
HEARING STATEMENT

ISSUE 17 – COMMUNITY
FACILITIES

13 JUNE 2018 (PM Session)

ASHFORD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN
EXAMINATION

EXAMINATION HEARING SESSIONS

Prepared By Barton Willmore On Behalf of
Persimmon Homes & Taylor Wimpey (Representor Id 793)

April 2018

HEARING STATEMENT

ISSUE 17– COMMUNITY FACILITIES

**ASHFORD BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION
EXAMINATION HEARING SESSION 13 JUNE 2018**

**Prepared by Barton Willmore
on behalf of
Persimmon Homes & Taylor Wimpey (ID 793)**

April 2018

Project Ref:	27136
Status:	Draft
Issue/Rev:	01
Date:	24 April 2018
Prepared by:	Lucy Wilford
Checked by:	Lucy Wilford
Authorised by:	Lucy Wilford

Barton Willmore LLP
The Observatory
Southfleet Road
Swanscombe
Kent
DA10 0DF

Tel: 01322 374660
Email: lucy.wilford@bartonwillmore.co.uk

Ref: 27136/A5/LW/djg/kf
Date: 24 April 2018

COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Barton Willmore LLP.

All Barton Willmore stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil based inks.

CONTENTS

PAGE NO.

Issue 17: Are the topic policies for community facilities justified, deliverable and consistent with national policy? Will they be effective?

Word Count: 215 words (excluding Inspector's Questions and title pages)

Issue 17: Are the topic policies for community facilities justified, deliverable and consistent with national policy? Will they be effective?

i) Does the Local Plan, including policies COM1 and IMP1 provide sufficient clarity as to when and how development would be required to contribute to the community's needs or infrastructure? Would the limitations on the pooling of S106 contributions have any implications for the delivery of critical or strategic facilities or infrastructure, particularly prior to the adoption of a CIL?

1.1 As currently drafted it is not clear as to when and how development would be required to contribute towards some of the infrastructure provision listed. There is clear policy criteria/standards in respect of open space. However, there is no clarity as to how developments might be required to contribute to infrastructure and facilities such as public art, voluntary sector space and health provision and how this requirement is to be judged? Specifically, it is noted in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP – SD10) that there is no reference to a need for voluntary sector space and the CCG has not provided any firm proposals for additional health infrastructure requirements. Additionally, the IDP mentions various public art projects which are not directly related to all sites, with an additional 'desirable' requirement for various works of art to be integrated into the public realm, but how this is to be delivered and where is unknown.

1.2 Where the requirement for specific facilities/infrastructure has not been Justified and specific projects identified to ensure delivery, then these should be removed from the list. Furthermore, the policy is written as a blanket requirement on all development. The wording should be amended to reflect the legal tests set out in CIL Regulation 122.

ii) Table 4 identifies a need for a number of different types of open space. Paragraph 5.433 states that not all of this provision will be delivered through development. In light of this, does the Local Plan provide a positively prepared and effective mechanism for delivering play, open space and sports needs of the district? Would Policy COM3 be effective in meeting the need for 3.36 ha of additional allotment land?

1.3 No comment. Refer to previous representations.

iii) Is the plan positively prepared in relation to cemetery provision? Should the Local Plan identify a site or sites for additional cemetery facilities in light of the need identified in paragraph 5.452?

1.4 No comment.