

## Tenterden and Rural Sites DPD - Post Hearing Consultation on Suggested Amendments

### Comments from CPRE Protect Kent

In response to the suggested amendments to the DPD put forward by the Borough Council, CPRE Protect Kent would make the following comments in relation to the changes made to Policy WYE3 and its supporting text.

#### Change No. 4 (paragraph 6.97)

CPRE Protect Kent support this change

#### Change No. 5 (paragraph 6.98)

CPRE Protect Kent support this change

#### Change No. 6 (paragraph 6.99)

1. We consider that the terms and extent of the marketing exercise should be agreed with the Borough Council to ensure that it is robust and fit for purpose. We would therefore suggest that the start of the 4<sup>th</sup> sentence should be amended to read:

*“The precise terms and extent of the marketing exercise shall be agreed with the Borough Council but should include...”*

2. In the 5<sup>th</sup> sentence the reference to a development brief should be deleted. A development brief is a different document to a Master Plan, the preparation of which often follows after the production of a Master Plan and usually focuses on a single development site in more detail. It seems here that the intention is very much to prepare a Master Plan that covers the whole college complex, and this should be the sole reference.
3. The final sentence should end after the words *“changed circumstances”*. The rest of this sentence suggests that the Master Plan could be agreed as SPD. Whilst we do not disagree in principle with Master Plans being agreed as SPD, in this case though it is unclear what the Master Plan will actually be supplementary to. Policy WYE3 is essentially a policy of intention rather than one containing specific proposals for redevelopment. The Master Plan, however, will contain specific development proposals for alternative uses if educational and related uses are found to be unjustified, but for uses not proposed in Policy WYE3 or any other Policy in the DPD. Therefore, it would be the case that the Master Plan/SPD would be deciding the alternative land uses, and thus be contrary to paragraph 6.1 of PPS12. This states that: *“SPDs should not be prepared with the aim of avoiding the need for the examination of policy which should be examined.”* We believe that the Master Plan should not be agreed as SPD before Policy WYE3 is reviewed, allowing the proposed future uses of the site to be subject to proper independent examination.

### Change No. 7 (Policy WYE3)

1. In the first paragraph of the Policy, the words “*for a minimum continuous period of 6 months*” should be deleted. This simply repeats the detail given in paragraph 6.99.
2. The second paragraph of the Policy should end after “*...a formal review of this policy.*” This would be in accordance with our concerns about SPD explained in point 3 in response to change no. 6.
3. The final paragraph of the Policy should be deleted. This paragraph is in conflict with the approach advocated in the supporting text which seeks the preparation of a Master Plan and a review of the Policy to determine future uses if the marketing exercise found educational and related uses not to be justified. This paragraph, though, would allow such alternative uses to be permitted without the Master Plan or Policy review, if the marketing exercise concluded that educational and related uses were not justified.