

## Comments

### Main Modifications to the Local Plan (18/02/19 to 01/04/19)

Comment by	MS Kim AUSTIN (1208072)
Comment ID	98
Response Date	31/03/19 14:41
Consultation Point	HOU 04 - Villages with Boundaries ( <a href="#">View</a> )
Status	Processed
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1

To which proposed Main Modification does your representation relate? Please state the relevant reference number that you are commenting on from the Schedule of Proposed Main Modifications e.g. MM1

#### ROCKLANDS PARISH COUNCIL - COMMENTS

##### MM17: Page 37: Policy HOU 04 - Qualifying criteria numbered 1-5

The latest edition of the NPPF requires that policies should be '**...clearly written and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals**' (NPPF 2018, Section 3 'Plan-making' para. 16d). In considering the text amendments made to HOU 04, qualifying criteria nos. 1-3 inclusive (and the relevant Reasoned Justifications associated with these) we would contend that the Inspector has clearly failed to comply with NPPF guidelines as detailed below.

HOU 04, criterion no. 1: The original text very clearly establishes that, in the identified 17 villages with settlement boundaries (including the parish of Rocklands) any proposed new development should be '*minor*' in scope and '**...of an appropriate scale and design to the settlement of up to 5 dwellings**'. The text provides specific and unambiguous instruction to all of the parties concerned in the decision-making process. It is also wholly consistent with the Reasoned Justification subsequently provided in para. 3.18 that states '*In line with the Spatial Development Strategy and Settlement Hierarchy, **the level of new development permitted in settlements defined in the policy will be restricted, consistent with the rural character of these villages and reflective of the more limited service provision and infrastructure available***'.

The Inspector's amended text – '*The development is of an appropriate scale and design to the settlement*' is clearly open to individual interpretation as to what might constitute an 'appropriate' number of new dwellings – hence, clarity is replaced by ambiguity. As well, by removing the limit on the number of permitted dwellings, the Inspector is effectively diluting one of the stated goals of Policy HOU 04 (i.e. to **deliberately restrict** the amount of permitted new development in rural areas that, under the new Development Plan, are considered not to be sustainable). This is of particular significance in small villages such as our own where the maximum 5% new development limit described under Criterion no. 2 equates to a total of just 8 new dwellings to 2036 (and where we already see planning applications regularly submitted for anything up to 17 new dwellings at a time).

HOU 04, criterion no. 2: In respect of our comments above, the Inspector's introduction of the word 'significantly' into the text (i.e. development '*...would not lead to the number of dwellings in the settlement*

***significantly*** increasing by more than 5%) is similarly ambiguous. **Who is supposed to ascertain how many additional new dwellings constitutes a significant amount and what criteria are they supposed to use to determine this?** Again, in Rocklands, we have already seen a 12% increase in the pre-existing housing stock since the current Development Plan was adopted in December 2009; thus, we need some degree of certainty that the LPA will be provided with the necessary policy tools to keep such development under sensible control (again, the Reasoned Justification provided in para. 3.18 refers).

HOU 04, criterion no. 3: The Inspector is proposing to completely delete criterion no. 3 '*Development provides a significant community benefit*' and yet the Reasoned Justification relating to this (page 49, paras. 3.22 to 3.24 inclusive) is left intact. Is it the Inspector's intention that any proposed new development must still demonstrate '**...there is clear evidence that development will provide a community benefit by meeting an identified local need, delivering community aspirations or by virtue of local support for a scheme**' and that '**Development proposals which fail to demonstrate a significant benefit to the local community will not be permitted**'? If so, then why does he consider it necessary to delete criterion no. 3 that almost exactly mirrors what is stated in the Reasoned Justification?

The single reason provided by the Inspector for introducing all of the text changes being proposed under MM17 is '*To ensure that the Local Plan supports opportunities for self-build dwellings*': However, **none of the above-referenced text changes have anything to do with the concept of self-build per se**. The only specific reference by the Inspector to self-build in the context of HOU 04 is where the original sentence '*Opportunities for **self-build** dwellings which meet the criteria set out above will be considered in accordance with national guidance*' is corrected such that the last six words are replaced by the single word 'supported'. This appears to be rather superfluous since any submitted proposal, be it self-build or otherwise, is still subject to the same overriding, qualifying criteria: Thus, it must be presupposed that if all of the qualifying criteria are met (regardless of whether the application relates to a self-build proposal or not) then the application will be supported by the LPA.

**Do you consider the proposed modification is:  
(please mark the appropriate box)**

**If you consider the proposed Main Modification  
to be UNSOUND, please identify which test of  
soundness your representation relates to?**

**Please give us details as to why you think the Local Plan with proposed modifications is NOT legally compliant or sound?**

**Please give us details as to why you think the Local Plan with proposed modifications is NOT legally compliant or sound**

- 1 The Inspector's proposed amendments to the qualifying criteria listed under Policy HOU 04 actually introduce ambiguity, uncertainty and inconsistency when considered against the stated reason for introducing the proposed text changes and the associated Reasoned Justifications. In doing so, it directly contradicts the requirements of NPPF 201, para. 16d).
- 1 The blanket reason provided by the Inspector for making all of the text changes relative to Policy HOU 04 – i.e. '*To ensure that the Local Plan supports opportunities for self-build dwellings*' - is considered not to be valid in the context of qualifying criteria nos. 1-3.

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications to the Local Plan legally compliant or sound.**

**Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications to the Local Plan legally compliant or sound**

The original text contained more clarity, certainty and consistency. One of the stated objectives of Policy HOU 04 is to restrict any significant new development in the identified settlements to a maximum of 5% because it is not considered appropriate to the rural character of the identified villages and the level of services / infrastructure available i.e. the settlements do not constitute sustainable options for development. The final policy text should not leave this open to doubt or subject to miscellaneous interpretation: It should be clear and unambiguous. If the Inspector still considers that the above-referenced text changes are necessary, then he should provide specific reasons for making those changes other than the one provided – which is clearly not valid in the case of criteria nos. 1-3.

**Would you like to be notified of future stages of the Local Plan?**    Yes

**How would you like to be notified?**    .    By email to my email address