

From: Public Access DC Comments
Sent: 09 November 2017 21:20
To: Public Access DC Comments
Subject: Comments for Planning Application 17/01981/F

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 9:20 PM on 09 Nov 2017 from Mr Hugh Pidgeon.

Application Summary

Address: The Pheasant Pluckers Inn Street Through Burdrop
Burdrop Banbury OX15 5RQ

Proposal: Change of use from A4 to C3 (ACV Listed)

Case Officer: Bob Neville

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Name: Mr Hugh Pidgeon

Email: [REDACTED]

Address: Burdrop Green Street From Hawkes Lane To Street
Through Burdrop, Burdrop, Oxfordshire OX15 5RQ

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment:

Comments: 17/01981/F | Change of use from A4 to C3 (ACV Listed) | The Pheasant, Street Through Burdrop, Burdrop, Sibford Gower, Banbury OX15 5RQ

From Hugh Pidgeon
Burdrop Green, Sibford Gower
Banbury, Oxon, OX15 5RQ

Thursday, 9th November, '17

With nearly 30 letters of objection, and substantial responses from the two Parish Council and the Bishop Blaize support group already registered on this website, I believe I don't need to re-iterate the case that has been made so eloquently for a refusal to this application for change of use.

As several have already commented, the fact that this is now the tenth time Geoffrey and Jacqueline Noquet have applied either for a certificate of lawful use of the premises as a private house or for a direct change of use from A4 to C3 amounts to a misuse of the public funds that have had to be diverted both from Cherwell District Council the national Planning Inspectorate to manage what is manifestly a deliberate manipulation of planning law.

The fact they have succeeded in sustaining this campaign to secure a change of use to a private house for more than 10 years against repeated injunctions, determinations by the courts, rejections of applications and appeals and the determination of 3 week-long public hearings by officers of the Planning Inspectorate is bringing the entire planning process into disrepute.

It is that concern that I wish to bring to the attention of the CDC Planning Committee in this submission.

Repeated refusal of planning applications for the conversion of the pub to a private dwelling (for example 06/01697/F and 07/00630/F) have appeared to make absolutely no difference. Or to take an associated example, the conversion of the pub's bottle store first into a barn and then into private accommodation for let went ahead with neither building regulation approval or planning permission. That was all obtained retrospectively when the work had already been completed.

To date every enforcement order that has been made has been evaded or disregarded. As an article in the Banbury Guardian of the time summarized, in February 2012, Cherwell District Council issued the enforcement notice which was upheld on appeal in October the same year. An investigation in court in August 2013 found that the family were still using the property as a residential dwelling.

The court heard that the "Noquets had ignored a planning enforcement notice which prohibited the premises being used solely as a residential dwelling". Speaking at the hearing Mr Gary Grant prosecuting on behalf of the CDC said that by the time the enforcement notice was issued the whole of the building had changed to use as a residential dwelling house.

In 2013, District Judge Stephen Day ordered Jacqueline and Geoffrey Noquet to each pay £8.500 in legal fees and be subject to a 12-month conditional discharge. Consequently, Cllr Michael Gibbard, lead member for planning at Cherwell at the time, said that the case should serve as a 'severe warning', that "planning permission is not optional nor can it be ignored, and it is important the enforcement notices are adhered to in order to protect the integrity of the planning system".

It is this integrity that is now at stake in this new application. The pub is no longer on the market, and is not functioning in any sense as a pub, and yet Noquets are still in residence 5 years on from the original enforcement order - applying yet again for change of use, when in effect the

change of use has already taken place.

The warning has not been heeded, planning permission does indeed seem to be optional in this case.

As a result of the recent revelations contained in the Paradise papers, lawyers have been rushing to demonstrate, from the Queen of England down, that their clients have not broken any law. But it is the offence to what has been termed 'natural law' that has caused such widespread outrage across the world.

In no different a fashion, it is not the minutiae of whether the Bishop Blaize pub was viable or saleable but the lack of integrity involved in the owners' pursuit of private profit and the threat to the reputation of the whole planning process that has been incurred in the process that causes such offence - and such concern.

It is exactly for this reason, I urge the Planning Committee to see this application for what it represents and reject it outright.