Issue 10 Housing Policies HOU3a Ref MCLP 889 and ALP 2159

Statement:

Question iii)

1. The loss of the concept of 'settlement confines' makes this aspect of the Plan **unsound** and not effective. Whilst the preparation of a 'Village Envelope' is a potential exercise, it is time consuming and costly.
2. The **Tenterden And Rural Sites DPD** spoke specifically about **'village confines'** and the concept needs to be continued, if only for testing the windfall application to justify why it steps outside the limits.
3. It is vital for **HOU3a** to have defined boundary lines so that developers can respect the village character and layout.
4. We refer to omission site **WS70** whereby a previous layout intended to respect the confines at the corners of Lonefield and Park Farm Close. This created a diagonal line across the existing large pasture field. See map in **Appendix 1 "Woodchurch Road / Central Shadoxhurst Current and Future Development Proposals"**. It was seen then as 'infill'.
5. We oppose the easy option of 'infill', as it was a simpler option for developers to try for planning permission that was not beyond the 'confines', depending on where you draw the 'confines' line of course. Current building lines were also respected.
6. We refer here to omission site **WS17,** see map a**ppendix 1**, whereby the field that was an important green gap and green corridor in the middle of the village, was seen as an easy target for 'infill'. Sadly, what developers see as infill, Parishes and villagers see as vital green space to break up continuous lines of ribbon development. It urbanises the road and the village. The boundary of the site granted in 2017 pushes the confines back further north. This is an example of a gradual erosion of building lines and confines, this can make it easier for developers to erode these yet further.
7. We firmly believe that this test must be incorporated in the policy.

Question iv)

8. This questions the policy item a) and appropriateness. This is an essential ingredient and is coupled with the proposed Landscape Protection Policy in teasing out and testing justification for eliminating green spaces that may otherwise be important in the rural setting.
9. Often it is assumed that rural settlements have a considerable amount of green spaces. In Shadoxhurst, we are a prime example of where central green spaces have been picked off by developers to infill and urbanise the central core of the village. See map in **Appendix 1.**
10. Also questioned is the clarity of criterion **c)**. We support the inclusion of this as a test for an application. We will not labour this, but elsewhere we have talked about the loss of two key green spaces and having this test in place would have required full justification of the development. We tried to demonstrate the harm but the policies were not sufficiently weighted.

11. This once again returns to having an **LPP** that can support the defence of character and appropriateness of developments in small settlements. We are not anti-development in Shadoxhurst, but we need the right houses in the right places.

12. We consider these items both **HOU3a** and the **LPP** to run alongside each other because vitally, the word **'minor'** was removed from its predecessor **HOU4**. By this one word being removed, it leaves the way clear for large developments to come forward in any village. As a small village we need improved protection. Discussed elsewhere, we anticipate a 60 house application coming to our last eastern buffer field in a matter of days. Such a development of this size and magnitude is wholly inappropriate.

What will make this policy sound?

13. The Policy will be sound if it can be tied in with an **LPP** as proposed by SPC and other Parishes. This was dismissed by ABC, but acceptable wording can and should be drawn up that is both meaningful and defendable to be incorporated into the Plan.

14. It also needs to be linked directly with **HOU5** as discussed under that separate Policy issue.