

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
<b>Question 1</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA75	Disagree	<p>The approach set out in the flow diagram is generally supported. However, in Stage 10 it is noted that reference is made to "determining the potential of windfalls (if justified".</p> <p>We do not consider that there should be a need to include this element.</p> <p>As the Council is aware, PPS 3 advises that windfalls should not be relied upon in the first 10 years of the LDF unless exceptional circumstances exist. Specifically such circumstances are when the authority simply does not have the ability to identify sufficient deliverable sites which can be allocated to cover the first 10 years need.</p> <p>This is clearly not the case in Tunbridge Wells with a large number of sites and land readily available for development being promoted by landowners and developers.</p> <p>We submit that seeking to justify reliance on windfalls in the first 10 years would be an unproductive and unnecessary exercise that is ultimately unlikely to be accepted by an Inspector.</p>	Windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years [By TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change
117374	Mr Asher Ross	Indigo Planning	SHLAA156	Disagree	<p>The approach to the assessment is too simplistic and does is not able to identify sites that should be deliverable. In addition, assessment by officers both desk top and, in particularly, on site, does not have regard to the ability of developers to overcome constraints on site, such as continuation. Officers should consider discussing the development potential of the site with owners / developers.</p>	The approach does not identify deliverable sites or the constraints that need to be overcome; Need to involve developers when considering development potential of sites [by TWBC]	Comment noted. Stages 6 to 7d inclusive consider the constraints to development and how these can be overcome. The setting up of a SHLAA panel will ensure the involvement of developers/landowners/agents in the ongoing process	Partial Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA49	Disagree	<p>Whilst I agree that the SHLAA needs to be iterative, the process appears to omit the recommendation of the RSS Panel, that there should be a Green Belt review at Tunbridge Wells to assist in ensuring that there will be an adequate supply of housing land in order to meet realistic levels of housing need and demand in the future. The Borough Council has not</p>	The Stages of the SHLAA should include a Green Belt review be carried out at Tunbridge Wells as recommended by the RSS Panel Report. This is currently absent / ignored	Comment noted. Sites within the Green belt are not to be excluded from the SHLAA process	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					included this important stage in the proposed SHLAA. This is an important component and should be considered in Stage 1 - Planning the Assessment and then carried through subsequently in the survey and analysis in order that sound and robust conclusions may be reached.	[By TWBC].		
24757	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	SHLAA57	Disagree	<p>The approach set out in Figure 1 does not follow that in the Practice Guidance (as identified within paragraph 18, Figure 3). Stage 7a should remain a later stage in the methodology approach to ensure that all sites are considered and evaluated equally in the process. A survey and robust development potential assessment on each identified site is essential to enable the Council to establish balanced conclusions for each site put forward.</p> <p>The introduction to the methodology sets out that the SHLAA is to provide an approach to meet the South East Plan strategic housing requirement to 2026. It is essential, therefore, that all site suggestions are explored equally. This will facilitate later re-visits and revisions to the approach to be based on a complete and robust initial site assessment. Paragraph 17 of the Practice Guidance requires the SHLAA to be kept up-to-date once complete and suggests that this is completed annually as part of the Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). A limited assessment of sites at the SHLAA preparatory stage would hinder a robust annual re-visit and review of the sites identified. This is not in accordance with the Practice Guidance.</p> <p>It is considered that the approach in Figure 1 does not deliver the SHLAA core outputs identified in the Practice Guidance (at paragraph 14, Figure 1). This requires:</p> <p>1 A list of sites, cross-referenced to maps showing locations and boundaries of specific sites (and showing broad locations, where necessary).</p>	<p>Stage 7a should be later in the process to ensure that all sites are equally evaluated</p> <p>Consider the approach in Figure 1 does not deliver SHLAA core outputs</p> <p>Rural fringe sites need to be considered [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed</p> <p>SHLAA methodology will deliver core outputs as required by SHLAA Practice Guidance</p> <p>Rural Fringe sites are not to be excluded from the SHLAA process</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>2 ASSESSMENT OF THE DELIVERABILITY/DEVELOPABILITY OF EACH IDENTIFIED SITE (I.E. IN TERMS OF ITS SUITABILITY, AVAILABILITY AND ACHIEVABILITY) TO DETERMINE WHEN AN IDENTIFIED SITE IS REALISTICALLY EXPECTED TO BE DEVELOPED.