INSPECTOR’S MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION AT EXAMINATION HEARINGS
Version 1: Issued 28 July 2015

Discussion at hearing sessions will be based on the matters, issues and questions set out below.

An Examination Programme will be published in mid-August. It will set out the dates on which hearing statements must be provided, the commencement times and venue details for hearing days and sessions, list the matters to be examined in each session as described in this paper and list persons who have been invited to participate. It will take full account of representors’ recent confirmation of requests to be heard.

Guidance Note 1 published on 23 June 2015 [ID/1] provides general guidance about drafting hearing statements and participating in hearings. Further to that guidance note, the Council is requested to provide a written statement addressing each matter, issue and question directly or by reference to evidence that has already been submitted. For examination participants other than the Council there is no need to submit additional hearing statements if you are content that your original representations adequately cover the matters, issues and questions that are relevant to you. If you do submit a statement, it should only address those matters, issues and questions that are relevant to your original representations and no additional evidence should be provided. The guidance note sets a limit of 3000 words for statements and, for the avoidance of doubt, my expectation is for no more than one statement per main issue under each matter set out below.

References below to the Allocations Plan are to the Site Allocations Local Plan, submission draft for consultation, February 2015 [CD/3.20].

All examination documents, including the Allocations Plan, the Guidance Note and (in due course) the Examination Programme can be found at: www.tunbridgewells.gov.uk/examination

Matters for Examination

The matters to be examined broadly follow the structure of the Allocations Plan, chapter by chapter. The Examination Programme will divide the hearings into two sections: a first section proposed to be held in November, addressing in-principle issues of Core Strategy and national policy consistency, housing land supply and other borough-wide policy issues (Matters A – C); and a second section proposed to be held in December, addressing site-specific allocations on a settlement by settlement basis (Matters from D onwards) and matters arising from earlier hearings, including arrangements for any Main Modifications that may be proposed.
Matter A: Policy, Strategy and Methodology

Main issue 1: Duty to Co-operate (DTC)
A number of representations suggest that the DTC has not been met in relation to cross-boundary housing needs. The Duty to Co-operate Statement [CD 3.31] records the co-operation actions taken and summarises the current position, recording that the Allocations Plan ‘does not allocate any sites which will have impacts beyond the borough’s boundaries’ [paragraph 4.6] and that there are no outstanding housing-related concerns from relevant public authorities. Further, there are no representations from Kent County Council, East Sussex County Council, adjoining district tier local authorities or the Mayor of London that raise concerns about the DTC or call for specific measures to be undertaken to enable it to be met.

1) Has there been any other contact between the Council and any other Council or public authority that seeks action under the DTC that has not been addressed in the Allocations Plan? If so, please provide copies of any correspondence and a summary of the issues to which it relates, which should specifically address the source of any concerns about the meeting of housing needs.

2) Are there any remaining concerns that the DTC has not been met in respect of housing or any other topic; and

3) if so, what (if any) specific actions are necessary to enable it to be met?

Main issue 2: the national policy relationship
The Core Strategy which provides the strategic context for the Allocations Plan was adopted before the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) came into force.

1) How does the Allocations Plan relate to national policy:
   • in the context of the adopted Core Strategy; and
   • what role will the forthcoming Local Plan Review play in delivering national policy consistency and when will the review be carried out?

Main issue 3: the Core Strategy and housing
The adopted Core Strategy identifies the broad locations for housing development and the numbers of units to be developed over the plan period.

1) In the context of national policy and the adopted Core Strategy, what are the implications of the decisions of the court in Gladman Development Limited v. Wokingham Borough Council [2014] EWHC 2320 (Admin) (Wokingham), Gallagher Homes Ltd and Lioncourt Homes Ltd v. Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council [2014] EWHC 1283 (Gallagher) and City and District of St Albans v. Hunston Properties Limited and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2013] EWCA Civ. 1610 (Court of Appeal) (Hunston) for the relationship between the Allocations Plan, the Core Strategy and national policy requirements relating to housing land supply?

2) Does the Allocations Plan soundly implement the adopted Core Strategy by providing sufficient land to meet housing need and specifically:
   • is there any need for the plan to provide for any shortfall in housing provision that has arisen since the adoption of the Core Strategy?
   • does it provide for a 5 year forward supply of specific and deliverable housing land (NPPF paragraphs 47 & 49);
   • should 5% or a 20% buffer be applied to the 5 year forward land supply (NPPF paragraph 47);
• to what extent do the current allocations provide for housing land supply in years 6-10 and 11-15 / end date of the plan?

