

Session 13B –Alternative Sites.

Inspector's Question 13.20

Does the site have any relevant planning history? (applications, permissions, appeals, previous allocations)

Inspector's Question 13.21

What is the site's policy status in the submitted Local Plan? (eg whether in defined settlement/countryside/AONB/conservation area/Landscape of Local Value etc)

Inspector's Question 13.22

What is the site's policy status in any made or emerging neighbourhood plan?

Inspector's Question 13.23

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

Inspector's Question 13.24

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 (SHEDDLAA) and does the Representor have any comments on its conclusions.

Inspector's Question 13.25

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

Inspector's Question 13.26

What type, and amount of development could be expected and at what density?

Inspector's Question 13.27

When could development be delivered and at what rate?

Inspector's Question 13.28

What evidence is there of the viability of the proposed development?

Inspector's Question 13.30

Has the site been the subject of sustainability appraisal and does the Representor have any comments on its conclusions?

Inspector's Question 13.31

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

Council's response to Questions 13.20 to 13.31

13.20.1 Questions 13.20 to 13.31 are either seeking information from the Council or a response from the Representors. To assist the examination, the Council has prepared a schedule which, where known, provides the information requested for each of the sites that are the subject of Session 13B (Appendix A).

13.20.2 During the preparation of the Local Plan, the Council undertook two calls for sites. In 2012/13 a borough-wide call for potential development sites generated the submission of 186 sites from landowners, developers and agents. A second call for sites was undertaken in 2014, requesting the submission of additional sites that were located in accordance with the emerging Local Plan settlement hierarchy. This exercise yielded 120 new sites and 41 resubmitted sites. Both calls for sites were widely publicised and a standard pro forma was used to assess or reassess each site. The same methodology was applied to the assessment or reassessment of sites submitted through the Regulation 18 consultations (11 new sites and 25 resubmitted sites emerged). The Council also identified further sites using local knowledge of previously submitted sites, focusing on the town centre and former urban capacity studies. All sites that were assessed through the SHEDLAA were subject to sustainability appraisal.

13.20.3 New development should be located at the most sustainable towns and villages where employment, key infrastructure, services and facilities, together with a range of transport choices, are available. The Council has established a settlement hierarchy by focusing new development within and adjacent to the urban area, with smaller scale contributions from the Rural Service Centres as a whole and then, at a more limited scale, the Larger Villages. An extensive search for sustainable and deliverable housing sites has been undertaken, and the Council is satisfied that it has allocated appropriate sites in sustainable locations in the Local Plan to meet its objectively assessed housing needs.

13.20.4 The Council believes the sites promoted by representors R19252 and R1974 are the same site: Albion Road Marden, leaving 11 sites the subject of examination in Session 13B.

13.20.5 Of the 11 sites, nine sites have been assessed through the SHEDLAA and have been subject to sustainability appraisal. All nine sites were rejected, and the Council's position has not changed. Sites previously promoted and assessed through the SHEDLAA for 100% residential development that have been put forward for mixed use development at the Regulation 19 stage, including residential, have not altered the Council's view expressed in the SHEDLAA, i.e. that the sites are unsuitable for development.

13.20.5 One site (R19107) is a Local Plan allocation whereby the representor is seeking an

amendment to Policy H1(68) Bentletts Yard, Laddingford. The site has since been approved subject to the signing of a S106 agreement.

13.20.6 One new site has not been previously assessed (duplicate site R1952/R1974). New sites have not been the subject of a detailed SHEDLAA assessment: sites have not been surveyed, infrastructure providers and the public have not been consulted, and sites have not been subject to sustainability appraisal. In the case of the newly submitted site, the Council reaffirms its position that objectively assessed needs can be met without the allocation of further development sites.

Inspector's Question 13.32

Are these changes necessary for soundness, and if so, why?

Council's response

13.32.1 This is primarily a question for the representor. The Council does not consider the changes to Policy H1(68), proposed by the representor, to be necessary for soundness.