

## SPR Planning Local Review Body

---

**From:** Jackie Polakowska [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 July 2024 00:00  
**To:** SPR Planning Local Review Body  
**Subject:** LRB-2024-29

**CAUTION:** This email originated from an external organisation. Do not follow guidance, click links, or open attachments unless you have verified the sender and know the content is safe.

Having read the reasons for seeking a review of the refusal of this retrospective planning application, which seems to me to lack new evidence and rather miss the point, I would like to make the following comments.

The pod has no relationship or connection whatsoever to the house on the walled garden site, from which it cannot even be seen.

It looks prominent in its elevated position on a very public site above the main access roadway which it overlooks. The trees around it are deciduous, so for most of the year it is highly visible. It is very out of keeping with what is otherwise an attractive roadway, and spoils the look of the main entrance area to the walled garden.

As the walled garden is not listed, this eases restrictions on where the pod can be situated either within the garden's walls or behind the house on the north side.

A crane was used to deliver the pod so a crane could be used to lift it over the wall into the front of the main garden. It would also be possible to lift it with a crane and take it up the field to the west of the property (with the farmer's permission) at the top of which there is only a low metal fence for the pod to be lifted over, and into the area to the rear of the house. Alternatively, I believe this type of pod can be disassembled which would facilitate moving it, so despite what the applicant claims, it would not be impossible to relocate it.

I would like to point out that a significant proportion of residents of the small hamlet of Garth have taken the trouble to object.

The applicant, during a conversation near the pod before applying for retrospective planning permission, told me that the suppliers of the pod had informed her that planning permission was not required.

The combative attitude in the applicant's conclusion to her reasons for requesting a review might be better directed towards whoever gave incorrect advice about requirements for planning permission.

This application clearly contravenes the planning requirements for ancillary accommodation and approval would set an undesirable precedent for future applications.  
Please uphold the decision to refuse.

Jacqueline Polakowska

[REDACTED]