

Dear Lewis,

Thank you for forwarding on your additional correspondence from Mr Pickup regarding the marketing requirements for APP/18/00530.

From reading through I am able to advise the following:

Unit 8-9:

The minimum marketing requirements are set out at the end of paragraph 10.06 of the [Local Plan \(Core Strategy\)](#). I reviewed the submitted Marketing Report by Holloway Iliffe & Mitchell at the time of the original consultation and concluded in my comments (27th June 2018) that for Unit 8-9:

Requirement i) = Met

Requirement ii) = Submitted photos not dated

Requirement iii) = Met

Requirement iv) = Not met

Requirement v) = Screenshots not dated

After reviewing the correspondence received from Mr Mort (Holloway Iliffe & Mitchell) dated 26th July 2018, I can see that photos of dated marketing boards (3rd August 2017) and dated screenshots of internet marketing (7th August 2017) have been provided. As such, I am satisfied that requirements ii) and v) have been met for Unit 8-9.

Regarding advertisement in the local press [requirement iv)], I note Mr Mort's statement that:

"It is not current practice to advertise through this method. We receive a much better coverage elsewhere, such as online exposure which would not be received through advertisements in the local press. As such we maintain that the decision not to market on this basis is correct".

Though it is the Council's current starting point is request advertisement in the local press, it is acknowledged that it is not uncommon for property to be increasingly marketed through online advertisements (as opposed to through the traditional trade or local press). Whilst this information could be supplemented with further information in respect of analysis of online activity; this particular unit has been marketed since 2016 with evidence, in the form of an enquiry log, from February 2017. On this basis, I am satisfied that units 8-9 have been subject to a realistic and active marketing exercise.

Unit 10:

My comments (from 27th June 2018) concluded that for Unit 10:

Requirement i) = Not met (marketing commenced in March 2018 so the period was less than 6 months)

Requirement ii) = Not met as nothing submitted

Requirement iii) = Not met (see requirement i)

Requirement iv) = Not met

Requirement v) = Screenshots not dated

After reviewing the correspondence received from Mr Mort (Holloway Iliffe & Mitchell) dated 26th July 2018, I understand that the unit has not been marketed for the minimum 6 months required by

Policy DM2. At the time of the application submission, the current tenant had provided notice to their landlord of their vacation, and since then, further marketing has taken place as shown by the additional enquiry log entries up until 24th July 2018. When areas are proposed for redevelopment, current tenants are vulnerable to displacement and it would appear that the tenants have felt obliged to relocate in this particular case. It may be possible to justify a deviation from the marketing requirements set out by Policy DM2, if evidence from the current tenants can be provided which confirms they have available and suitable accommodation to relocate to within the borough. This follows the same advice I gave in my previous comments on 27th July 2018.

Based upon the newly submitted information, it would appear that Unit 10 has now been actively marketed for a period of about 5 months. The marketing of Unit 10 should continue at least for the next month to ensure that the minimum marketing period of 6 months is undertaken and/or evidence is obtained from the current tenants which confirms they have other premises which are suitable for them to relocate.

In addition to the above, I note and understand Mr Mort's explanation as to why marketing boards were not erected for Unit 10. Although requirement ii) will not be met I feel there is an understandable justification for this in this instance. With this, I am satisfied that requirement v) has now been met as Mr Mort has provided dated screenshots (11th May 2018) of internet marketing for Unit 10.

The other four units:

I stated in my previous policy comments (27th June 2018) that the four units (between Unit 1 [Grastar Restaurant] and Unit 8-9), which are currently occupied but are proposed for demolition, have not been marketed. Although the area is being proposed for redevelopment, the absence of information about the current tenants situation and the absence of marketing is not acceptable. As such, my previous policy objection still stands.

I recommended in my previous policy comments that as the proposal is to redevelop the area, there may be justification to set aside the marketing requirements of Policy DM2 providing that evidence which demonstrates that the current tenants have suitable and alternative accommodation to relocate to is submitted to us. This recommendation still stands.

Summary:

I am satisfied that Uni 8-9 has been marketed sufficiently.

The marketing of Unit 10 should still continue for the next month to ensure that the minimum 6 months marketing is achieved. During this time, I would recommend that Mr Pickup provides information from all current tenants (including those in Unit 10) that they have available and suitable accommodation to relocate to.

Please let me know if you have any questions with the above, I look forward to future correspondence regarding APP/18/00530.

Thank you

Kind Regards

Lewis Ford
Senior Planning Policy Officer, Planning Services