</p> <p>3 POTENTIAL QUANTITY OF HOUSING THAT COULD BE DELIVERED ON EACH IDENTIFIED SITE OR WITHIN EACH IDENTIFIED BROAD LOCATION (WHERE NECESSARY) OR ON WINDFALL SITES (WHERE JUSTIFIED).</p> <p>4 CONSTRAINTS ON THE DELIVERY OF IDENTIFIED SITES.</p> <p>5 RECOMMENDATIONS ON HOW THESE CONSTRAINTS COULD BE OVERCOME AND WHEN.</p> <p>Source: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessments Practice Guidance (July 2007),</p> <p>Figure 1: Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Core Outputs (BARTON WILLMORE OWN EMPHASIS).</p> <p>Bringing forward Stage 7a would not deliver the identified core outputs numbered 2 to 5 which are required as a minimum by the Practice Guidance. Bringing forward Stage 7a would prematurely discount a number of Sites before a complete assessment of the deliverability and developability has been carried out, as an assessment of the site's constraints and any potential for these to be overcome would not have been completed.</p> <p>Returning Stage 7a to its suggested place in the proposed Practice Guidance methodology (as set out in Figure 3 of the Practice Guidance) would allow the Council to assess the site suggestions in full and in a more robust fashion, this would then be</p>			

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>defensible at an independent examination. It is considered that at present the suggested methodology would not accord with the Practice Guidance and is therefore contrary to the requirements of PPS3: Housing (November 2006).</p> <p>Stage 2: Determining which sources of Sites will be included in the Assessment</p> <p>No questions relate directly to this Stage in the consultation document, our comments are set out below.</p> <p>Table 5 of the SHLAA methodology lists sites to be considered that are already in the planning process, this includes:</p> <p>Table 5: Sites in the Planning Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land allocated (or with permission) for employment or other land uses, which is no longer required for those uses.</li> <li>- Existing housing allocations and site development briefs.</li> <li>- Site which have planning permission that are under construction or not yet started for housing, retail and employment or a combination of these and other uses.</li> </ul> <p>The existing Rural Fringe sites allocated in the Local Plan (adopted 2006) which include Hawkenbury Farm, Royal Tunbridge Wells (RTW), are discounted from Table 5. The Rural Fringe sites are allocated to provide for the Borough's longer term housing needs (post 2011). The SHLAA methodology identifies that the SHLAA will reflect housing requirements to 2026. The Rural Fringe sites should therefore be considered.</p> <p>Further, the policies in the adopted Local Plan (2006) are not timetabled to expire until March 2009, those sites designated as Rural Fringe under Local Plan</p>			

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>policies RF1 and RF2 should therefore be included in Table 5 as follows (additions shown as underline):</p> <p>Table 5: Sites in the Planning Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Land allocated (or with permission) for employment or other land uses, which is no longer required for those uses.</li> <li>- Existing housing allocations, RURAL FRINGE HOUSING ALLOCATIONS and site development briefs.</li> <li>- Site which have planning permission that are under construction or not yet started for housing, retail and employment or a combination of these and other uses.</li> </ul> <p>Paragraph 16 of the Practice Guidance highlights that one of the key differences between the Urban Capacity Study previously required by PPG3 and the new SHLAA required by PPS3 is that the SHLAA will determine whether identified sites are still available and to review assumptions on housing potential. Including Rural Fringe in Table 5 will ensure that all allocated housing sites are identified and reviewed on an annual basis.</p>			
24920	Mr P Errington	Home Builders Federation	SHLAA161	Disagree	<p>Stage 7a</p> <p>The first concern relates to the proposal to undertake stage 7a of the CLG SHLAA guidance so early in the process. As I stated when we met, I can appreciate the council's desire to minimise the workload of carrying out a SHLAA. However, the final outcome still has to be technically robust.</p> <p>The process of carrying out a SHLAA should be a technical assessment divorced from policy considerations as the process of undertaking the SHLAA may suggest a need for a review of those policy considerations. It would appear that the proposal to bring forward stage 7a involves making policy judgements about the suitability of sites based on existing policy. However, if the SHLAA was done in the proper order as set out in the CLG guidance, it</p>	Concern over position of Stage 7a within the proposed approach	Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>may suggest a need for a review of those existing policies in order that housing targets can be met.