

**BLAZE-INN SADDLES
FORMERLY THE PHEASANT PLUCKERS INN
BISHOPS END
STREET THROUGH BURDROP
SIBFORD GOWER
OXFORDSHIRE
OX15 5RQ**

APPEAL: 21/04166/F

APPEAL APPENDICES AND DOCUMENTS:

Appendices 8.a

Rebuttals and additional comments not published.

**BLAZE-INN SADDLES:
PLANNING APPLICATION: 21/04166/F**

Conservation Objection:

Thank you for consulting the Conservation Team on the above application. There are concerns with the description of the application? Permission is sought to re-position and amend the structure of the previously allowed 3 bedroom building? The proposed structure is different in terms of location, design and function to that permitted at appeal for 16/02030/F. The original building was intended as ancillary accommodation to the pub whereas this application is for a standalone cottage. Therefore, the application should be considered as an entirely new development not a replacement development with the accumulative impact of both structures being taken into account. The application should be considered to be a new application and the accumulative impact would need to be considered.

Applicants Response:

In our view the Conservation Team should only be concerned with any possible negative impact on the adjacent Listed Buildings or to the Conservation Area. The proposal will replace the previously permitted structure and therefore there is no requirement to address any accumulative impact of both structures when there is clearly only 1.

I have previously submitted a Rebuttal to both of the Objections from The Sibford Parish Councils in which contain indirect Support to the new building at 2 points.

- 1. That if our Historical Evidence is found to be accurate then a building in its new position would be appropriate.**
- 2. If the proposed building replicated the materials used at Barn Close it would be complimentary and enhance the Street Scene.**
- 3.**

We submit the following:

- 1. Our Historical evidence was sourced from the History Centre based in Oxford.**
- 2. We have proposed a structure built in the same stone as Barn Close and offered to tile the roof in the very same materials used on the main part of the living wings of their home.**

In our opinion the proposed amendments would provide a balanced, complimentary and enhanced addition to the Street Scene. We will resist any requirement to incorporate a thatched roof because it would not allow for the possibility of installing Solar Roof Panels on the southerly facing side of the structure.

Conservation Objection:

There are also concerns with the design of the building which is overly domestic and does not respect the surrounding vernacular buildings.

Applicants Response:

I have previously sent emails offering both yourself and the Conservation Officer an opportunity to consider and request any design and materials changes that you might find acceptable and that offer still stands.

Signed: Geoffrey Richard Noquet

Dated: 17/02/2022

Blaze-Inn Saddles

21/04166/F

Supporting Evidence:

SGPC have indirectly indicated that they would support our proposal on 2 points:

4. That if our Historical Evidence is found to be accurate then a building in its new position would be appropriate.
5. If the proposed building replicated the materials used at Barn Close it would be complimentary and enhance the Street Scene.

We submit the following:

3. Our Historical evidence was sourced from the History Centre based in Oxford.
4. We have proposed a structure built in the same stone as Barn Close and offered to tile the roof in the very same materials used on the main part of the living wings of their home.

In our opinion the proposed amendments would provide a balanced, complimentary and enhanced addition to the Street Scene. We will resist any requirement to incorporate a thatched roof because it would not allow for the possibility of installing Solar Roof Panels on the southerly facing side of the structure.

Signed: Geoffrey Richard Noquet

Dated: 04/02/2022

Blaze-Inn Saddles

21/04166/F

Rebuttals to Objections as of 26/01/2022:

Fait accompli:

There will be a Building in our car-park regardless of any objections, the question is what will it look like and where will it be sited?

Street Scene:

We believe the new proposal will result in an enhanced and better view along the Street Through Burdrop and will be more aesthetically pleasing than that of the previously allowed structure.

