestic storage. It is a bungalow built of breeze block

In the REASON FOR APPROVAL Points against

The actual new build (it does not begin to conform to the plan) is massive – totally dominating the hill having a real detrimental impact on the character of the area. Val Dilcock letter 16/10/09 states page 2 3<sup>rd</sup> from last para "replaces a previous building of a very similar size" This is an absolute misrepresentation and "a down right lie"! Val Dilcock has admitted not having visited the site. If she had she would quickly realise she has been unprofessionally advised. I demand she visits the site, withdraws assumptions made and makes a full apology to those who suffer her arrogance. The building is unlawful and must be demolished!

Demolished because every "discrepancy" was intentional.

J Cavanagh letter of 03/08/09 mentions numerous discrepancies. Again I prompted a very reluctant Compliance Officer to go back and do her job. These were her findings. Amazingly she rubber stamps these serious infringements.

On the 3/11/09 Mike McCabe submits an amendment application. Again he admits failings. These are tractor widths (not inches Val Dilcock claimed) and it's a big tractor! THIS APPLICATION IS FRAUDULENT because

1) Section 13 The new bungalow can be seen from the road.

2) The plan is what was intentioned all along. The internal wall was never going

to be built

3) Reasons for amendment are untruthful. I received an email from Mike McCabe on 11/11/09 @ 12.16 stating horses are going to be kept at Tamarind. But if the Bungalow which now nobody can deny is not fit for stabling purpose how will this be achieved. EASY — THE PADDOCK IS NOW DOMESTIC LAND AND ANOTHER BUNGALOW (sorry stable) has to be built.

The honesty, judgement, professionalism, integrity and motives of Val Dilcocks Team MUST BE FULLY INVESTIGATED. The "Team" instantly respond to Mike McCabe wishes and excuse blatant intentional changes. I on the other hand must wait until 30/11/09 (see V Dilcocks letter 11/11/09 last para) for information requested 22/10/09. How can anyone be expected to present a decent objection(s) when denied freedom of information.