

Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan (2020 – 2038)

New Evidence Base Documents Consultation Representation Form

Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Ret:
(For official
use only)

Box 1:

Name of the Local Plan Evidence Base Document to which this representation relates:

Stage 3 New Evidence Base Documents

Completed forms must be received at our offices by **midnight on Wednesday 23rd October 2024.**

We encourage you to respond online using the consultation portal. Please note you do not have to sign in to respond via the portal: https://consult.tunbridgewells.gov.uk/kse/

Alternatively, you may email or scan forms to: <u>LocalPlan@TunbridgeWells.gov.uk</u> or send them by post to: Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, PLANNING POLICY, Town Hall, Royal Tunbridge Wells, TN1 1RS

PART A – CONTACT DETAILS

Please note that representations must be attributable to named individuals or organisations. They will be available for public inspection and cannot be treated as confidential.

Please also note that all comments received will be available for the public to view and cannot be treated as confidential. Data will be processed and held in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018 and the General Data Protection Regulations 2018.

	1. Personal Details	2. Agent Details (if applicable)
Title	Mr & Mrs	Mr
First Name		Mike
Last Name	Whetstone	Holmes
Job title (where relevant)		Associate Planner
Organisation (where relevant)		KLW Ltd
Address Line 1		Ridgers Barn
Address Line 2		Bunny Lane

Address Line 3	Tunbridge Wells
Address Line 4	
Postcode	TN3 9HA
Telephone number	
Email address (where relevant)	

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION

(Please use a separate sheet for each representation)

Name or	
Organisation	

3.	To which part of the document listed in Box 1 above does this representation relate to?		
Chapter and (if applicable) sub heading		Revised wording for Policy STR/SS 1 - The Strategy for Paddock Wood including Land at east Capel	
Para appe	graph number or endix		

4.	Do you consider the Evidence Base document on which you are commenting, makes the Borough Local Plan Submission Version (2020 – 2038) (please tick or cross as appropriate):				
4.1	Legally Compliant	Yes		No	
4.2	Sound	Yes		No	Х

Please give details of why you consider the Borough Local Plan Submission Version (2020 – 2038) is not legally compliant or unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

5. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The text box will automatically expand if necessary.

Our client continues to retain land interest that forms part of Tunbridge Wells Borough Council's (TWBC) planned/proposed strategic expansion of Paddock Wood.

Tudeley Brook Farm (the Site) is a private home with several outbuildings and set in extensive grounds which extend to approximately two hectares. The Site lies to the north of Paddock Wood directly south of Whetsted Road (A228). The full extent of the holding is identified in the Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) and referenced 'Site DPC19'.

The land is also included within the masterplan vision, development strategy and draft policy allocation for the proposed extension of Paddock Wood: referenced as Local Plan Allocation STR/SS1 and identified as part of the 'North-Western Parcel (A)' in the 'Master Plan Areas for STR/SS1 Paddock Wood and East Capel Strategic Policy' map.

The Site (DPC 19) was not included within the original call for sites process, during the Regulation 18 consultation stage. Following consultation, a series of strong and credible planning arguments were brought forward including, but not limited to, the beneficial relationship of the Site to Whetsted Road and Tudeley Brook presenting 'natural' tangible and defensible boundaries to the western parcel, the facility to contribute meaningfully to flood water/water management requirements to the benefit of the wider development, and with other interests, the provision of public open space/ country park, integrated with land to the south and west for the benefit of new and planned communities: all supporting the inclusion and integration of the Site within the planned growth proposed at Paddock Wood.

The Site was then appraised by a team of highly regarded independent consultants covering amongst other disciplines, urban design and master planning, flood and water environments, transport and integration and ecology. The complete professional team, appointed by TWBC undertook the master planning work (based on garden settlement principles) to inform the proposed strategic growth at this location.

Following months of detailed assessment and appraisal across all technical disciplines, the appointed consultant team independently concurred with our view on the planning and environmental benefit of fully including the Site within the planned expansion of Paddock Wood. This continues to be reflected in the fact that the land continues to form part of the North-Western Parcel (A) of Strategic Site STR/SS1.

The Site is an integral part of the masterplan vision adding real value to the wider strategic development planned around Paddock Wood and acts as a facilitator in several important ways.

The Strategic Sites Topic Paper for Pre-Submission Local Plan (March 2021) explains that the appointed consultant team, led by David Lock Associates (DLA), correctly took an "ownership blind" approach to developing the masterplan vision for the planned growth. Adopting this approach ensured that the planned expansion fully maximised the development potential in terms of securing the important garden settlement principles, providing the key infrastructure in the right locations, without influence or favour on landowning interests.

This ownership blind approach to masterplanning has directly resulted in the Site being positively included within the wider strategic allocation for Paddock Wood in the North-Western Parcel (A) of Strategic Site STR/SS1.

We welcome the Site's continued allocation, but continue to have grave concerns regarding the commitment to support the Site and facilitate its wider integration. This is contrary to TWBC's adopted professional and independent advice from its advisors who have recommended its inclusion within the masterplan. It is essential now that TWBC commits fully to the entire masterplan vision, including the Site at Tudeley Brook Farm, to ensure that the full benefits of the masterplan are realised. We feel that the continued reliance upon the delivery of the masterplan through a Supplementary Planning Document is not sufficient.

