

Economy Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 22:28:25

Name/Organisation

Stephen Davis

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Member of the Public

2. What Economy policy you are commenting on

E4 - Supporting the Rural Economy

3. Does your comment relate to a specific paragraph(s)? if yes which paragraph does this relate to?

I am commenting / objecting to the phrasing of point C in the introductory paragraph for Supporting The Rural Economy. The text says:

"To ensure a strong rural economy the council will support economic uses in the rural area where proposals are for...

C. The intensification/ expansion of existing rural industrial estates or employment sites;

4. In relation to the policy or paragraph you are commenting on, do you consider the Island Planning Strategy for submission to be legally compliant?

Yes

5. Please give details to support your answer to question 4

- **Yes - legally compliant**
- **Yes, complies with Duty to cooperate**

6. In relation to the policy or paragraph you are commenting on, do you consider the Island Planning Strategy for submission to be sound?

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **not effective**

8. What modifications do you think are needed to make the Island Planning Strategy legally compliant and/or sound?

The use of the word "intensification" is not appropriate in the context of potential further development of existing industrial sites in rural locations. Phrasing of this nature weakens the LPA's ability to reject unsuitable applications. It also encourages rogue development by landowners who see their chances of gaining retrospective permission greatly increased by this type of phrasing.

As residents of Merstone will attest, there have been significant impacts in the area from an industrial complex that has been created almost entirely by retrospective grants of permission. Furthermore the planning agents for the site have already quoted this very wording from the draft policy to bolster their attempt to support yet another slew of retrospective planning applications for a major expansion of the site. See the DAPS for 22/00762/FUL - Page 8

Diversification of the rural economy can be beneficial provided the implementation is properly controlled.

A revision of wording to replace "intensification/expansion" with something such as "appropriate development" would be a very worthwhile change.

This still shows intent to support the rural economy but makes it clear that it is not 'open season' to industrialise the countryside.

It is important to get the tone of these umbrella statements correct. The long term consequences of poor wording could be considerable as this plan will influence decisions for years to come.

I submit that this is a necessary change to make the plan "sound".

It should also be noted that several people made written representations on this very point during the Regulation 18 consultation phase, these were recorded in the published summary of comments. The summary of comments states "Amend criteria c) as it gives licence to aggressive expansion and industrialisation of rural areas".

It isn't clear why this amendment has not been implemented but at least there is still time to make the change.

9. Do you have any comments on the policies map?

No.

11. Do you wish to request to appear at the hearing sessions that will take place?

No

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

N/A

Economy Reg 19

Submitted by: Anonymous user

Submitted time: 19 Aug 2024, 22:39:27

Name/Organisation

Stephen Davis

Email Address

[REDACTED]

1. What type of respondent are you?

Member of the Public

2. What Economy policy you are commenting on

E4 - Supporting the Rural Economy

3. Does your comment relate to a specific paragraph(s)? if yes which paragraph does this relate to?

**My comment relates to Point C in the introduction to the E4 section which states
To ensure a strong rural economy the council will support economic uses in the rural
area where proposals are for:**

**C. The intensification/ expansion of existing rural industrial estates or
employment sites;**

4. In relation to the policy or paragraph you are commenting on, do you consider the Island Planning Strategy for submission to be legally compliant?

Yes

5. Please give details to support your answer to question 4

- **Yes - legally compliant**
- **Yes, complies with Duty to cooperate**

6. In relation to the policy or paragraph you are commenting on, do you consider the Island Planning Strategy for submission to be sound?

No

7. If you answered no to question six is this because?

- **not effective**

8. What modifications do you think are needed to make the Island Planning Strategy legally compliant and/or sound?

NOTE: This is a correction to an earlier comment in which an incorrect planning reference number was included - corrected in this version.

The use of the word "intensification" is not appropriate in the context of potential further development of existing industrial sites in rural locations. Phrasing of this nature weakens the LPA's ability to reject unsuitable applications. It also encourages rogue development by landowners who see their chances of gaining retrospective permission greatly increased by this type of phrasing.

As residents of Merstone will attest, there have been significant impacts in the area from an industrial complex that has been created almost entirely by retrospective grants of permission. Furthermore the planning agents for the site have already quoted this very wording from the draft policy to bolster their attempt to support yet another slew of retrospective planning applications for a major expansion of the site. See the DAPS for 22/00672/FUL - Page 8

Diversification of the rural economy can be beneficial provided the implementation is properly controlled.

A revision of wording to replace "intensification/expansion" with something such as "appropriate development" would be a very worthwhile change.

This still shows intent to support the rural economy but makes it clear that it is not 'open season' to industrialise the countryside.

It is important to get the tone of these umbrella statements correct. The long term consequences of poor wording could be considerable as this plan will influence decisions for years to come.

I submit that this is a necessary change to make the plan "sound".

It should also be noted that several people made written representations on this very point during the Regulation 18 consultation phase, these were recorded in the published summary of comments. The summary of comments states "Amend criteria c) as it gives licence to aggressive expansion and industrialisation of rural areas".

It isn't clear why this amendment has not been implemented but at least there is still time to make the change.

9. Do you have any comments on the policies map?

No.

11. Do you wish to request to appear at the hearing sessions that will take place?

No

12. Please outline why you would like to attend?

N/A