3) Having regard to housing delivery that has taken place since the commencement of the Core Strategy period, are the proposed net dwelling requirements sound and is the spatial distribution of the proposed housing allocations appropriate and soundly based?

• Does the plan aim to meet the particular housing needs from specific settlements within or close to those settlements, or do the allocations simply aim to meet the overall housing requirement within the borough as a whole?
• With reference to Core Strategy targets, has sufficient land been allocated in individual settlements?

4) Has sufficient account been taken of the need for residential care home development (C2) development or similar provision (such as extra-care housing) in the allocations?

Main issue 4: implementation of retail development strategy
Does the Allocations Plan soundly implement the adopted Core Strategy by providing sufficient land to meet retail development requirements?

1) The retail strategy and requirement set in Core Policy 8 was expressed as being applicable until 2017 and subject to revision if a different need is identified. The Retail and Leisure Study Update (2014) [CD 3.44] has proposed the following revisions (from table 5) in order to deliver greater retail retention – an increase in the retail function and spend within the borough:
• a significant addition to net comparison and convenience retail floor space in Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough;
• reductions in net comparison and convenience retail floor space in other main settlements (Paddock Wood, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst); and
• a minor increase in net comparison and convenience retail floor space in the villages and rural areas.

Is the amount of proposed retail provision soundly based, justified and effective?

2) Does the extent of primary or secondary retail frontage identified in the Allocations Plan sufficiently respond to existing or proposed retail land uses?

3) Having regard to relevant factors such as the location of proposed housing allocations and retail catchments, is the spatial distribution of the proposed retail components of allocations appropriate and soundly based?

4) With the exception of land at Royal Victoria Place in Royal Tunbridge Wells (AL/RTW19) where there is an exclusively retail allocation, retail development outcomes are proposed to be delivered flexibly as part of mixed use and ‘area of change’ allocations and within designated primary shopping areas and neighbourhood centres.
• Is there sufficient direction within policies to secure the amount of retail development sought to underpin the ‘retail retention’ strategy?
• What is the appropriate balance to be struck between flexibility in mixed use and ‘area of change’ allocations and certainty in the promotion and delivery of greater retail retention?
5) A substantial uplift in retail floorspace is proposed in Royal Tunbridge Wells, but this is not proposed to be phased. Is there any basis for phasing retail development by volume or spatially?

Main issue 5: implementation of employment strategy
Does the Allocations Plan soundly implement the adopted Core Strategy by providing for sufficient employment land?

1) Additional key employment areas have not been allocated. Taking changes in employment land policy and practice into account (the inclusion of actively used office floorspace in major site/area of change allocations, homeworking and change of use from office to residential), are the employment land assumptions in the plan still sound and will it implement Core Policy 7 by maintaining the net volume of employment floorspace?

2) A number of mixed use and ‘area of change’ allocations support residential redevelopment / change of use in areas that appear to contain ongoing employment uses. At paragraph 2.24, the plan indicates that ‘the Council has sought to ensure that other sites are available for employment uses and that there is no overall net loss of employment provision’.
- Please explain how this is achieved without the need to allocate any new employment land?
- Do national policy changes such as the implementation of prior notice procedure for change of use from office to residential affect the delivery of this approach?

Main issue 6: ecological impacts and sustainability appraisal
Some representors have expressed concerns about the ecological evidence base relevant to large allocated sites, or have suggested that a high level ecological review should be carried out in respect of all proposed allocations and that the outcome of this work should inform policy requirements for individual sites. Concerns are raised in a number of representations about the proximity to or inclusion of ancient woodlands in allocations and the potential for adverse effects on these environmental assets.

1) Is any additional ecological survey work required to support the allocations made in the Allocations Plan?
- If so, what are the implications of the absence of such survey work for the sustainability appraisal process conducted to date; and
- do any additional survey or mitigation measures need to be included in policies within the Allocations Plan?

