

Planning Committee Presentation

Steve Ainsworth

GenR8 junior development partners.

The real applicants, and the senior partners are Councils own officers

Interest? Officers' ego trip. Boast of having a Big One.

Papers not normal objective and impartial planning report. A sales pitch by promoters.

Public record shows that officers have repeatedly sexed up their reports in order to manipulate members. Your papers tonight are yet another dodgy dossier.

Fail to mention cost if fails of £5m

Fails to point out that the 'mini by-pass' terminates in a single lane tunnel too low and narrow to be passed through by large vehicles.

Fails to point out that this application is incompatible with policy E20

Policy E20

Primary purpose new town centre focus **South of the river** in Holmes Road.

E20 dependent upon *business relocation* from Holmes Road **South of the River**:

E20 officers knew for years E20 dead:

1. when grant available only for *new* businesses.
2. when businesses declined to move.
3. When PPS 25 issued - no building on flood plain
4. E20 now impossible as this application uses land intended for planned relocation.

.....over

E20 P 58 and 59

“residential development at Sterne Mill will only be allowed as part of a comprehensive scheme to bring the land south of the river forward for development”.

Why? Because Residential development was only being allowed to fund the Holmes Road project **south of the river**. This application is ***Not part of a comprehensive scheme***.

The **E20 fall back position** is *“to develop the Sterne Mill site in isolation solely for employment use”*. – and **NOT** this plan.

Fails to correctly apply the Sequential Test.

Agenda bottom of page 61.

PPS 25 (51 pages) and PPS 25 Practice Guide. (192 pages)

Sequential Test

4.5 The aim should be to keep all development out of.... flood risk areas... All opportunities... should be explored, prior to any decision to locate them in areas of ..risk.

4.3 This needs to be done in a transparent and clearly documented way.

4.17 At the local level the sequential test should be applied to the whole LPA area.

Officers have casually skipped over the question – because it would fail the test.

Officers have:

1. Made a decision which is the proper prerogative of members alone.
2. Failed to do so in a transparent and well-documented way
3. Been the judge in their own application
4. And, ***unsurprisingly***, come to an incorrect decision which supports themselves.

Maladministration on a text book scale.

Confident will unanimously reject application.