

Supplementary Statement to Session 13A. Land at Frith Cottage, Dean Street.

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

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

The site has not been the subject of a planning application by my client. However, I have promoted it through the local plan process since April 2014.

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

It is shown as being outside any defined built-up area, but not subject to any constraints.

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

There is no emerging Neighbourhood Plan for East Farleigh.

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, being part of the curtilage of my client's house.

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 ?

The Council has consistently rejected sites that are not within or adjacent to Rural Service Centres or Larger Villages.

This has a detrimental effect on the attractiveness and future prospects of a considerable number of smaller settlements. Indeed, it is likely to lead to their decline.

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

The site covers an area of 0.15ha.

Plans of the site were appended to the representations on the draft local plan and are attached to this document.

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

My client is looking to obtain permission for a single dwelling for her daughter

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

Development could take place soon after the granting of planning permission.

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

The land is owned by my client. Neither she nor I are aware of any concerns about viability.

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

The site was assessed in the 2016 appraisal by AECON. Whilst that showed that the site was not well-related to a doctor's surgery, a post office or a train station, it reasonably well-related to an extensive range of other services.

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

As far as my client and I are aware, there are no constraints on the site's development.

Issue (iii) Whether the lack of a policy to permit infill housing development in the countryside renders the Local Plan unsound.

Qn 13.15. When did Policy H29 cease to be part of the development plan ?

This policy was not amongst those that the Borough Council sought to save.

A letter dated 24th September 2007 to the Borough Council, signed on behalf of the Secretary of State, confirmed which policies she had agreed to save.

Qn 13.16 Why would the Local Plan be unsound without such a policy_?

A policy such as this would help meet the objectively assessed needs of the Borough and therefore be in accordance with the NPPF. The Council's resistance to virtually all development outside defined built up areas, and not at Rural Service Centres or Larger Villages means that those smaller settlements will decline. These places need to be able to provide to a limited but reasonable degree for local residents and for people that wish to live there. Without this provision, the Local Plan fails to meet its objectively-assessed needs and is thus unsound.

Qn 13.17 What wording does the Representor seek ?

A policy should be included in the Local Plan stating that, outside defined built up areas, but in otherwise developed frontages, small scale residential infill development should be permitted. Particular support will be given to proposals where the dwelling is to be occupied by a relative of the landowner.

Issue(iv) Whether the lack of a policy to encourage self-build development renders the Local Plan unsound ?

Qn 13.18 Why would the Local Plan be unsound ?

NPPF states that local plans should be flexible and responsive to change. We have heard much from government and other organisations about the need to stimulate opportunities for self-build dwellings. Unfortunately, the Borough Council has simply ignored these calls, thus rendering the Local Plan inflexible, unresponsive to change -and unsound.

Qn 13.19. What wording does the Representor seek ?

A policy should be included that states that, outside defined built up areas, but within otherwise developed frontages, there will be a presumption in favour of self-build dwellings, particularly where the dwelling will be for use by someone related to the landowner or with a need to be housed in that location.