Views to The Sibford Gap:

A site visit will clearly demonstrate the following facts:

At present when our gates are closed there is only a very limited opportunity to experience any view across our property or to actually see the Sibford Gap. Any pedestrian must stand on, or close-to, the position shown on our Street View Block Plan. There are 2 options for future views and they can be assessed by reviewing our accompanying Superimposed Photographs.

If we proceed with the allowed structure, it will extinguish most of any view and quite frankly it is virtually impossible to see the Gap regardless of either new building, in fact, the Sib Valley can only realistically be seen by standing within our car-park or from the many other vantage points around the 2 Villages.

Additionally, the new proposal sits in a position that has no views behind it because of the large conifers screening our Shepherds Hut.

Our Street View Block Plan clearly shows that although the sight-line will change it will still allow a better view from the Street to the open space beyond. We estimate that there will be an approximate 400% increased triangle of sight span if we erect the newly proposed building. If the Case Officer wishes, we are prepared to reduce the height of the new gates and lower the existing wall and that will enable and open-up a more permanent and wider view that is presently unavailable. Notwithstanding the above, our Historical Photographic Evidence demonstrates that the views in the past were much more limited and virtually non-existent from then until now.

In essence our new proposals will improve the views across the land above the Gap. Our final point on this issue is that in Planning Law, no person is entitled to a View.

Tourism:

The Promotion of Tourism in Rural Areas is strongly supported by the LPA and is a Key part of their Local Plan and Policy Strategy. Our existing Holiday Letting Facilities generate a significant contribution to ourselves and also the viability of The Wykham Arms. From our knowledge we estimate that our guests spend at the very least £10k per year at the Wykham and that figure will probably double if this proposal is allowed. The Village Shop also benefits from the visitors to our Holiday Accommodation and again that will increase with more families using our proposed additional facilities.

continued

2.

Parking:

Any concerns about parking have been previously addressed by 2 PINS Inspectors, the increase to the proposed footprint is less than 1 car-parking space and that loss is off-set by the reduction of the new requirement for 1 car as against 3 cars. Parking is also available to the front of the building.

The Oxfordshire Highways Officer (Glen Speakman) has no Objections to this current application.

Barn Close

The building is sited too close to a fragile listed building

Whilst this may occupy a previous footprint, that footprint would be an agriculture barn. Which would not have humans inhabiting or have had windows at first floor level,

Applicants Response:

It is probably me, but I cannot find the Building Regs Underpinning Application that must have been submitted to make their Barn Safe for the Bathroom and current Human use.

I have also scanned the Planning website and cannot find the Application to excavate and install the Huge Underground Heat Pump System in the lower field at Barn Close.

Likewise, I cannot find the Ecology Report and Flood/Watercourse Surveys that should have been submitted prior to those extensive Engineering Works and disruptions to the Natural Habitat and Ecology of that part of the Sib Valley. It must be me, now I can't find the Applications to remove the recently felled Beech Trees at the end of their garden.

Mr Downes Is obviously a stickler for Statutory Planning Requirements and just to make sure that everything is correct and Hunky Dory at Barn Close, can he point me to the relevant Applications that must have been submitted by him or his Agents.

We can understand that the owners of the closest property might have a few legitimate concerns, however, they knew that they were buying their Second Home immediately next to a Pub and now they object to any of our Plans for continued Viability. Their tone could be taken to be as somewhat derogatory and some comments unwarranted. It seems that they have a problem with the pub and not necessarily what is actually a fairly harmless building addition. We had to endure nearly 2 years of noisy, disruptive and major building works carried out at Barn Close, we gave them access to our property and field and this is their response.

The new position of the proposed building will have minimal impact on the owners of Barn Close, they will not be overlooked and the structure will help to suppress any noise emissions from our car-park. The local population will benefit from the wider and significantly enhanced view of the Sibford Gap and by the improved Street Scene.

continued

3.

