

## Written submission (objectors):

### Charles Romaine

(Submitted jointly by neighbours in close proximity to Glenvale: Allayne Amos, Chris Amos, Jim Forrester, Liz Forrester, Gareth Osborn, Julie Osborn, Bryony Romaine, Charles Romaine, Dave Spokes, Julie Spokes, Janet Vaughan, Wayne Vaughan)

### Policy ADPP1

- The application site is in open countryside in the AONB, 700m from the nearest settlement, and not in the settlement hierarchy (“Urban Area”, “Rural Services Centre” or “Service Village”).
- The Applicants (and Economic Development consultee) have not provided sufficient grounds for exception to this policy; no real analysis has been provided and stated demand includes “office” and “chiropractor” uses which are not applicable. Proposed is just a “speculative” industrial property rental business (Committee Report paragraphs 6.10/6.39).
- The existing mixed-use site will be significantly reduced by the units and the dominating 100m access road, reducing its ability/flexibility to operate as a viable rural business in future, particularly after the Applicants’ ownership.

### The site is not in sole agricultural use or a farm

- The site is “mixed-use”:
  - (a) horticultural
  - (b) retail
  - (c) wholesale commercial

as concluded by an inspector on 26/10/17 (APP/W0340/X/16/3165648), who stated:

*“the unchallenged evidence is that up to 50% of the business comprises the sourcing and provision of plants to commercial operators .... As a matter of fact therefore the dominant activity at Glenvale is to provide a service to commercial operators. The provision of goods for sale, display or service to visiting members of the public is a steadily decreasing element of the business, whilst the nursery element, ... appears to have remained relatively static.”*

- The Inspector’s analysis confirms that (a) horticultural plant nursery (agriculture) plays a lesser role compared with (b) retail and (c) wholesale commercial together.
- Therefore, rather than Local Plan Policy ENV16 Farm Diversification and CS10 Rural Economy, Policy CS9 is of most relevance and should therefore be afforded greatest weight.

## Policy CS9

- Paragraph 3.4 of the Committee Report states, “*Early engagement between the case officer and the agent resulted in the description being amended to remove B1 from the proposal scheme. The reasons for this was due to potential conflict with policy CS9.*” It is not clear why CS9 is now thought to be complied with by having light industrial use under new class E when it was not thought to be so under old class B1. Moving the proposed development just a few metres North in the revised site plan has not materially changed the impact on the residential amenity.
- Contrary to Policy CS9(a), industrial units at the Southern end of the Glenvale site are not compatible with uses in the area (residential dwellings in a tranquil environment abutting Bucklebury Common, in open countryside and the AONB) and the potential impacts, particularly noise.
- Glenvale’s main business activities, generating the typical background noise, have always been conducted at the Northern part of Glenvale (shop, car park, lorries unloading). At residences in the South (over 80m away), these background noise levels have always been perceived to be low. Temporary structures (polytunnels) used for horticulture are proposed to be replaced with a permanent building undertaking light industrial activities and a 100m access road, with the consequential adverse impact on the residential amenity.