

Part B - Your Representations

Please note: this section will need to be completed for each representation you make on each separate policy.

4. To which part of the Local Plan or Sustainability Appraisal (SA) does this representation relate?

Local Plan or SA:

Local Plan

Paragraph Number:

Policy Number:

DS11

Policies Map Number:

29. Kingswood

5. Do you consider the Local Plan is :

5.1 Legally Compliant?

Yes

No

5.2 Complies with the Duty to Co-operate?

Yes

No

5.3 Sound?

Yes

No

6. If you answered no to question 5.3, do you consider the Local Plan and/or SA unsound because it is not: (please tick that apply):

Positively Prepared:

Justified:

Effective:

Consistent with National Policy:

For Official Use Only

Person ID:

Rep ID:

7. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty co-operate. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Please see below

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

8. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 7. above where this relates to soundness. (Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Notwithstanding the above comments we propose that the number of dwellings on the two sites combined be increased to approximately 40. A detailed justification for this is provided in a separate representation.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. **After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.**

For Official Use Only

Person ID:

Rep ID:

9. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

10. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

To discuss the issues surrounding the allocation.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Please note: This written representation carries the same weight and will be subject to the same scrutiny as oral representations. The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

11. Declaration

I understand that all comments submitted will be considered in line with this consultation, and that my comments will be made publicly available and may be identifiable to my name/organisation.

Signed

[Redacted Signature]

Date :

27/06/2014

Copies of all the objections and supporting representations will be made available for others to see at the Council's offices at Riverside House and online via the Council's e-consultation system. Please note that all comments on the Local Plan are in the public domain and the Council cannot accept confidential objections. The information will be held on a database and used to assist with the preparation of the new Local Plan and with consideration of planning applications in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

For Official Use Only

Person ID:

Rep ID:

Q7 Policy DS11 proposes the allocation of Kingswood – Meadow House and Kingswood – Kingswood Farm for residential development. The Policies Map (number 29) shows the sites, H29 and H30, excluded from the Green Belt to allow development to proceed. We find the proposed allocations, and the removal of the land from the Green Belt to facilitate that development, to be sound and appropriate.

Kingswood is a sustainable settlement which provides a good range of local services and facilities to its residents. These include a primary and nursery school, local shops, doctors surgery community meeting rooms with a range of clubs and societies, public houses and limited employment opportunities. Moreover the village is served by regular public transport, both bus and train, making access to higher tier settlements feasible without reliance on the private car.

Whilst the settlement has historically been excluded from the Green Belt the boundary has been drawn very tightly around its perimeter which considerably restricts its future growth and ability to meet local needs. We find the proposal to release land from the Green Belt at this point in time necessary to ensure the future success of the settlement. It is only by releasing land that the village will be able to meet its own housing needs, both affordable and market. Indeed there has been considerable support for the allocation of land on the perimeter of the village to meet the needs of young families and of older people looking to downsize (and thereby releasing much needed family housing to meet the needs of growing families).

Land at Meadow House and Kingswood Farm is available and suitable to meet the development needs of the settlement. Looking at its credentials:

- The sites lie in the centre of the settlement, within walking and cycling distance of its local services and facilities;
- A highways report has previously been submitted to the District Council which confirms that the existing access to the Meadow House, following minor alterations within the site boundaries, is suitable to accommodate up to 50 dwellings, and that there are no existing highway safety or capacity issues which need to be addressed.
- There are no known protected species within the sites which would prevent development, although a full ecological survey would be undertaken prior to any development.
- Dwellings can be provided without encroachment onto flood zones 2 or 3, and with no increase in flood risk. A corridor of land running approximately parallel with the brook lies in flood zone 3. In consultation with the District Council a detailed hydrological assessment has been made of the land to establish a more precise mapping of the flood zone. This work was not available when the District Council finalised the Publication Draft and in the absence of this more detailed analysis the District Council put a conservative estimate of 10 dwellings on the Meadow House land and a further 10 dwellings on the Kingswood Farm site. The more detailed analysis now undertaken confirms that the two sites can accommodate a total of approximately 40 dwellings. This is the subject of a separate submission which seeks to increase the number of dwellings included in the Plan for the sites.
- The Meadow House land was previously used from 1984 to 1996 as a garden centre and retail nursery utilising the field to the south of the site for the growing of soft fruit, trees and cut flowers and for the propagation and growing on of shrubs. When the garden centre was closed in 1996 the national landscape company which had been based on the site since 1986 then took over the site completely until March 2006 when all commercial use ceased. The site still retains extensive hardstandings and glasshouses. The adjacent land to the rear of Kingswood Farm

is currently used as pony paddock land. Redevelopment provides the opportunity to enhance the appearance of the land, and in particular the Meadow House land, in the longer term.

- The sites have clearly defined boundaries (including canals and a brook, as well as mature hedgerows) and are almost completely screened from the wider area. Development will not have an adverse impact on the wider landscape.
- The land is being promoted by AC Lloyd on behalf of the land owners. This shows the site is of market interest. There is no reason to doubt that the site will be brought forward and developed successfully within five years of the adoption of the Plan.

We find that the proposed allocations, and the removal of the sites from the Green Belt, is appropriate, having been fully justified through the Local Plan preparation process. It is effective in that the development will meet housing needs in a sustainable settlement, and is consistent with national policy.