2) Residential allocations including AL/GB2 (Knights Wood, Royal Tunbridge Wells), AL/PW3 (land at Church Road and Mascalls Court Road, Paddock Wood), AL/PW4 (Mascalls Farm, Paddock Wood) and AL/CR4 (land adjacent to the Crane Valley, Cranbrook) contain or closely adjoin ancient woodland.
- Are the measures taken in the policies relevant to these allocations sufficient to protect ancient woodland features?
- In some instances, the substantial areas of the allocated sites are proposed to be subject to an ‘open space within site allocation’ designation. It is not clear that these open spaces are necessary to meet the recreational needs of the allocation or of the surrounding settlement. What is the rationale for including such extensive undeveloped areas within site allocations?

3) With particular reference to the Ashdown Forest SPA and the HRA process:
• has it been demonstrated that the Allocations Plan would have no likely significant effects upon internationally important nature conservation sites which are not capable of being mitigated; and
• with reference to the decision of the Court of Appeal in Ashdown Forest Economic Development LLP v. Wealden District Council [2015] EWCA Civ 681, to the Ashdown Forest SPA and the HRA process, what consideration has the Council given to the options necessary to secure the avoidance of likely significant effects on the Ashdown Forest SPA and are there any sites that require to be reconsidered for allocation in the light of this judgement?

**Matter B: Mixed Use and Area of Change Allocations**

**Main issue 1: implications of mixed use approach**
A number of large site / area of change allocations propose mixed use development outcomes to be secured by a masterplan addressing a broad range of potential use and development.

1) With reference to topic based responses to questions in Matter A above, does the Allocations Plan approach to mixed use development on large / area of change sites provide sufficient certainty about the amount, location and form of housing, retail and employment development and its delivery?

**Matter C: Infrastructure Policies, Delivery and Implementation**

**Main issue 1: rail strategic safeguarding**
Is the proposed safeguarding of former rail alignments for the development of new rail links and/or green infrastructure soundly based, fully justified and effective (Policy AL/STR3).

1) Is there an adequate justification for a safeguarding policy for the former Tunbridge Wells Central to Eridge railway line for re-use as a railway and is re-use deliverable, having particular regard to:
   - the re-development of former railway land on the alignment (Sainsbury’s and Homebase);
   - the current use of the former Tunbridge Wells West station building;
   - and
   - the operation of part of the alignment as the heritage Spa Valley Railway?

2) Is there an adequate justification for a safeguarding policy for the former Paddock Wood to Hawkhurst railway line for a green infrastructure corridor and is the proposed use deliverable?

**Main issue 2: water storage strategic safeguarding**
Is the proposed safeguarding of land for Bewl Water expansion soundly based, fully justified and effective (Policy AL/STR4)?

1) What is the extent of land subject to Policy AL/STR4?

2) What measures have been taken to engage with stakeholders affected by this policy?

**Main issue 3: planning obligations and community infrastructure**
Tunbridge Wells does not have a Community Infrastructure Levy Plan (CIL Plan).
1) Please set out a summary assessment of viability related to the policy requirements of the Allocations Plan, identifying how the infrastructure needs arising from the requirements can be met.

2) To the extent that infrastructure requirements arise from the Allocations Plan to ensure that development on the allocated sites is deliverable, can these be met using planning conditions and/or obligations under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)?

3) Will it be necessary to develop a CIL Plan during the lifetime of the proposed allocations to ensure deliverability?

**Main issue 4: delivery and implementation.**
The Allocations Plan contains delivery-focused policy and explanatory text. However, it does not include a section, either in the plan as a whole or in respect of each main chapter, which draws out how the plan outcomes are to be delivered and implemented.

1) Having regard to infrastructure requirements arising from the Allocations Plan are there topics and policies in respect of which greater specificity on delivery and implementation are required?

**Matter D: Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough Allocations**

**Main issue 1: Urban Design Framework.**
Policy AL/RTW1 commits to the preparation of an Urban Design Framework (UDF) for Royal Tunbridge Wells town centre. This aims to provide detailed guidance on accessibility, connections and linkages, improved public realm and enhancement through the delivery of features such as public art and lighting. It addresses subject matters that might have been the subject of policies within a town centre action area plan that is not now being proceeded with. It is understood that the UDF will be a supplementary planning document (SPD)?

1) Are there elements of the UDF that are essential to the delivery of development subject to the allocations and policies in the Allocations Plan and hence should be included in the plan

2) Should the UDF policy take specific account of the contribution of the historic built environment and conservation area(s) to the character of the town?