</p> <p>If such a policy review was needed and stage 7a had been carried out so early in the process the only sites which would have been assessed in any detail through the SHLAA process would be those compliant with existing policies leaving nothing left to be brought forward earlier than anticipated should the housing trajectory show targets were not being met. However, the SHLAA process should allow a range of sites to be identified which are in varying levels of compliance with existing policies but which could be suitable (and the other PPS3 "ables") should policies need to change in order to ensure targets are met. The council's proposed approach would mean that such site would have been ruled out at the early stage and not assessed in detail as part of the SHLAA. This cannot be a 'sound' way forward.</p> <p>HBF would prefer, therefore, that the assessment was carried out in the sequence set out in the CLG guidance in order that the assessment is as complete and robust as possible. Otherwise, it may be necessary for stage 7a to have to be repeated later in the assessment meaning that it would actually duplicate effort rather than save time. So, while we are fully supportive of the need to minimise the workload this should not be at the expense of a comprehensive survey. All reasonably foreseeable sites should be included, particularly where there is a likelihood they will be promoted for development during the course of the strategy period. Such sites may well be ruled out by the council on policy grounds as part of the assessment process but they should be included in that assessment process so that the decision making process is transparent and obvious.</p> <p>As stated at the meeting, it may be possible for this concern to be overcome by undertaking a full</p>			

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					assessment of any site which the owner requests be assessed regardless of how this scores on the council's current-policy-based suitability screening. As I suggested, it is in the council's interest to undertake a full assessment of all those sites where it is known from discussions with developers there are likely to be planning applications in order that the SHLAA evidence base can inform any appeal.			
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA20		In principle the stages are correct . However we believe that there is a risk that the desk top review may be too superficial.Care must be taken to ensure that sufficient weight is placed on the relative merits and constraints of each site. Is the sequence followed on the desk top review correct or is there a risk that sites which may be ruled out at stage 1 could in fact be preferable to sites that "tick" box 1 but are less suitable in other ways?  Sites should therefore only be ruled out at stage 7(a), prior to inspection if they are fundamentally wrong.	Risk of desk top review being too superficial and thus some suitable sites being ruled out at too early a stage.	Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed	Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA142	Agree	We agree, generally, with the stages proposed. However, we feel that there is need for an option to identify specific areas which CANNOT be developed.	Need to identify specific areas which cannot be developed [By TWBC]	Support noted. See Stage 2. Table 7 lists the types of land to be excluded from the SHLAA	No Change
25587	Mr Brian Lloyd	Campaign to Protect Rural England	SHLAA65	Disagree	It is proposed that the only fieldwork to be undertaken is to survey the sites that have been identified in Stage 3 (para. 4.22 of the methodology). It is clear from paragraph 25 of the Practice Guidance, though, that the site survey stage (Stage 4) should be used to identify further sites which were not identified by the desktop review. Whilst this will involve more work for the Council, we consider that this is an essential part of the SHLAA to ensure that all potential sites are picked-up.	Site surveys may identify additional sites [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Stage 4 should be reviewed following site surveys to ensure that no further sites are suitable for inclusion within the SHLAA process	Change
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA114	Agree	We agree, generally, with the stages proposed. However, the Workshop Session on 6 March 2008 (RTW Camden Centre) underlined the importance of local knowledge of residents (not just House Builders and Estate Agents) in the Stage 3 "Desktop review of existing information".	Importance of local knowledge	Support noted. Wider community involvement will take place at the Submission Stage of the Core Strategy and when producing Development Plan Documents/Supplementary	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					Also, the importance of para 1.12 regarding "windfall projection allowances" should be noted and is referred to later (see: Questions 2, 4, 7, 14)		Planning Documents	
