

R1995

Supplementary Statement to Session 13A. Land at Mount Lane, Yalding. (R1995)

Issue (i) -Whether the alternative site would be suitable, sustainable and deliverable.

Qn13.1 Does the site have any relevant planning history ?

An outline application, ref: 15/509402 was refused permission on 17th February 2016. The reasons for refusal were that :

(1) The proposed development , by reason of the loss of woodland, loss of habitat and biodiversity, the scale of the development and the location outside a settlement boundary would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area including the Special Landscape Area and the benefit of the additional housing would fail to outweigh the demonstrable harm that would be caused to the local area contrary to the NPPF and Policies ENV28 and ENV34 of the Adopted Local Plan.

(2) In the absence of appropriate legal mechanism to secure the delivery of affordable housing and to mitigate the additional impact on local community facilities in respect of education, libraries and healthcare provision the development would fail to contribute to meeting local need for affordable housing and would be detrimental to existing local social infrastructure and therefore would be contrary to policy CF1 of the Adopted Local plan , Affordable Housing DPD (2006), policy DM13 of the Reg. 19 consultation and central government policy as set out in the NPPF.

The decision was appealed via the written representations method. At the Inspector's site visit, the Inspector stated that the appeal may be elevated to Hearing as the Council was now claiming that it now had a five year housing land supply - something that it hadn't had since November 2012.

The Hearing is now due to be held on 15th December 2016.

Submissions have been made in response to the Council's previous "Calls for Sites."

Qn13.2 What is the site's policy status in the submitted Local Plan ?

It abuts the edge of the settlement boundary of Yalding.

It is not subject to any policy constraints in the submitted Local Plan.

Qn13.3 What is the site's policy status in any made or emerging neighbourhood plan

There is no published draft of any neighbourhood plan.

Qn13.4 Is the site greenfield or previously developed (brownfield)land according to the definition in the glossary of the National Planning Policy Framework ?

It is greenfield.

Qn13.5 What previous consideration by the Council has been given to the site's development (eg inclusion in a Strategic Housing and Economic Development Land Availability Assessment (SHEDLAA) and does the representor have any comments on its conclusions ?

In the Council's SHLAA dated May 2009, the site (which had the reference no. 009) was described as being adjacent to the village and well-related to facilities. It then added that the site was potentially suitable as a modest extension to the village and that a modest development could be accommodated here without compromising the wider countryside.

The capacity of the site was given as 60 units.

The site then had the reference no. HO-150 in the 2014 SHEDLAA. The assessment stated that, in terms of access and sustainability, it was considered suitable for housing. Nevertheless, the conclusion was that ;"the site is a major area of woodland and the development for housing here would have a significant impact on the character of the area and this change, loss of woodland, ecological impacts are likely to be unacceptable."

Qn13.6 What is the site area and has a site plan been submitted which identifies the site ?

The site has an area of 3.12ha.

Qn13.7 What type and amount of development could be expected and at what density.

The proposal comprises a total of 30 dwellings, of which 40% will be affordable.

The market housing comprises 3 x 2 bed dwellings; 10x 3 bed dwellings and 5x4 bed dwellings.

The social rented housing comprises 4x2 bed units and 3x3 bed units.

The intermediate housing comprises 3x2 bed units and 2x3 bed units.

Qn13.8 When could development be delivered and at what rate ?

An outline application (15/509402) was submitted in 2015. It is now subject of an appeal that will be heard on 15th December.

There is no constraint to the development of the site, which would need to await Reserve Matters approval.

It is expected that development would take one year.

Qn13.9 What evidence is there of the viability of the proposed development ?

The developers, Millwood Designer Homes, have assessed the viability of their proposals and not identified any problems in this respect.

Qn13.10 Has the site been the subject of sustainability appraisal and does the Representor have any comments on its conclusion ?

The URS Sustainability Appraisal March 2014 states, in para. 12.14.4, that this site (HO-150) is located adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. However development of the site would result in significant loss of valued woodland.

In response to this it is no doubt likely that local people do value the woodland and do not wish to see development there. However, the trees were not subject to any TPO until 18th October, when the Council imposed a blanket TPO on the whole of my clients' site.

Qn13.11 What constraints are there on the site's development and how could any adverse impacts be mitigated ?

The main concerns of the Council are related to the fact that the site comprised (poor quality) woodland. Millwood Homes' consultants have identified how adverse impacts of this could be mitigated.