Malicious Falsehoods and Possibly Bogus Objections:

Now to the very serious matter of some extremely questionable Objections:

Banbury:

115 Winter Gardens Way, there have many Objections from this Address over the last decade and we had no idea why or who this person was. We had our suspicions, because of the content and decided to investigate and verify the authenticity of the person and address. No person with the name Henry Rawlin has lived at this address for at least a decade.

Arundel

Does anyone really believe that someone living in Arundel actually cares what is happening in the Sibfords, a place where they lived some 30 years ago? Even if true, which is highly unlikely, how can this Objection carry any weight, how can our proposal affect someone who lives in Arundel? Furthermore, the objection is clearly a personal attack and contains no relevant Planning Substance. The 1 common denominator is the surname, if anyone doubts our concerns about the authenticity and source of this email, just read the content.

Plymouth

Does anyone really believe that someone living in Plymouth actually cares what is happening in the Sibfords, a place where they lived some 30 years ago? Even if true, which is highly unlikely, how can this Objection carry any weight, how can our proposal affect someone living in Plymouth? Furthermore, the objection is clearly a personal attack and contains no relevant Planning Substance. The 1 common denominator is the surname, if anyone doubts our concerns about the authenticity and source of this email, just read the content.

Malicious Falsehood:

Malicious Falsehood is a false statement made maliciously that causes damage to the claimant. Malicious Falsehood exists to protect against statements which themselves are not defamatory but are untrue and cause damage. There is no need to show damage to reputation.

continued

4.

Malicious Falsehoods:

It is possible to have a statement which is not defamatory and a claim in libel or slander would not succeed but a claimant still has a claim in malicious falsehood. A claim for malicious falsehood is usually made to protect economic interests.

What does a claimant need to show to make out a claim in Malicious Falsehood?

The statement must be published deliberately to a third party.

There needs to be reference to the claimant or to his business, property or other economic interests.

The statement must be published maliciously. Malice is defined as a statement made by a party who knows that the statement is false or is reckless as to its truth. Being negligent as to the truth of the statement is not enough, or if the words are published in good faith, even if they are false. Where a defendant intending to cause harm publishes words, they believe to be true but turn out to be false, then they could be liable. But when the intention was to benefit their own business, the fact that they damaged another business, is not evidence of malice. There are exceptions to this. Where the offence is actionable under section 3(1) of the Defamation Act 1952, it is not necessary to prove actual damage if the words in dispute are calculated to cause financial damage to the claimant and are published in writing or other permanent form or; calculated to cause financial damage to the claimant in respect to his office, professional calling, trade or business.

“In an action for ... malicious falsehood, it shall not be necessary to allege or prove special damage –

(a) if the words upon which the action is founded are calculated to cause pecuniary damage to the plaintiff and are published in writing or other permanent form, or

(b) if the said words are calculated to cause pecuniary damage to the plaintiff in respect of any office, profession, calling, trade or business held or carried on by him at the time of the publication.”

Continued

5.

Objection Advice:

Don't Make it Personal

Of course, it is your objection letter so you can say what you want. However, you must remember to stay within reason. Content that is potentially libellous or offensive will likely not be published, or they may be rejected altogether. You should also refrain from criticizing the applicant or appellant at any point, even if it is justified. This is because the results are determined based on their planning merits, and personal issues will immediately be disregarded.

Your letter should focus on the benefits of refusing the planning, and why the application should be denied. The objections should come across as balanced and logical, with detailed and well-thought arguments. Consider public interest and how the local community could be impacted by the approval of the planning permission or appeal.

Avoid focusing on issues such as land ownership and the effects of the proposal on the value of the neighbouring property. Councils have little interest in this and see this as a personal motive instead of a genuine one. You must also refrain from talking about any personal circumstances of the applicant. Remain neutral, as though you do not even know them personally, and your letter will gain better results.

Conclusions:

Main Issues:

Impact:

The re-siting of the Proposed Structure will have minimal Impact on the Surrounding Area and General Location. The proposal will be sympathetic and retain the character of the adjacent listed buildings.

