

## Call in addendum

Item three of the call-in requires no explanation other than at our introduction and explanation of reasons for call-in next week.

However with regard to call-in reasons 1) and 2) it might be helpful to state that we believe there must be some uniformity in the treatment given to sites in relation to reasons given for both refusal and approval and if this is not done there must be a written reason as to why. Otherwise we believe the final Local Plan submitted will be deemed to be unsound.

For example at **H1 (65) Land at Lenham Road, Headcorn** it is clearly stated "That this new site be rejected and not taken forward to Regulation 18 consultation on the grounds that development is impractical due to current water conditions and *community perception of failure of infrastructure providers to deliver infrastructure identified as required in the past, local knowledge of flood risk and community concern about the cumulative impact on local education provision and highways.*"

In other words the councillors at both Scrutiny and cabinet are, in this instance, supporting and agreeing with the consultation response from residents and specifying why. This is not however followed through in other decisions.

For example

At **H1 (10) – South of Sutton Road** where the Cabinet overturned the decision of Scrutiny as one of the reasons for refusal at little (e) it is merely states "*that the development here would not command the consent of local people as reflected in the consultation response.*"

What does this actually mean? Due to the number of responses? We could argue that there are many other sites that received a similar or indeed much greater number of responses than South of Sutton Road. Coxheath in particular; but where is that reflected as having been considered by Cabinet and given the same weight?

Or is the reasoning behind (e) that it was the arguments residents presented that swayed the Cabinet's decision. If so, where is the explanation as was done for Land at Lenham Road, Headcorn? This is particularly pertinent when comparing South of Sutton Road and the Otham Housing allocation proposals.

Likewise in relation to South of Sutton Road and the Otham sites where the traffic will all enter the same major highway the traffic impact is treated in significantly different ways.

Finally in policy terms the Cabinet did cite the loss of a leisure facility at South of Sutton Road as a reason for refusal but took no regard of the likely impact on either the visitor economy or the damage that might occur to a heritage site in relation to the Otham housing allocation proposals.

We will, of course, elaborate at Call-in but hope this assists in preparation for the Committee meeting.

I would point out that we are not calling the Cabinet decision in to re-open discussion about officer recommendations as these were all fully covered at the three Planning and Transportation Scrutiny Committee evenings but to achieve consistency of approach across the recommendations. If we do not do so it is likely to lead to numerous challenges by developers, parish councils, Residents Associations and individual residents.

This is particularly pertinent