**Main issue 2: Areas of Change.**
Three major areas of change are proposed for Crescent Road/Church Road (AL/RTW2), Vale Avenue (AL/RTW3) and Eridge Road (AL/RTW4).

1) Crescent Road/Church Road (AL/RTW2) divides between area 2A (the Civic Centre and environs, a largely developed and actively used site) and area 2B (the former ABC or Ritz cinema site, which is largely cleared and ready for re-development).
   - Is there sufficient congruence of existing and potential land use and urban character between areas 2A and 2B to merit their treatment together in a single policy?
   - Are the policy outcomes sought sufficiently flexible, or are they too broad and thus insufficiently certain for effective delivery?
   - Area 2A largely appears to be in existing active use. Are there reasonable prospects of this area (or sufficient of it) being brought forward?
   - Is there sufficient clarity about the elements of this area that are expected to provide retail frontage at ground floor level?
2) Vale Avenue (AL/RTW3) contains the environs of the main station, Morrisons supermarket and office development in Vale Avenue.
   - Much of the area appears to be in existing active use. Are there reasonable prospects of this area (or sufficient of it) being brought forward?
   - Are the policy outcomes sought sufficiently flexible, or are they too broad and thus insufficiently certain for effective delivery?

3) Eridge Road (AL/RTW4) abuts the southern edge of the historic ‘Pantiles’ precinct. It contains the mixed use Union House building (retail, office and parking) in respect of which there is an active residential conversation proposal, a car park and housing in the private road Montacute Gardens.
   - Much of the area appears to be in existing active use. Are there reasonable prospects of this area (or sufficient of it) being brought forward?
   - Are the policy outcomes sought sufficiently flexible, or are they too broad and thus insufficiently certain for effective delivery?
   - Could additional housing be delivered in this location?
   - Have freeholders in Montacute Gardens committed to the availability of their portion of this site and if not, what implications are there for the availability / deliverability of this site?

4) To what extent would these policies be delivered by residential conversion and what impact will officer conversion permitted development rights have on them?

5) Do the areas of change policies respond sufficiently to the historic built environment and conservation area designations?

Main issue 3: Housing allocations.

1) Is the use of AL/RTW6 (Eridge Road) for housing fully justified, or does this site form part of the commercial / town centre area in which some retail or employment development might be justified?

2) Is the use of AL/RTW13 (Telephone Engineering Centre and W A Turner premises) for housing fully justified, or does this site represent an employment opportunity?

3) Is the use of AL/RTW16 (Beechwood Sacred Heart School) for housing fully justified or does this site represent an opportunity for an element of residential institution (C2) use and development?

Main issue 4: Infrastructure
Allocations and mixed use / ‘area of change’ residential development is likely to give rise to the following infrastructure requirements:
- traffic and transport demand generated by new housing, retail and employment development (including any impacts on or upgrades to private roads);
- parking demand generated by new housing, retail and employment development;
- parking demand generated by the need to replace / relocated existing parking provision on allocated sites;
- demand for school places and other community facilities generated by new housing development; and
- stormwater and foul drainage demand from all new built development.

1) Have the infrastructure demands arising from town centre allocations been sufficiently identified and can they be met through existing or new capacity?

2) If new capacity is required, how is it to be delivered?
3) If capacity remains limited or new capacity cannot be delivered, to what extent are these allocations deliverable?

4) A number of existing car parks are proposed to be allocated. Whilst some policies make specific provision for replacement parking, others refer to opportunities to re-provide car parking being ‘explored’. Is the effect of the Plan on car parking capacity in the town centre sufficiently understood?

5) Are any road, pedestrian or cycling safety measures required to respond to new housing, retail and employment development?

Main issue 5: Omissions sites.
Having regard to responses to all questions relevant to Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough, has sufficient land been proposed for allocation to meet Core Strategy requirements and is there any need to consider omissions sites?

Matter E: Green Belt and Rural Fringe Allocations
Core Policies 2 and 9 and Core Strategy paragraph 5.28 suggests that there may be no need for a review of the Green Belt boundary. Paragraph 5.28 does flag the need for a review of the ‘adequacy or otherwise of the stock of safeguarded non-Green Belt land...’ (the long term land reserve) focused on Royal Tunbridge Wells and Southborough. Some sites from the long term land reserve have been brought forward for development. Additional land has not been added to the reserve and (in line with the Core Strategy) the Green Belt boundary is not subject to any change proposals.