Harm:

The proposal will not harm the Street Scene and in our opinion it will both improve and enhance the views in the immediate location.

Benefits:

Enhanced View of the Sibford Gap, Improved Street Scene for the Local Population, Long-Term Viability of the Public House, Tourism to the Rural Location, Employment Opportunities, A safe and welcoming Meeting Venue for the Motorcycling Community. These Benefits clearly outweigh any potential Harm that may be caused by the re-siting of an Allowed Development.

continued

6.

Viability:

According to Hayley Butcher (PINS Inspector) There is no Planning Requirement to demonstrate viability. Nevertheless, based on our existing facilities and historical turnover we conservatively estimate a Nett Income of circa £30k per Annum derived from this proposal if permission is Granted. This potential income will result in the Pubs Viability both now and the foreseeable future.

Covid Pandemic:

None of the Objectors mention the Covid Pandemic and seem to be Oblivious to the affect it has had on the Hospitality Industry. Our Opening times are Fluid and will continue to be so due to the changing trading conditions. The Objections are mostly Hostile and contain little, if any, relevant Material Planning Substance.

Personally Insulting Objections:

Many of the objections contain Malicious Falsehoods and therefore should not have been accepted or indeed published. There is very little, if any, relevant Material Planning Substance or content within these unsubstantiated accusations. Our main concern is that the LPA continually allow these spiteful submissions and then suppress our right to defend ourselves accordingly.

By viewing the Objections it is blatantly obvious that LPA's Legal Team are clearly extremely selective and biased in what they deem to be acceptable from the Public as against what they will not accept from ourselves.

Final Conclusion:

If this Application is Refused, we will be faced with a Decision of whether we continue to fight a Hostile Community that Boycotts our business and will not support any attempt by ourselves to improve our Pubs Viability, or we reluctantly make another Change of Use Application. Our last 2 Planning Appeal Decisions relied heavily on the fact that our property was listed as an ACV, that is no longer true. Furthermore, we now have amassed a body of evidence that overwhelmingly demonstrates that our Pub is not locally supported or indeed vital to the wellbeing of the local community. Nevertheless, it is our wish to continue to operate as a Bikers Pub/ Café and this proposal will help us to both attain and then maintain Viability.

For all of the above reasons we respectfully ask that permission is Granted.

Signed: Geoffrey Richard Noquet

Dated: 26/01/2022

Blaze-Inn Saddles

21/04166/F

Response to Sibford Gower Parish Councils Letter of Objection and Unintentional Support:

Sibford Gower Parish Council OBJECTS to this application. The site is identified as within the curtilage of a non-designated historical asset, located within the Sibford Gower Conservation Area. There is an extensive planning history associated with the property. Parish Council Minutes provide evidence of several unsuccessful planning applications for dwellings on this site in 1982.

Applicants Response:

In 1984 Permission was Granted for 2 dwellings in the car-park subject to the Premises Licence Being Surrendered, the Landlord at that time decided not to give-up his Licence.

SGPC

Planning Appeal APP/C3105/W/16/3165654 (further referenced as APP) is particularly relevant to this application. A number of significant issues have been identified, namely: Time Limit: APP identifies a start date for the relevant time limitation, while the current application offers a vague reference to 'early 2020?'. In order to determine that APP Condition 1 has been met in full, a specific work commencement date is required, together with verifiable evidence.

Applicants Response:

The Building Regulations Department has evidence of works commenced within the allotted timeframe.

SGPC

Evidence Review: Material evidence (1922 OS map section and c1920 photograph) have been submitted in support of the application. Subject to further verification by CDC, the original photograph has been identified and confirmed within the local community. This is acknowledged as identifying a possible precedent on the current car park site. Relocation of the currently approved building: This is a separate matter for consideration prior to any consideration regarding the proposed amended building. **Should the supporting evidence be validated by CDC, such relocation of the currently identified building, comprising 3 en-suite rooms with associated conditions (APP Schedule of Conditions p5), could be considered to be appropriate.**

Applicants Response:

The SGPC seem to doubt the accuracy of our evidence and infer that we have submitted Fake Documents. The documents are copies obtained from the Official Archive based at The Oxfordshire History Centre and are clearly authentic, it therefore follows that SGPC actually supports the Application when CDC confirm the photographs are accurate.

continued

2.

