

Comment for planning application 21/04166/F

Application Number	21/04166/F
Location	The Pheasant Pluckers Inn Burdrop OX15 5RQ
Proposal	Permission is sought to re-position and amend the structure of the previously allowed 3 bedroom building
Case Officer	Wayne Campbell
Organisation Name	Nick Butt
Address	2 Arundel Wing, Tortington Manor Estate, Ford Road
Type of Comment	Objection
Type	neighbour
Comments	<p>I was brought up in Sibford and have been a lifelong regular visitor to the village as I love it and the local area. I have objected to earlier applications of Mr Noquet as he has serially attempted to drive a coach and horses through the planning process that safeguard the local area and its amenities. This current application is perhaps the most egregious yet. It is another step in his plan to de-licence the public house and then sell the real estate as residential property and so realise a capital profit and thereby deprive local residents of the amenities of the pub and the lovely local environment, all contrary to planning rules. His renaming of the pub from the historic The Bishop's Blaize to The Pheasant Pluckers is a self-evident and typically coarse and offensive "Spoonerism" jibe aimed at the local community, for whom he has little or no respect, and perhaps the planning authorities too? It is hardly likely to attract the great majority of potential customers. The objections to the current application are several, as set out below. 1) The proposed business advantages claimed are nonsense and are a ruse to abuse and evade planning regulations. It is ridiculous to suggest that a single three bed property will convert a poorly managed pub business into a viable business. In a more than forty year international and UK career in finance and investment I have invested profitably and exited (ie sold out) from private hospitality companies (including Airbnb and a UK pub chain built up over several years). The claimed incremental additional revenues from a 3 BR house versus three letting rooms - if any, and I am doubtful - are likely to be small and will have no significant impact on the viability of the pub business. Arguably, the 3 letting rooms have a better chance of attracting touring [probably single or paired] adult bikers than families seeking peace and quiet in Sibford. The Noquet proposition is preposterous. The real underlying commercial purpose appears NOT to build a property fully integrated with the pub and synergistic with it (the original planning application might have been sought to be justified on that basis). Instead, the obvious objective is to build a separate residential property on the whole site so that the site can be divided later and sold as two residential properties once the Bishop's Blaize (I refuse to use the obscene new name) has finally been de-licenced. The claims that the 3 bedroom house will attract a family customer-base rather overlooks the siting of same amid hoards of motor-bikers and in their vehicle park. I would not want to have any children in my care exposed in such a way. Nor would I go for a staycation with my family sited in the middle of motor-bike rallies, with poisonous fumes and noise, risk of bad behaviour, etc. The idea is absurd and cannot be the real purpose. Furthermore, Mr Noquest claims to be saving the planet with his fundamental change of use of the property and yet he actively solicits custom (almost exclusively) from bikers to come long distances from around the country to use his pub. This is patently rubbish! The two propositions are in direct contradiction. The planning authorities must exhaustively test the claimed business proposition [eg: why will the building of a separate property in/on the bikers' car park not limit parking space and so detract from the custom of the pub?] - which must be properly evidenced, which it has not been to-date - as in my view it extends tenuous credibility into the world of fantasy. If any planning permission of the type sought is granted, it must very tightly tie - ie inextricably link (akin to a tied farmer's cottage) - the new property to the pub such that they cannot be severed and subsequently sold separately, even if the pub is eventually de-licensed, which it should not be. Furthermore, such planning permission should not allow any separate grounds to be conferred on the new property and no vehicle or people access rights, such that it cannot be so easily sold separately (effectively as a stranded residence with no legal rights of access). The existing planning permission is ancillary to and adjacent to the pub buildings and business. This physical and business connection must remain. In summary, the whole existing estate of the pub must be kept intact in perpetuity. 2. Specious "Green" claims Mr Noquet makes several grand claims about the environmental benefits of his</p>

application. There is little or no substance to them and it would be better for the planet if he desisted from purporting to run a pub for biker traffic for a widely dispersed potential customer-base that necessarily through their journeys contribute heavily to large carbon emissions and cause noise pollution. Instead, the pub would likely be better off providing a good service to a more local clientele and Mr Noquet might even then fill the new letting rooms (if he ever builds them, which is doubtful if he is correctly limited to his existing planning permission which was only granted in support of the pub business)! To take just one example of the overblown claims: staycations are on the rise but they are not usually attractive to those e.g. who wish to fly away to the sun. For most people, a Sibford staycation, in accomodation sited in a pub estate, is likely to be an additional vacation option, not a substitute for an international holiday which will be taken in the normal way. So it may be argued that his holiday lettings business likely will ADD to emissions and pollution rather than diminish them as he might well increase human travel not reduce it. 3. Property not in keeping with the historic and/or listed neighbouring properties and is inconsistent with planning regulations I have read online and endorse the objections of others who have objected to this application and so do not repeat them. Sibford is a lovely area and planning authorities must ensure that developments are clearly within permitted rules in order to preserve its special status. Mr Noquet does not appear to agree with this proposition. However, that does not entitle him to ignore or abuse the rules when seeking to develop his property investment. Accordingly, he should not be permitted to prejudice the local environment just as he should not be allowed to profit from buying the pub and then running it into an unviable condition and then obtain de-licensing in order to sell it at a capital profit. Similarly, planning applications in support of the apparent overall objective must be looked at sceptically, claimed supporting business propositions must be evidenced and properly tested and then the application looked at in the round. When done properly, this approach must lead to the conclusion that the application has to be rejected.

Received Date

11/01/2022 13:39:19

Attachments