

Good evening.

Graveney with Goodnestone Parish Council has already submitted comments objecting to this proposal and is grateful for the opportunity to speak to the committee tonight. We raised this issue with enforcement some months ago, prompting what is now a retrospective application.

Our original objection was based mainly on the unsuitability of the area and roads. We will not repeat these points but will add that although Head Hill Road and Seasalter Road are not free of HGV movements, these are far less frequent than those that would arise from this change of use, and they are currently of an agricultural nature, which is to be expected in a rural area such as this. Skip lorries are a completely different type of vehicle and would risk changing the character of the villages. We also believe that the impact of additional vehicle movements would be more significant than that suggested by the applicant. The road through the villages is often the scene of minor incidents and crashes, which are often not reported, but are well known to residents.

We also have concerns over the storage of 'plant' applied for. 'Plant' is a wide term, encompassing many things and depending on its nature, could be quite sizeable and require substantial transport to and from the proposed warehouse.

As this is a retrospective application, we feel it important to consider the current activities being carried out by the applicant. As stated in our original objection, vehicle movements are in excess of 20 per day (as one would expect, with a storage capacity of 900m²), access to the site is **not** as specified on the application with Cleve Hill Lane also being used and waste is being transported. This gives residents and the parish council little confidence that any self-imposed conditions in future would be adhered to.

Having said this, we recognise that the barn itself seems acceptable for storage use, and although we recognise that each application needs to be considered on the basis of the information submitted we are particularly concerned about compliance issues and are aware of the difficulties already faced by residents in Oare in dealing with the operations of the applicant. We are grateful to the planning officer for taking our concerns into account and the suggestion of a number of conditions. Whilst we consider the application should be refused, we would strongly request that if the committee was minded to grant approval it should impose conditions 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 for the reasons given in the report. We also feel that condition 4, which deals with the hours of use, is still too lenient, given the proximity of residential properties along the route that would be taken, and would request the hours be reduced further. Perhaps a possible compromise would be 8-6 on weekdays. We have recently had complaints from residents about early morning noise and vibration; asking them to suffer this six days a week is, in our opinion, unfair and excessive. The cycle route is also particularly busy at weekends and we would have concerns for cyclists' safety if hours included Saturdays. We are grateful to the planning officer for the suggestion of Condition 1, relating to a temporary permission of three years, but, in the light of our concerns already expressed about the applicant's history of non-compliance, would ask that the review takes place sooner than three years, ideally after one year. If the applicant intends to be fully compliant, this should present no difficulty.

Finally, we are concerned that the burden of monitoring activity may fall to residents and the parish council, particularly given the remote location of the site, so would wish to have the council's fullest assurance that effective monitoring and enforcement would take place if necessary.

2'55