

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

<http://www.maidstone.gov.uk/residents/planning/local-plan/examination>

SESSIONS 13A

ALTERNATIVE SITES & COUNTRYSIDE HOUSING POLICIES

Hearing Statements: Please refer to the Inspector's Procedural Guidance Notes for information on the provision of hearing statements.

*Deadline: One electronic copy in pdf format and three hard copies to be sent to the PO by 6.00pm on **10 November 2016**.*

Inspector's Agenda with Matters, Issues, and Questions

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. Alternative site proposals are unlikely to progress any further unless the Inspector has concluded that there is a shortfall in the development proposed in the plan or that other proposed developments are unsuitable meaning that the Local Plan is unsound as submitted. In that event the Inspector would be likely to refer the issue back to the Council to consider whether they wished to identify alternative development sites to address the soundness issue.
- 1.2. Before any site were to be recommended for inclusion in the Plan there would need to be a further public consultation on the associated proposed modifications with an opportunity for representations by interested persons.
- 1.3. This hearing and any associated written statements in response to the identified questions provides an opportunity to establish whether sufficient information is available to inform the site selection process.
- 1.4. Those who are proposing alternative site allocations may also submit written statements in response to the questions set out below whether or not they have not chosen to participate in the hearings.
- 1.5. Where the relevant information has been provided with the Regulation 19 representations or is already available in another document in the

Examination Library it is not necessary to repeat it but the appropriate document reference and any site reference number should be provided.

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

1.6. Separate responses to the following questions should be submitted for each proposed development site.

Qn13.1 Does the site have any relevant planning history? (applications, permissions, appeals, previous allocations)

Qn13. 2 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Issue (ii) – Whether the Policy SP17 is inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework

- 1.7. Representations R1991 and R1993 claims and inconsistency between Policy SP17 and national policy. The Representors seek its rewording to allow the restraint on housing in the countryside to be set aside when a 5 year supply of housing land is absent and also to allow 'sustainable development proposals' even when there is a 5 year supply. No alternative wording has been proposed.

Qn13.12 What wording does the Representor seek?

Qn13.13 How does the Representor define a 'sustainable development proposal' for this purpose?

Qn13.14 Does the Framework not already allow that the weight to be accorded to development plan policies for the supply of housing should

vary in the absence of a 5 year supply? In which case why would the policy itself need to make that provision?

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

- 1.8. Representation R1992 seeks the reintroduction of former (unsaved) Policy H29 in the 2000 Borough Wide Local Plan which allowed for limited infilling in defined circumstances and subject to compliance with other named policies.

Qn13.15 When did Policy H29 cease to be part of the development plan?

Qn13.16 Why would the Local Plan be unsound without such a policy?

Qn13.17 What wording does the Representor seek?

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

- 1.9. Representation R1992 also suggests that there is a need for one or more other policies to facilitate self-build development?

Qn13.18 Why would the Local Plan be unsound without such a policy?

Qn13.19 What wording does the Representor seek?