

## **Written submission (objector):**

### **Gareth Osborn**

I have read with interest the report to the above committee with the recommendation summary

As an objector to the application I have the following observations

The report is well drafted and a fair summary of the objectors views.

The officers appraisal summarises our objections very accurately:

6.3 Development is outside a defined settlements, but is permitted subject to allowances where there is identified need - our contention, no demonstrated need

6.6 The site is not within an accessible location. It is remote from local services and public transport - our contention, this is contrary to all policies

6.7 Proposals for industry will be directed to the districts Protected Employment Areas - there is good demand for the protected employment areas and they are sustainable. Support should continue to be prioritised to these identified areas

6.8 The Council will promote existing employment sites - our contention is that the planning designation of the site does not support an industrial use

6.10 New speculative space only - our contention, no proven demand

6.12 Environmentally unsustainable - our contention is this is critical

6.18 TVLEP are said to say that there are not sufficient space for such "affordable units" - unproven as demonstrated by many vacant units in former farm buildings available to let

The comments above are the thrust of our objections

My observations are that there are many other small units particularly within agricultural space - farms within the vicinity. There are many units available within 2 miles of the site. Officers will be able to confirm.

The space will not be "affordable". The applicants will have to put in 100m of roadway to access the site. This infrastructure will make the site very expensive to develop and will as a consequence not provide affordable space to local businesses or alternatively not be commercially viable.

Therefore the presumption that there is demand is flawed by the fact that there is available space in the vicinity and the units are speculative only, they will also be expensive, so do not support the LEP report

### **Highways Concerns**

The design shows the 4 units with roller shutter doors immediately opposite the entrance onto the industrial development. This will leave scope for conflict between vehicles accessing the premises, working in the premises - fork lift trucks - and in particular pedestrian movements. Turning circles within the industrial development are flawed. A van can not turn safely to access the units as the turning circle within the scheme is too tight

I query whether emergency vehicles can circulate within the site.

There should be some proper tracking of turning circles within the industrial areas proving that vehicles can move safely.

The scheme is flawed and the layout is dangerous

Summary - whilst the conditions to the recommendation prepared by the officers will mitigate the impact on residential amenity, and that is very much appreciated, it does not provide justification for a positive decision which is clearly against Council policy