TWBC's objectives for a collaborative landowner approach is reinforced in the Strategic Sites Topic Paper for Pre-Submission Local Plan (March 2021). This Topic Paper provides the background to the Strategic Sites Working Group forum and explains that all stakeholders were made aware of the requirement to deliver the growth around Paddock Wood and east Capel, in line with garden settlement principles, "acknowledging that these carry a higher infrastructure burden". Paragraph 3.5 states that site promoters were advised that they may need to "prepare for the potential use of equalisation agreements in order to achieve [the] ambitious, but reasonable, objectives sought".

Chapter 7 of the same topic paper is concerned with deliverability and viability but throughout this chapter, reference is only made to the key site promoters. Regrettably, TWBC have focussed their attention on the four principal housebuilders: Crest Nicholson; Dandara; Redrow and Persimmon with little regard to the smaller site promoters. TWBC has failed to properly acknowledge that there are other important areas of land that, following independent review, now form viable and necessary component parts of the overall plan. This requires resolution in order for the plan to become effective and therefore sound.

The revised wording of Policy STR/SS1 continues to omit reference to required land equalisation agreements. The policy wording within the Submission Local Plan acknowledged that it is "highly likely" that the development will require land equalisation, in the interests of astute planning and deliverability, and it continues to be the case that the Local Plan must address these land equalisation omissions now. Without the necessary controls to ensure the comprehensive delivery of the whole masterplan vision, the policy/plan is not effective and is, therefore, unsound.

Furthermore, the Strategic Sites Masterplanning and Infrastructure Study (February 2021), prepared by DLA, has a whole chapter dedicated to delivery (Chapter 7). It highlights that "instances may arise where one developer is meeting the full cost of infrastructure shared by all, or one is disproportionately contributing in a different way such as by providing land". It concludes that "Developers should be invited to form their

own collaboration agreement or alternative mechanism for the equal sharing of costs. Should this not occur, TWBC should facilitate this process".

TWBC's own advisors have therefore recommended that TWBC must 'step in' if it is becoming clear that an equalisation agreement in unachievable. Furthermore, they point out that this should be actioned in a timely fashion so that the delivery of the development is not delayed.

It therefore remains important that this land equalisation agreement is enshrined into the policy wording now for clarity and to avoid unnecessary delays in the delivery of the wider masterplan.

The correct vehicle to support the development of Paddock Wood is through an equalisation agreement. It is imperative that TWBC, as Planning Authority, take complete charge of this process in the public interest and absent of private agreements between the affected stakeholders.

We would respectfully ask TWBC to note that both we and our clients have made repeated approaches to Crest Nicholson to explore collaborative working possibilities: linking in with Site DPC19. Regrettably, especially given the emphasis and need for comprehensiveness, as supported by the Inspector in his recent findings, these approaches have been rejected. So, despite our endeavours, at present there is no collaboration or agreement between landowners.

Without TWBC's support, there are concerns that our clients' land (and other smaller land holding interests), which forms a legitimate and important part of the integrated masterplan vision, will be marginalised to the detriment of the overall planned vision and interests of acknowledged importance including: amenity provision and open space, blue/green infrastructure, connectivity, ecology and biodiversity, all of which are key and central planks to the masterplan/ policy vision of the Paddock Wood expansion. Delivery is central to the soundness of the plan and it is clear that land equalisation is fundamental to this.

Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the Matter you have identified at Section 5 (above) where this relates to legal compliance or soundness.

6. 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.

The text box will automatically expand if necessary.

Given the above, and to make the Borough Local Plan sound in our view, we would therefore suggest the following modification to the proposed policy, to be inserted as a new paragraph 5 of the "Development principles" section of the revised proposed wording of the policy, with the numbering for the following paragraphs increasing by a number –

"Where the delivery of the development involves more than one landowner, land equalisation agreements will be required to be put in place. The Council will, if necessary, use its Compulsory Purchase Order powers to ensure the delivery of the appropriate masterplanned approach."

This wording reintroduces the concept of equalisation agreements, as set out in the Submission Local Plan, and strengthens this by requiring equalisation agreements to be put in place.

7.	Please use this box for any other comments you wish to make. The text box will automatically expand if necessary.		
	N/A		

8. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the examination hearing session when it takes place? (please tick or cross as appropriate)			
No, I do not wish to participate at the examination hearing session			
Yes, I wish to participate at the examination hearing session X			

9. If you wish to participate at the examination hearing when it takes place, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

It is important that we can present directly to the Inspector, to assist with their assessment of the proposed modifications to the Development Strategy for the Local Plan, in particular the proposed content for Policy STR/SS1 relating to the strategy for Paddock Wood. Both we and our clients participated in the previous hearings and our continued participation is a logical extension to the process.	

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the examination hearing session.

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 later stages.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he identifies for examination.

Signature	Mike Holmes on behalf of Mr & Mrs Whetstone	Date	22/10/2024
-----------	--	------	------------