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA117	Agree	We recognise the process by which sites are defined as `available` comes essentially from the Govt Guidance but it seems confused. The Council can only predict what sites will come forward for development (see Comment on Q.12 below).		Support noted.	No Change
55897	Mr Sean Hanna	Natural England	SHLAA41	Agree	Natural England broadly agrees with the approach taken to the SHLAA.		Support noted.	No Change
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA171	Agree	Yes it seems to follow the approach set out in the government guidance. An issue that was raised at the workshop was about the concept of "suitability" of land for housing development. There was a view that "suitable" was a misleading term, as even a cursory application of the early stages of the methodology could identify land which, while perhaps available in theory for housing development is never going to be found suitable for a particular reason. Needless public upset could also be created if areas which were never realistically going to be developed for housing were declared as "suitable".	Concern over the term "suitability" - too general a term	Support noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed	Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA89	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
<b>Question 2</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA76	Disagree	<p>The five year housing land supply is largely based on existing planning permissions and quite rightly does not seek to include a windfall allowance.</p> <p>However, PPS3 states that where reliance is placed on existing permissions robust evidence must be provided to demonstrate that those permissions are indeed likely to come forward. As part of the SHLAA it is submitted that an appendix listing the permissions relied upon, their progress and likely delivery rates should be provided.</p> <p>We respectfully submit that the current assumptions based on general past trends cannot be classed as</p>	Robust evidence on uptake of existing planning permissions needs to be provided [by TWBC]	Comment noted. Any lapsed permissions will be excluded from the calculation of the supply of deliverable sites. These will reflect the actual level of lapsed applications for a specified period	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
117374	Mr Asher Ross	Indigo Planning	SHLAA157	Agree	robust evidence without this. The Council has to be able to show that all these sites are deliverable (for example, while planning permission has been granted this does not mean that it will be implemented - a lapse rate would be expected). In addition, the Council will have to show flexibility in the delivery of housing, for example if the South East Plan increases the number of housing to be delivered. In addition, the Council has to recognise that the 5-year housing supply is a minimum and that development on sustainable locations should be permitted in order to exceed the minimum housing target.	Not all planning approvals will be developed. 5-year housing supply is a minimum [By TWBC] The 5 year housing supply is a minimum [TWBC]	Support noted. Any lapsed permissions will be excluded from the calculation of the supply of deliverable sites. These will reflect the actual level of lapsed applications for a specified period  According to policy H1 of the Draft South East Plan, "local authorities should make the following provision in their Local Development Documents 5,000 dwellings between 2006-2026" (subsequently increased to 6,000 dwellings). Policy H1 also states "Local authorities should adopt a Plan, Monitor, Manage approach to housing provision, with appropriate phasing policies in Local Development Documents and taking account of any phasing and provisos set out in the sub-regional strategies/policies". The Council will have regard to any changes to policies in the adopted South East, once published.	Partial Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA50	Disagree	The Borough's assessment of dwellings that are likely to be built from existing planning permissions is excessive. The Borough concedes that about 10% of permissions are not implemented. It would be reasonable to discount the delivery expectation by at least this amount. There is also uncertainty about the delivery of the sites already identified for future housing delivery.  To be able to demonstrate a credible 5 year housing land supply, it would be prudent to be cautious about delivery and increase the anticipated supply figures in order that the supply target is met.	Estimates of dwellings that are likely to be built from existing planning permissions are excessive [by TWBC]	Comment noted. Any lapsed permissions will be excluded from the calculation of the supply of deliverable sites. These will reflect the actual level of lapsed applications for a specified period	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
