

Dear Mr Lewis

OFFICES AND WAREHOUSE - OUTLINE 64, 65,66 AKEMAN STREET - TRING

This application was discussed at the Liaison Meeting on October 30th and I have the following comments to make.

The 1971 planning permission on appeal for the use of the site for storage was temporary for one year only and there was a refusal on appeal in 1975 to continue the use when the Inspector concluded inter alia that:

"... any further expansion of this successful company should now take place in an area allocated for such purposes."

Furthermore, in the 1977 appeal the Secretary of State decided not to discharge the condition requiring the cessation of the storage use at Nos. 65 and 66 while accepting that this use had become established at No.64. He considered that there had been no material change in circumstances since the 1975 decision and therefore continued to support the objective that the area within which the site is located should ultimately become primarily residential.

In the Tring Town Plan 1977 the site and indeed the whole of Messrs. Batey's premises are again included within a primarily residential allocation, and Policy 7 of this Plan contains the statement that:

"Residential uses in the Town Centre will be retained and extended wherever possible."

Thus, with circumstances continuing unaltered since the 1977 appeal decision and the residential allocation being reaffirmed in the Tring Town Plan it is assumed that your Council will once again oppose this proposal.

From a strategic planning standpoint the issues raised by this application relate to the fact that it proposes the establishment of a storage use ancillary to industry on a site where - with the exception of No.64 - there is no commitment to industrial use. There is thus a conflict with the provisions of Policy 4 of the submitted County Structure Plan. Moreover, should the storage use become established, it will undoubtedly make difficult the relocation of the remainder of Messrs. Batey's non-conforming premises should this be considered expedient.

A Lewis Esq -2- 2 November 1978

Accordingly, in order that strategic policies are properly safeguarded, I direct that permission be refused for the following reason in addition to the reasons that your Council may impose.

Policy 4 of the submitted County Structure Plan states that industrial development will be restricted to existing commitments as at January 1 1976 and no such commitment exists in this instance.

Yours sincerely

7/4

Geoffrey Sneeley

