

Issue 10 Housing Policy HOU5 Question v) Ref MCLP 889 and ALP 2159

Statement:

1. Our comments under **HOU3a** largely apply here too. If **HOU3a** applies strictly within the village confines, then this policy is interpreted as anywhere else in the village. More importantly it needs to be clarified if this policy or **HOU3a** would be the test for a current planning application **AS/17/01888** north of Farley Close, also listed as omission site **WS19**, <http://planning.ashford.gov.uk/Planning/details.aspx?systemkey=108316&pageindex=0>
2. It lies outside the settlement confines and should we presume, be tested under **HOU5**.
3. It basically extends a current close of 12 dwellings by adding 21 more to the north. There is thus no landscape buffer as **HOU5 f) iii)** requires as it extends into the existing landscape buffer.
4. We certainly support the inclusion of **HOU5 f) iii)**. However, in this case and in omission site **WS17** already granted planning permission, the parts of the field or next field to the north are in the same ownership as the respective developers, and we anticipate that any landscape buffer conditioned would be negated when subsequent applications to extend the developments are submitted at some point in the future.
5. However, the above application also would not meet the tests of **HOU3a a), b), c) or d)**, so these elements are missing from **HOU5** and thus if the two are taken in isolation we contend that **HOU5 is not effective**.
6. Once again, to protect the village properly, we would need both to apply as well as having the proposed **Landscape Protection Policy**.
7. In terms of the question relating to criterion **f) vi)**, we believe that it is correct to include this as it reinforces the message regarding biodiversity loss and required mitigation. This is just as important in a rural as a more urban situation.
8. In the application cited above, the landowner destroyed 15 plus years of maturing biodiverse habitat in two days prior to the submission of the planning application to be able to declare the field had no biodiversity value. This was gross land mismanagement and is misleading with respect to the submission of the planning application.

How can this policy be made sound?

9. **HOU3a and HOU5** are related and should be tied in with making the two policies linked. Our example shows that a proposed development might be just a fence or a hedge away from existing dwellings. So there needs to be a consistent approach to testing the applications.
10. We also commend the inclusion of a **Landscape Protection Policy**.