24838	Mr H Moore	Highways Agency	SHLAA46	Agree	<p>The report details that the emerging South East Plan will set out the strategic housing requirement of constructing 6,000 dwellings per annum in the Borough between 2006 and 2026. Having considered the Housing trajectory, the Agency would like to remind the Local Authority that any identified housing developments must be planned in such a way that is comprehensively linked with the delivery of key transport infrastructure. This is supported by the PPS12 document which sets out the importance of planning for infrastructure at the outset. In addition, the need for infrastructure to support housing growth and the associated need for an infrastructure delivery planning process has been highlighted further in the Government's recent Housing Green Paper.</p> <p>Additionally, all residential developments should encourage the use of sustainable travel modes by being situated in areas where high quality and interconnected public transport facilities are available. It is vital to front load such transport infrastructure so that buses for example are operating services from the outset. The emphasis on reducing the need to travel, for private car trips in particular, is the fundamental principle of PPG13.</p> <p>Where a residential development is located within close proximity to the A21 trunk road and is likely to have a traffic impact on these junctions, the Agency will expect for the planning application to be accompanied by a detailed Transport Assessment and robust Travel Plan. This is to satisfy the Agency that such a development will have no adverse impact upon the operation and safety of the trunk road network. The development impact must be assessed in accordance with DfT Circular 02/2007 and Guidance on Transport Assessments, dated March 2007.</p>	To ensure that any proposed development is linked with the delivery of key transport infrastructure [by TWBC]	<p>Support noted. Stages 6 and 7 of the SHLAA ensure that the infrastructure necessary for any development is considered and factored into the estimates of achievability and constraints.</p> <p>Will add transport infrastructure to list of criteria to consider.</p>	Change.
24920	Mr P Errington	Home Builders Federation	SHLAA162	Disagree	5-Year Supply of Deliverable Sites	Deliverability of sites should be based upon robust evidence and	Comment noted. Stages 6 and 7 will incorporate methods that will ensure a robust approach to	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					comments in the early part of section 4 where the methodology says a number of times that it "is reasonable to assume" various things about the deliverability of sites in the next five years. HBF would suggest that it may not be reasonable simply to make these assumptions and that, instead, these assumptions should be supported by detailed information from developers about likely future completion rates on those allocated and permitted sites. This is part of the purpose of carrying out a SHLAA to remove assumption and speculation and replace this with fact and certainty. HBF would suggest that the council contact the owners of all of these sites and incorporate their views about delivery over the next five years to inform this part of the assessment.	research [By TWBC]	assessing the deliverability of sites.  Landowners/Developers/Agents will be contacted to help inform SHLAA	
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA143	Disagree	We feel strongly that any residential institution (class C2) - e.g. retirement homes - should also be included in the supply of deliverable sites.	Residential institutions should be included in SHLAA process [By TWBC]	Comment noted. SHLAA will consider uses other than dwelling houses	No Change
25772	Mr P Allen	Weald of Kent Protection Society	SHLAA1	Disagree	The arithmetic is OK. But the decision to exclude windfalls is (notwithstanding PPS3) very dubious. The published arithmetic suggests that TWBC needs to build 66 houses by 2013. The reality is that TWBC does not need to build any, because windfalls will cause it to exceed the target figure. That figure itself was forced up, despite environmental arguments that it is too high.	Not 66, but a zero (or negative) figure of housing requirements by 2013, is appropriate in the light of inevitable windfalls.	Comment noted. The SHLAA is not a one off exercise and its updating is an integral part of the AMR exercise. Therefore, the Council will need to update housing figures regularly.	No Change