1) AL/GB2 Knights Wood is understood to be an allocation from the long term land reserve and to contain ancient woodland. Having regard to issues and responses to questions raised under Matter A and to site specific considerations relevant to this allocation, is this allocation deliverable?

2) Having regard to issues and responses to questions raised under Matter A, is there any need to bring forward land for housing within the long term land reserve (AL/GB4)?

3) The plan identifies Holmwood House School, Langton Green; Kent College, Pembury and Tunbridge Wells Hospital, Pembury as ‘major developed sites in the Green Belt’ (AL/GB5).
   - Does this allocation conform with NPPF paragraph 89, bullet point 6?
   - What is the latest understanding of the uses on these sites. Are any considered to be redundant or to offer an opportunity for use consistent with NPPF paragraph 89?

Matter F: Paddock Wood Allocations

Main issue 1: Paddock Wood housing and Core Policy 11:
Paddock Wood is proposed to provide a substantial volume of housing development opportunities through a planned urban extension. There are two housing allocations: AL/PW3 (land at Church Farm and Land at Mascalls Court Road); and AL/PW4 (land at Mascalls Farm).

1) At approximately 900 units, the scale of the housing allocations at Paddock Wood appears to be large relative to the scale of the settlement and to that extent it appears to be meeting needs arising in other settlements including Royal Tunbridge Wells and the rural area. The Core Strategy anticipated an allocation of in the region of 600 dwellings. Is the allocation approach justified?
2) Flooding is an acknowledged issue in Paddock Wood. The built area of the town south of the railway line is identified in the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SRFA) Level 2 (2009) [CD 3.40] as and ‘area of critical drainage’ and parts are in Flood Zone 2. Parts of the proposed allocations are also subject to flood risk.
   - Are there alternative deliverable sites not exposed or less exposed to flood risk that could be allocated for housing?
   - Are the flood alleviation measures proposed in the housing allocations sufficient to address the flood mitigation / storm drainage surcharge requirements for the existing town in addition to the new needs generated by development on these sites?
   - If so, are the necessary measures sufficiently secured in the policies for these allocations?
   - Policy AL/PW3 refers to ‘an open space buffer in the northern part of the [Church Farm] site to reduce flood risk…’. This appears to spatially direct the main flood mitigation measures downstream from the bulk of the allocated site. Is this degree of spatial direction appropriate or does it constrain the ability of the flood mitigation scheme to deliver the outcomes sought for the site and the town?

3) AL/PW3 and AL/PW4 both contain significant areas identified as ‘open space within site allocation’. AL/PW4 is understood to contain ancient woodland and to closely abut nature conservation sites (EN15).
   - Are the allocations sound?
   - Do the policies sufficiently protect these natural environment assets?

4) With regard to questions F1(2) and (3), is there a need to consider alternative housing land supply at Paddock Wood or elsewhere?
   - What is the anticipated contribution of windfall sites?
   - What is the anticipated contribution (if any) from Neighbourhood Plans?
   - Is there any need to consider the allocation of currently unallocated additional land for housing from the ‘Site Templates’ document [CD 3.29]?
   - Is there any need to consider the allocation of omissions sites?

Matter G: Cranbrook Allocations

Main issue 1: Crane Valley housing and AONB impacts:
AL/CR4 (land adjacent to the Crane Valley / Brick Kiln Farm) is identified to provide between 200 and 250 dwellings.

1) The sustainability appraisal [CD 3.63 at pg 103] identifies that AL/CR4 will represent a significant incursion into the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and also scores the site negatively in terms of efficient land use, natural/built environment and biodiversity.
   - Is the allocation sound and fully justified, having regard to paragraphs 115 and 116 of the NPPF?
   - Does the policy sufficiently identify and mitigate the constraints?
   - Is it possible that policy and design constraints on this site might reduce the number of units capable of construction from the number stated in the Allocation Plan?

2) Further to question G1(1) above, is there a need to consider additional housing land supply at Cranbrook or elsewhere?
   - What is the anticipated contribution of windfall sites?
   - What is the anticipated contribution (if any) from Neighbourhood Plans?
   - Is there any need to consider the allocation of currently unallocated additional land for housing from the ‘Site Templates’ document [CD 3.29]?
Is there any need to consider the allocation of omissions sites?

