

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to submit a further objection to the planning application DM/25/2223. While I appreciate there have been revisions to the initial application, the amended plans do not alleviate my serious concerns regarding the proposal's compliance, justification, and long-term impact on the area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB).

Firstly, the applicant, COSRECI, has demonstrated a repeated disregard for planning regulations and the terms of granted permits, casting serious doubt on their willingness to comply with any new permission granted:

- The applicant has a proven track record of ignoring and flouting planning law, including three consecutive years of illegal construction work (the marquee) and ignoring a Planning Contravention Notice issued in 2024.
- Even when COSRECI have been granted permits, the terms have been breached, as seen with the planting license given by WSCC earlier this year, where significantly more than the permitted 35 plants were planted. This, along with planters and other items placed along the verge were considered unlawful obstructions of the public right of way, which came solely as a consequence of the event this planning application seeks to facilitate. Where is the guarantee that Scientology will stick to the conditions and rules of any planning authorisation they are given?
- The application contains conflicting information regarding the duration the temporary structures will be in place. The event field elevation plan suggests "no longer than 6 weeks," while the Design and Access Statement states the marquees will be in place for up to 15 weeks (from 17 August to 30 November). Furthermore, the application fails to specify clear limits on how long the 'temporary structures' will be in situ each year, offering no guarantee they will not remain for extended, near-permanent periods. Historically, the marquee has been erected mid-August and not taken down until late November, with construction work taking place for over a month at both ends, leading to unnecessary and anti-social noise nuisance and HGVs coming and going from the property.
- The total area occupied by temporary marquees is listed as 8,100 sq m on the application form, but the detailed structures listed in the Planning Statement (Event Tent, Catering Tent, Seminar Tent) total only 7,500 sq m, leaving 600 sq m unaccounted for. Further clarity is needed on what exactly they are planning to build.
- It must be noted that the application is not simply requesting permission to upgrade existing provisions; it is seeking ratification for development (the marquee and car park change of use) that has occurred annually without planning consent and is considered a planning breach.

Given this history, there is no confidence that the applicant will abide by the rules or confines of any planning permission granted.

Second, the proposed development is disproportionate to demonstrated need and is intended for a limited duration, making the permanent alteration of the AONB unjustified:

- There is insufficient evidence that the neighbouring Leisure Centre and Rugby Club require 600+ car parking spaces for overflow. While an extension may be needed, the scale of this 683-space expansion is unwarranted.
- Photographic evidence from the 2025 event shows large, vacant spaces at the rear of the tent, proving that a smaller structure would be adequate for their stated purposes. There is no evidence to suggest a structure of this size is needed, and the attendance figures provided by the applicant are inconsistent.
- The application provides no evaluation or analysis of alternative, more appropriate nearby venues that could host the event without building on the AONB. If this were done, I believe that it would be apparent that there is no need for development of this scale. This development would result in totally unnecessary permanent damage to the AONB, destroying the rural nature of the area and restricting members of the public from enjoying the quiet and peaceful countryside on public footpaths. Given this development is primarily intended for an annual event run over three days, it is in my mind unjustified.

Third, I have concerns regarding the applicant's right to develop all proposed areas:

- The connecting land between Hobbs and Juhring fields is reportedly not owned by COSRECI, but by the Hobbs family, and there is no evidence that permission has been obtained to develop this third-party land.
- The amended block plans indicate a differing site boundary compared to the original map, and the boundary line also differs from the Land Registry map, crossing the access road when it should run along the edge. This makes it unclear where the applicant's actual property boundary lies, particularly regarding the access route and new entrance.

Unless these boundaries are clarified, the proposed development of the access road can't be justified.

Fourth, the transport aspects of the application are based on inconsistent data and lack credible provision for sustainable transport goals:

- The claimed attendance varies wildly between 10,000 (press statements), 6,000 (told to police in 2023), and 5,000 (Travel Plan), making it impossible to determine the required infrastructure.
- Documents uploaded by the applicant state that on average, 1,100 vehicles park on the site for the event and yet they are only applying to increase capacity to circa 900. The proposed development does not therefore meet the requirements that already exist, and therefore means problems such as cars parking on the road will continue due to insufficient spaces being created. Furthermore, the Transport Assessment states 698 spaces, the Planning Statement says 683, and the Design and Access Statement says up to 689 spaces—this inconsistency does not give me trust that the application is well formed.
- Despite stated objectives "To increase the use of alternative modes of transport... including walking, cycling and public transport" and "To improve the health of staff and visitors through increased walking and cycling," there is no adequate provision to

support these aims (no pavements, no pedestrian crossing from Rockwood Park, and inadequate bicycle storage).

- The Travel Plan's goal to reduce single car use by 10% over 5 years means 10% of the proposed car park will become obsolete in a short period, further highlighting the long-term destruction of the countryside as unjustified.
- The Transport Assessment and Road Safety Audit appear to be based on regular day-to-day use, not a survey of the high-impact IAS event itself, making the figures unhelpful for determining the requirements of this development.

Last, the claims used to justify the development are unsubstantiated or unconfirmed:

- The Design and Access statement claims the events "provide an economic boom" to the local economy, but no evidence has been provided to support this claim. Most people who attend this event arrive on Friday, spend all day at Saint Hill and then leave the following morning. There is no evidence of people staying for extended periods in order to make use of town facilities or shops.
- The statement that agreements for shared use of the car park with neighbours will be "formalised promptly" is speculative. The lack of a formal agreement means the claim that the development will benefit the local sports and rugby clubs is entirely presumptive.

For the reasons detailed above, I strongly urge the Council to reject application DM/25/2223.

Kind regards,