

**Submission from Save Our Shorelines**

**QUESTIONS RELATING TO RELOCATION OF ADMINISTRATION TO TAMAR**

- There does not appear to be a clear definition of population planned to occupy the buildings
- Building sizes are being altered every few months it seems, suggesting that size is not being driven by a clear brief. If overall heights and net areas can be reduced so easily then how is this changing the numbers housed and the facilities they will need?
- Partial relocation is being proposed – this would be disruptive to administration
- Space allowances for users in new Tamar site may be reduced to get lower heights and areas and poorly planned, leading to user dissatisfaction. Where is the comprehensive planning strategy for this?.
- Risks associated with co-location of all senior branches of both Administration and elected chamber have not been addressed
- Geographical decentralisation of government separates from long established psychological recognition, relationship of business district, community, etc. and includes implied feng shui problems.
- Potential changes at CGO site should NOT be considered a separate issue from Tamar development
- If fully developed could be 3 x70 storey towers but this will create huge environmental problems. If height restricted then revenue benefits are lost to community and an asset is wasted.
- Assumptions that existing buildings cannot be retrofitted are wrong. Examples exist for improvements in situ.

In conclusion – the facts are not on the table, the story is incomplete. No funds should be approved while questions like these remain open and responses are only partial and unconvincing.