**Matter H: Hawkhurst (Highgate), The Moor and Gills Green Allocations**

**Main issue 1: Hawkhurst (Highgate) housing, infrastructure and Core Policy 13:**
Hawkhurst is proposed to provide housing development opportunities to meet its own needs and those arising from the surrounding rural area.

1) Representors have referred to an ongoing appeal in relation to unallocated land at Highgate Hill (TW/14/503346) that could provide 62 dwellings in addition to the 111 dwellings anticipated to be provided for in the Hawkhurst allocations (AL/HA1-4).

- What is the latest position in relation to this appeal?
- If it has been granted, does the Council propose to sustain or revise the proposed Hawkhurst allocations (the response to this question should take the broader housing position of the villages and rural areas into account)?
- If the housing supply at Hawkhurst were to be larger than that anticipated by the Allocations Plan, would it be necessary to secure additional highway / traffic mitigation?
- If so, what would this consist of and how should it be addressed in the Hawkhurst policies?

2) Further to question H1(1) above, what affect might the granting of the Highgate Hill appeal (TW/14/503346) have on the conclusions emerging from sustainability appraisal of housing options at Hawkhurst, paying particular attention to the cumulative impact of housing development on the AONB?.

3) If the Highgate Hill appeal (TW/14/503346) has not been granted, will there be a sufficient supply of housing for Hawkhurst (Highgate), The Moor and Gills Green?

- What is the anticipated contribution of windfall sites?
- What is the anticipated contribution (if any) from Neighbourhood Plans?
- Is there any need to consider the allocation of currently unallocated additional land for housing from the 'Site Templates' document [CD 3.29]?
- Is there any need to consider the allocation of omissions sites?

**Matter I: Villages and Rural Areas Allocations**

**Main issue 1: rural housing and Core Policy 14:**
Core Policy 14 in the adopted Core Strategy calls for the provision of in the order of 360 net additional dwellings in the villages and rural areas between 2006 and 2026. Monitoring indicates that this requirement has already been met between 2006 and 2015. On this basis, the Allocations Plan allocates only one housing site, at Sissinghurst for 8-12 dwellings (Policy AL/VRA1). The main purpose of the Sissinghurst allocation appears to be to secure an appropriate built form and use outcome on the prominent former school site, adjacent to Trinity Church. There are no housing allocations in other villages within the rural area, which include substantial settlements such as Pembury, Horsmonden or Five Oak Green.

1) Is it clear that by providing no allocated housing sites within villages that Core Policy 14 can be met?

2) What role does the Council anticipate that local needs housing and rural exceptions sites (Core Policies 1(2) and 6(6)) will play in delivering rural housing from 2016 – 2026? How much housing can be delivered via this route?
3) What role does the Council anticipate that windfall sites will play in delivering rural housing from 2016 – 2026, taking NPPF policy on garden land into account (paragraph 48)? How much housing can be delivered via this route?

4) Are neighbourhood plans or agricultural permitted development rights anticipated to make material contributions to rural housing supply from 2016 – 2026? How much additional housing might be delivered via these routes?

5) With reference to the responses to questions 11(1)-(4):
   - Is there any need to consider the allocation of currently unallocated additional land for housing from the ‘Site Templates’ document [CD 3.29]?
   - Is there any need to consider the allocation of omissions sites in the villages and rural areas?

Main issue 2: supporting a prosperous rural economy

In addition to housing land, the Allocations Plan allocates land for park and ride facilities (AL/VRA2) and recreation open space (AL/VRA3) at Pembury. Employment land is allocated at Brook Farm, Capel (AL/VRA4). The geographic spread and extent of these allocations is limited and there are substantial rural settlements with no allocations.

1) Is the extent and geographic spread of these allocations sufficient to comply with NPPF policy at paragraph 28 (supporting a prosperous rural economy) and relevant Core Policies (particularly 7, 8 and 14)?

2) If not, what changes would be necessary to bring about compliance and is it necessary for any additional land to be allocated?

Matter J: Other Outstanding Matters and Issues

It is possible that other matters and issues may arise that require to be addressed. If these are substantial, I will issue a revision to this paper. If such matters are minor, I will include them in agendas for hearings in due course.

Rynd Smith

Inspector