

## **Notes regarding the Planning Application to be heard regarding the retention of a large storage building to the rear of Turkish Restaurant, 9a-10a Shirley High Street, So15 3LR**

In both cases the owner of the property doesn't seem to feature. I would have thought this was imperative in such cases.

### **Application in 2022 07/00222/FUL – Application from 2007**

Basically 2007 the Planning permission was granted on untrue/incorrect information, the then lessee Mr Jung who ran the Little Buddah Restaurant, claimed to own the whole of the access back lane from his restaurant right to Mayflower Road. This was untrue and he must have known it. He completed the application for a Certificate A

Also on Mr Jung's application he gives the address as 6a-8a Shirley High Street. This is not the property from where he ran his Little Buddah business. (9a-10a Shirley High Street) I do not know if the owner of the property was involved in this but I think they should have been and not just solely given to a lessee.

Under the Town and Country Planning Act I have read that if Planning Permission has been granted on **false information** then it can be revoked. I think this should be put in place with regards to this illegal development and the buildings removed.

The land was illegally taken with false information given and not checked out properly by the council.

### **Application in 2022 22.01503/FUL -Current Application**

In the November 2022 Application I see no information about the actual owner of the property.

The current lessee, Mr Teymuroglu, completed his application in and entered that he was the owner of the land and completed and signed a Certificate A (this was false and I am certain he knew he was wrong as he was aware of bad feeling about the original store being there. He has now considerably extended on this filling the **ENTIRE** back lane with storage buildings. If he was so certain he was the owner why didn't he apply for Planning **BEFORE** he build the bigger store. He was building on the previous application which he knew had been given permission, but may not have known the above discrepancies.

**Change of Certificate** - My understanding is that a planning application procedure would normally take less than 3 months However in August 2023, 10 months after making the application Mr Teymuroglu makes a substantial change to his application. A change that none of the objectors/neighbours know about. He changed his knowledge of ownership to Certificate D – to be completed if you don't know the names and addresses of any other owners or people with an interest in the land'

**Posting in the local press** - I believe as a condition he was required to post a note in the Daily Echo (the paper that no one reads with an extremely low circulation) – this was done in early August. We the objectors knew nothing of this. This was wrong - we should not have been informed.

It says on the note be posted in the Daily Echo on 04/08/23 that he had -

'taken all reasonable steps have been taken to find out the names and addresses of everyone else who, on the 21 days before the date (04/08/2023) was an owners and /or agricultural tenant of any part of the land to which this application relates, but I ,the applicant/ have been unable to do so.

He **did** not know who the ownership was unknown (we have understood the road is unadopted) but there certainly are interested persons and he knows who they are. This is false information as he knew neighbours had objections and interests and 'all reasonable steps' would have included writing to inform them of this change – he didn't do this.

When I enquired about what was holding up the planning appeal I was told correct documents were being required – I was not told what they were.

**No consultation** - Mr Teymuroglu had clearly made no attempt whatsoever to contact any of his neighbours. The action was taken I believe with no contact in the hope that no one would know about it. He did after all know his neighbours had made objections about the unlawful development.

In my emails to the Planning Department I have asked questions about the reference to a 'consultation period between 27 August and 7 September 2023 and have received no answer to this question. Regarding the question of 'reasonable steps were not taken', I was told 'the applicant has taken the required action to serve notice with neighbours/relevant parties not being required to be notified via site notices or letters' (TB 26.10/03)

**Alerts on the Planning Portal** - My colleague and I have an alert on this planning application online and we have had no update about new Certificates, or posted documents, consultation time, in the local paper. Surely an alert should give such information. We feel left deliberately in the dark.

The only statement on the front page is 'Decision is awaited' The reference to any dates only appears loosely under planning Application Dates and does not explain what the consultation is about. I strongly feel we should have been alerted to this considerable change to the application. I do not feel we have been kept informed on this alert

**Changing Certificates** - I have also read that if someone submits the wrong certificate, as Mr Teymuroglu did a year ago then the Certificate should not be just changed/alterd but the case closed and they have to reapply – this did not happen... people are not supposed to change their statement about ownership. The fact that this change was made 10 months after the first application seems suspicious and I would have thought should have resulted in a fresh case.

I think the whole business is flawed, unfair and seeks to undermine all those who objected to passing this retrospective planning. It would seem to set a precedent for others to grab land and get away with it.

The initial permission was given on false evidence and probably no consultation and this case definitely seeks to allow people to commandeer land that is not theirs to take.