

Islami, Anila

From: McCardle, Ross
Sent: 20 April 2022 16:26
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 21/2178

Importance: High

Please add to file as additional information re: marketing/rental.

From: Tracey Dixon [mailto:Tracey.Dixon@tadplanning.co.uk]
Sent: 20 April 2022 10:21
To: McCardle, Ross <Ross.McCardle@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk>
Cc: Ian Hardman <ian.hardman@pentlandhomes.co.uk>; Keith Beavers <keith.beavers@pentlandhomes.co.uk>
Subject: 21/2178
Importance: High

Dear Ross

I write in response to your email sent 28.3.22 in respect of the above matter and the Planning Committee's resolution to seek additional information to support the planning application.

The application has the support of a thorough Marketing Report consistent with the requirements of Policies E2 and RL7.

The 2019 Refusal referred only to the above policies and not Policy E2 referenced in the Committee Report. It did not refer to the need to provide marketing evidence for the units to be let.

As stated in the Planning Statement Policy E1 is not relevant as the application site does not fall within Hawkinge West, Hawkinge site listed.

The Committee Report refers to Policy E2 which protects 'existing employment sites for business purposes under classes B1 and B8' and is permissive in respect of alternative uses subject to stated criteria being met. Criterion 2 refers to 'sustained marketing over a 12 month period prior to submission of the planning application but the premises has remained unlet or unsold for all appropriate types of B Class employment use and no reasonable offers have been received'.

The policy does not refer to the other permitted uses for the premises including A1, A2 and A3 (now within Class E).

In the preamble to the Policy the Council acknowledge that some employment land may be lost through the effects of national policy, including permitted development rights and expects proposals for alternative uses to demonstrate why the site is no longer required, including evidence of marketing over the previous 12 months. The policy does not explicitly prescribe what the marketing evidence should contain and the Councillors request does not therefore have any explicit planning policy backing.

The same applies to Policy RL7.

The submitted Marketing Report is consistent therefore with the requirements of PPLP Policies E2 and RL7. Its conclusions are clear as set out at Paragraph 6.12 in the Planning Statement; there was little or no demand for the

property for its approved use, to let or sale. The marketing was available to all purchasers including investors to rent but this did not attract any interest.

Pentland Homes are the developer of the units. Their Business Model is building to sell and it does not allow for any rental opportunities whereby it would act as landlord. To do so, would put that building business at risk, with obvious significant implications for the housing market and local economy generally. It was of course open to any commercial agent who have the skill sets and infrastructure to purchase the shops and rent them out themselves. That this didn't happen only adds to the fact that there simply isn't a market for these business units.

The application has the support of a cogent planning justification which addresses the previous reasons for refusal, particularly Reason for Refusal 1 and there is simply no reason why it shouldn't be granted a planning permission.

I trust that this information will be reported back to Planning Committee at the earliest opportunity and I look forward to your confirmation of such in due course.

Kind Regards
Tracey

Tracey A Dixon BSc (hons) BTP MRTPI



T : 07885 407278

 **Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail or its attachments**

The Information in this e-mail and in any attachments is confidential and intended only for the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying or distribution of this e-mail or any attachments is strictly prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and delete any message and attachments. We believe that this e-mail and any attachments are free from any virus or other defects which may affect any computer system, but it remains the responsibility of the recipient to ensure that it is virus free. TaD Planning Ltd accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage arising in any way from its use.