

## Future Planning

---

**From:** Planning  
**Sent:** 22 January 2026 07:37  
**To:** Future Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Regulation 18 Objection – Allocation 21T034 (Land rear of Market Street – Former Auction Rooms), Castle Lane, Torquay

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

---

**From:** Store Store 24 [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 January 2026 11:48  
**To:** Planning [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Regulation 18 Objection – Allocation 21T034 (Land rear of Market Street – Former Auction Rooms), Castle Lane, Torquay

Dear Planning Policy Team,

I am writing on behalf of **AWNS Group Limited**, the owner of the property known as **Store Store 24**, Castle Lane, Torquay, TQ1 3AN, to formally object to the inclusion of our property within the draft Local Plan allocation **21T034 – Land rear of Market Street (former Auction Rooms)** as part of the **Torbay Local Plan 2025–2045 (Regulation 18 Draft)**.

### Site identification and background

On the draft proposals map, our building is identified as “*the old auction house*”. While this reflects a historic use, the building has been **substantially renovated internally and externally** following our purchase and is now a **well-maintained, operational commercial premises**, trading as **Store Store 24**. Prior to refurbishment the building was derelict; it now represents a positive and active use within the town centre.

The building itself is **over 100 years old** and forms part of the established built fabric of the area.

### Objection to allocation 21T034

We object to the inclusion of our property within allocation **21T034**, which envelopes our building, for the following material planning reasons:

#### 1. Functional land-locking and deliverability concerns

The draft allocation relies on land located to the rear of our property. **Without the removal or redevelopment of our building, access to the rear land would be severely constrained or rendered unviable**, effectively land-locking the site.

As the sole controlling frontage, our property represents a **critical access constraint**, and no evidence has been presented within the draft plan to demonstrate how the allocation could be delivered without compulsory acquisition or loss of an established, viable business.

This raises serious concerns regarding the **deliverability and soundness** of the allocation at this stage.

## 2. Lack of justification for inclusion

We have seen **no site-specific justification** explaining why our property has been included within this allocation boundary, particularly given:

- Its lawful, active commercial use
- Significant recent private investment
- The absence of any vacancy or underuse

The boundary appears **arbitrary**, and we were not directly notified of the proposal. We only became aware through neighbours and social media, which further highlights concerns regarding the adequacy of engagement at this early stage.

## 3. Impact on a viable and established business

The allocation places **planning blight** on an operating business, creating uncertainty around future investment, refinancing, and long-term occupation. This runs counter to national and local policy objectives which seek to **support existing businesses**, particularly where they contribute positively to town centre vitality.

## 4. Historic and townscape considerations

The building is over a century old and contributes to the historic character of the area. While not formally designated, its age, scale, and position within the streetscape warrant careful consideration. The draft plan does not demonstrate how this historic asset would be protected or integrated.

## 5. Reasonable alternatives exist

We understand the strategic need for regeneration and housing delivery; however, **reasonable alternative sites exist elsewhere** within Pimlico and the wider town centre that do not compromise established businesses or rely on constrained access arrangements.

We also note that **neighbouring properties and residents share objections** to this proposal, particularly regarding the practicality and impact of the allocation as currently drawn.

## Requested modification

At this Regulation 18 stage, we respectfully request that:

- **Store Store 24, Castle Lane (former auction house) is removed from allocation 21T034,** and
- The allocation boundary is reconsidered to exclude established, viable commercial premises whose inclusion undermines deliverability.

We would welcome engagement with officers to discuss this matter further and to assist in shaping a more realistic and evidence-based approach before the plan progresses to the next stage.

Thank you for considering this representation.

Yours faithfully,

**AWNS Group Limited**

