

Dear Sirs

Re : Application Number SMD/2017/0252 & 0253

As a very close pre-existing neighbour I feel that I must add to my previous comment on this application.

I note the recent changes added to this application, altering room description, reducing bedroom numbers and suggesting a new car park, on rough ground with no preparation or lighting.

As I have commented before, these proposals will seriously affect our amenity and the right to enjoy life in the residential property we purchased over 30 years ago.

Caverswall Castle submitted and was given permission for a use to maintain the property in 2016. The owner apparently does not wish to use this. Why did he apply ?

These new proposals are solely to enhance the Sale of Caverswall Castle, making it more appealing to prospective purchasers.

We are asked to compare these additional uses, to residential usage of this property. All these usages will seriously affect us, we have already experienced their use, without permission over many years.

- Past residential usage was not the heavy day by day hotel usage. Remember that a Grade 1 listed property isn't protected by double or triple glazing. Any noise echoes around the neighbours properties, especially during the evenings and at night.
- Conference Usage – Even with all attending staying overnight, this is more intensive and noisy than residential usage. What about the other staff involved ?
- Filming – even the recent attempt by BBC News filming at the Castle involved approximately 6-8 vehicles and their passengers, and it was us, the close residential neighbours, who had their door knocked on, about where was Caverswall Castle, how was it entered, and how did they contact them.

If the applicant and his agent are suggesting that "restrictions" (and "conditions"?) could be agreed to prevent a negative effect on the amenity of the close pre-existing properties, should not we, as the owners of the very close properties that it will cause a loss of amenity and distress to, be included in, and be able to comment on any discussions prior to a decision.

Surely if a proposal requires numerous conditions, and a legal agreement to make it acceptable for permission, this proposal clearly has a serious negative effect on the close neighbours.

How would SMDC ensure that these conditions would be policed and enforced ? Who would pay for this in these days of cost cutting.

If conditions need imposing, I suggest that this application is totally unsuitable for permission to be given.

The NPPF core planning policy suggests that all applications should seek a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, and should find ways to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives.

I can clearly state from previous experience of these uses, when permission had not been granted, that these proposals will definitely not provide a good standard of amenity for all the pre-existing neighbours, and most certainly will not enhance, or improve our lives.

I also add, in evidence, that SMDC already has in their possession, photos and documents, from the very close neighbours, clearly showing how, when the Castle was used without permission, for all of these proposals, loss of amenity and distress was caused to all the close pre-existing neighbours.

I feel that even if pages of conditions and restrictions are agreed, they will not be able to prevent severe loss of amenity and a detrimental effect on the lives of all the people in the close pre-existing neighbouring properties.

I therefore request that this application is refused in full.

Marguerite Booth