SGPC

Viability Issues: The application identifies a "Biker Pub Caf? Bar" trading operation with an "outdoor trading model with "limited internal space", although no evidence is offered to identify the particular limits of the internal space. Further references state that "the major part of our income is derived from our letting business?.our pub is not presently viable?", although no evidence is offered in support. It is noted that these business premises have recently been identified by the applicant in correspondence with CDC Community Services as closed from "3rd October 2021 and will not re-open until maybe the spring of 2022 and therefore for at least 7 months our property will become our home/residence and not a pub" (13/08/21). This was further reinforced by a notice posted on the main gate: "We have now finished trading for this year's Biker season. We hope to reopen in the Spring of 2022" (08/10/21). Clearly, an extended period of conscious closure is likely to have a significantly negative impact on potential viability, offering a tenuous justification for seeking additional rental income, which would be at variance to the existing APP Condition 8 ("short-term holiday lets only"), to compensate for such closure.

Applicants Response:

SGPC seem oblivious to the fact that there has been and still is a Covid Pandemic and the damaging effect it has had on the Hospitality Industry. Our opening times have been and will continue to be Fluid due to the changing trading conditions caused by both Covid Restrictions and the Weather. They also fail to admit that they and the rest of the community do not support or visit our Pub and that is why we have changed our trading style to open when we can serve our loyal Biker Customers.

In her Decision Letter Hayley Butcher PINS Inspector said the following:

14. Both the Council and the appellant are in broad agreement that the holiday lets would bring in additional income and business for the PH and as such would assist with its viability. In my experience, such an approach is not unusual in this industry.

I have not been made aware of any local policy requirement to justify the proposed development in terms of the viability of the PH. Furthermore, the National Planning Policy Framework promotes the retention of public houses, which the proposal would help to do.

18. A number of third parties refer to the appeal site and the immediate surrounding area as falling within a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) but I find this not to be the case as no reference to an AONB is made by the Council.

continued

3.

16. The appeal site has a long history of planning and enforcement, which includes the unauthorised use of the PH as a dwellinghouse. From the evidence before me and from what I saw on my site visit the PH is currently operating as such, albeit with only limited opening hours. Notwithstanding this, any concerns in respect of the current use of the PH would be a separate matter for enforcement.

Applicants Response:

As verbally stated by an Enforcement Officer Jane Law on 19/01/2022, she was satisfied that we Trade and Operate as a Public House.

SGPC

Further, any letting activity for the proposed building when not potential viability, offering a tenuous justification for seeking additional rental income, which would be at variance to the existing APP Condition 8 (?short-term holiday lets only?), to compensate for such closure. Further, any letting activity for the proposed building when not operating as a pub would be directly contravening the existing planning permission, whilst also raising concerns regarding the current business operation, identified in the Planning Application Existing Use (6) as ?public house?. Use of proposed new building: The Application Statement references ?longer term letting facilities. needed for 3 to 6 months. or even longer? (p1) whereas the APP conclusions make very clear and specific reference to ? conditions restricting the use of the building to that of short-term holiday lets only, to be used in conjunction with the PH? (p4, para 21). This identifies a material variance between a long-term residential property rental model to be associated with the proposed relocated new building rather than the agreed short-term holiday lets model currently specified through APP Condition 8

Applicants Response:

We have simply identified the requirement for longer rentals whereby families have rented our Cottage for a short period whilst their house purchase transactions progress and then find that for various reasons their Completion Date is delayed. In some instances, this has meant the family has needed a much longer period to stay whilst negotiations continue, we would not evict any family found to be in this unfortunate predicament and for that we make no apology. By changing the Conditions it will safeguard us from any potential, unnecessary, unsympathetic and excessive Enforcement Actions.

continued

4.

SGPC

(p5). Proposed building: There are particular concerns, namely: Location: Given the proximity of the neighbouring Grade 2 barn, it appears likely that any building in this location may have a negative impact on the structural integrity of the barn. Size and Scale ? the proposed building has a significantly larger footprint and height, comprising 3 bedrooms, together with kitchen, utility & boots, bathroom and sitting room. This would appear to constitute an entirely new building, identified by the applicant as the Proposed Cottage? (p4), rather than an Amendment (p5). Design ? the proposed design does not appropriately reflect the photographic evidence provided to support the relocation and is not complementary to this location, thereby having a negative impact on the identified street scene in this sensitive conservation area Materials ? the photographic evidence clearly identifies local stone and thatch, which has been retained for the existing neighbouring barn. A similar use of materials would complement the adjacent Grade 2 listed building, generating a positive impact on the street scene in this sensitive conservation area. No specific details are included for doors, windows, rainwater goods Conditions: The scope and detail identified in the APP Schedule of Conditions (p5) continue to be appropriate and relevant for any building in this location

Applicants Response:

If the Case Officer so wishes, we are prepared to change the proposed roof tiles of Welsh Slate to Cotswold Heritage Roof tiles and match the recent Additions at Barn Close. The footprint of the proposed new building is only 10% larger and the ridge height is 0.8 metres higher, these changes are not significant, they are minor.

Applicants Conclusions:

It is pertinent to note that SGPC submitted a very flawed application to Re-List our property as an ACV (Asset of Community Value), their submissions contained some extremely dubious claims. Thankfully Cherwell Council's Kevin Larner saw-through their very lame attempt to prove their farcical declarations that our business was a Village Asset and rejected their application. Consequently, we believe that this quite hostile and contradictory objection is a reaction to that defeat.

We are well aware that many people in the Village have a completely different opinion to that of the few remaining members of Sibford Gower Parish Council and it is of no surprise that the more open-minded Councillors have very recently resigned. Nevertheless, we are buoyed by the fact, that in a strange way, this Skeleton Parish Council actually indirectly and clearly unintentionally, Supports our Application.

Signed: Geoffrey Richard Noquet

Dated: 21/01/2022

APPENDICES: 9.a

SGPC Application to Re-list ACV

Future Use

It is hoped that existing tensions between the current owners and the community may ease over time, leading to a more fulfilling partnership for all parties. The Parish Council would wish to see the pub once again being acknowledged by the local community as a meeting place for local groups and societies.

Should the premises become available for sale in the future, the **Bishop Blaize Support Group (BBSG) continue to express a keen and on-going interest in undertaking the purchase** and subsequent further development of the premises for the continued benefit of the whole Sibfords` community, recognising the CDC concerns identified in the Local Plan

Review 2040 (para 2.96, p35) in regard to the impact on local communities through the closure of local pubs. The viability could be further enhanced through the development of the premises as both a public house and a community work and well-being hub, recognising the significant impact of the COVID pandemic on healthy lifestyles, with many business activities now identifying working from home for part of the week as a conscious decision.

It is encouraging to see the public house in operation again. This Asset of Community Value application is intended to provide for an on-going period of sustainable operation consistent with the retention of this valuable local asset for the continued benefit of the local community.

Dear Mr Noquet

I refer to your response (below) to our notification of the ACV nomination in respect of the Blaze Inn Saddles.

In accordance with your request, if any further documents are submitted as evidence in support of the nomination I will forward copies to you.

I have sent Mrs Noquet copies of all the nomination and supporting documents received thus far. Names of individuals were redacted from just one of them. No other redactions were made.

Yours sincerely

Kevin Larner
Healthy Communities Manager

Communities / Wellbeing / Cherwell District Council
Direct Dial 01295 221706 / Kevin.larner@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

www.cherwell.gov.uk Twitter: @Cherwellcouncil



Cherwell

DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH OXFORDSHIRE

I am a Live Well Oxfordshire Champion. Contact me if you want to grow your community knowledge and support people to develop their strengths

www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/livewell – Live Well Oxfordshire, information to connect you to your community

From: Natalie Sanchez <Natalie.Sanchez@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>
Sent: 13 August 2021 09:04
To: Kevin Larner <Kevin.Larner@Cherwell-DC.gov.uk>
Cc: Lydia Avann <lydia.avann@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>
Subject: FW: ACV Nomination - The Blaze Inn Saddles, Burdrop

From: geoff noquet [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 August 2021 01:19
To: Natalie Sanchez <Natalie.Sanchez@cherwell-dc.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: ACV Nomination - The Blaze Inn Saddles, Burdrop

Dear Natalie

Please find my response.

The SGPC ACV Re-Listing Application is insulting, inexpedient and devious, it also contains fabricated/fake evidence, dishonest and misleading statements. It intentionally fails to include crucial historical evidence of their continual opposition to our proposals to improve viability of the Public House.

Insulting:

As recently as December 2020 the Fake BBSG Co-Ordinator emailed Cherwell Enforcement Officers stating that our 2 Letting Facilities were unlawful, Mr Butt was obviously intent on stopping that vital income to our business. (Emails Produced as Evidence).

There is also clear evidence from letters of Objections to our planning proposals that we have been the subject of a 15year Boycott. The Boycott that still remains to date was intended to devalue our Business so that we would have to sell it at a knock-down price. (Emails Produced as Evidence)

Inexpedient:

There is another Public House (The Wykham Arms) within The Sibfords that adequately serves any Community Basic Needs. Importantly The Wykham Arms is the pub that should be Listed as an ACV because it is widely accepted as being the hub of the community. It trades as a Traditional Village Pub providing all of the Day-to-Day Basic Needs for a small community and contributes to their wellbeing.

Devious:

The SGPC submissions are clear manipulations of the facts and are a deceitful and underhand attempt to achieve ACV status with the real aim and intention to undermine and influence the outcome of any future Planning Applications.

The Blunkett Localism Act was not designed to be used as a Blocking Mechanism to be used as a Useful Tool to derail Planning Applications for Change of Use, as publicly stated by Parish Councillor Mallows. The Local Community have had at least 3 opportunities in 5 years to utilise their Right to Bid and have failed to demonstrate any credible or valid attempt to acquire the property. Furthermore, there has never been any proof that a Community Group exists and is funded to progress any potential acquisition.

Therefore, the SGPC had clearly misused the ACV Act in 2016 and are intent on repeating that same Planning Abuse again.

Factual Evidence:

Mr Kevin Lerner has indicated that he will send us censored documents applicable to this ACV Re-listing Application. We believe that we are entitled to full disclosure of any submissions that are forwarded and should be in the Public Domain. The ACV Protocol should be completely transparent and therefore we respectfully ask that we have sight of all of the SGPC, SFPC and all Public Submissions so that we can respond accordingly.

Conclusions:

This SGPC ACV Re-Listing Application has no merit, it seeks to abuse the intentions of the Blunkett Localism Act and it relies on the opinions of 2/3 Parish Councillors, who are relatively new to the area, they do not represent the true wishes of the actual community. The only way that this application should proceed is that the SGPC can produced FACTUAL EVIDENCE of a Support Group and that they have the true and full Support from their Community that all want a Bikers Pub in the Sibfords, we believe that is not possible.

Signed: Geoffrey Richard Noquet

The SGPC failed to produce any evidence of a Bishop Blaze Support Group (BBSG), their application was Refused.