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA115	Disagree	We think that the base date should be March 2008, not March 2007 (para 4.11); as the end of March 2008 is so close, it seems unnecessary to work on figures that are a year out of date.  With regard to para 4.12 we think it right that Tables 3 and 4 do NOT include an allowance for windfalls.  The subject of windfalls is referred to later (SEE: Questions 4, 7, 14)  We feel strongly that any residential institution (class C2) - e.g. retirement homes - should also be included in the supply of deliverable sites.	Base date should be March 2008  Residential institutions should be included  [by TWBC]	Comment noted. Once monitoring information is collected for the period 1 April 2007 to 31 March 2008 it may transpire that the Council can demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable sites from a base date of 1 April 2008  SHLAA will consider uses other than dwelling houses	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA119	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning Associates	SHLAA32	Disagree	<p>In the context of PPS3, it is important that assessments of 5 year land supply concentrate on deliverability. Sites that may be allocated for development, and even sites that have planning permission, will not necessarily be commenced or built out within any given 5 year period.</p> <p>In terms of sites with planning permission, housing land assessments have in many cases traditionally allowed a 10% discount for non-implementation, even when considering delivery over the whole of a plan period. When considering delivery over a very short period such as 5 years, there is of course an even greater likelihood that not every unit will consent will actually be built and delivered on the ground in that period.</p> <p>Sites which have no planning permission take even longer to come through the system. It can typically take around 3 years even for a medium sized scheme to move through the planning process, with very indicatively around a year for scheme design and preliminary consultation, around 6-12 months for the formal planning process, and around 12 months for the discharge of conditions. It may also be necessary on larger schemes to add a year for Reserved Matters approval. Procurement and commencement of works can equally take 6-12 months, which means that although it may well be possible to commence a scheme within a 5 year period, for schemes of any substantive size it can be very difficult to move from a period of no permission to delivery of finished houses within 5 years.</p> <p>It cannot therefore be assumed that every allocated unit and every unit with consent will in fact be delivered in any given 5 year period.</p>	<p>Methodology appears too simplistic in its assumptions regarding delivery of permitted and allocated sites. A more transparent and detailed analysis of individual sites is required, from which a realistic and deliverable 5 year + trajectory can be developed.</p> <p>Larger schemes take up to 5 years to be developed [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Landowners/Developers/Agents will be contacted to establish likely timeframe when site will be available, if not already known and the time to develop these. Methodology will be altered to reflect this.</p> <p>As set out in Chapter 3 of the Draft SHLAA Methodology, an indicative housing trajectory of sites over the period to 2026 will be produced.</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>We would suggest that perhaps a more rigorous and transparent methodology would be to produce a trajectory for all of the main sites, based upon the Council's up to date knowledge of that scheme and its current position in the planning/construction cycle. Such a schedule would not need to be too specific as to start dates and completion rates, but at least provide an anticipated year for when commencement of development is expected and the annual build rate for the site. The Council would be able to use its own discretion to correct any overly optimistic assessments by the site owners, based on its own experience of the actual length of time it has taken to build out similar schemes in the past.</p> <p>By breaking the assessment down to the individual sites, the Council will be able to apply a much more critical eye to the actual likely rate of delivery, and will be able to defend its position by reference to specific examples. Assuming however that all available sites come forward without any critical analysis of the actual circumstances of those sites will leave the Council open to objections that its delivery forecasts are not realistic and are overly simplistic.</p> <p>A further advantage of a more detailed breakdown of delivery on a site by site basis is that this data can then form the basis for the start of the Council's Housing Trajectory, to which future proposed allocations can be added. It will therefore form an important part of the LDF evidence base as well as providing the requisite information to 'deal' with applications in the interim period up to adoption of the Site Allocations DPD.</p>			
3570	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Consultants Ltd	SHLAA4	Disagree	<p>The estimation on completions on allocated sites is not reliable. Many of these allocation could be challenged during the LDF process and could be removed or delayed beyond the 5 year period. TWBC need a new land availability study different from the urban capacity study carried out under the old PPG3 process.</p>	Estimation on completions from allocated sites unreliable.	Comment noted. Existing undeveloped allocations will be considered as part of the SHLAA.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
70323	Ms Annabel McKie	Southern Housing Group	SHLAA14	Agree	Broadly agree with the exception of the proposed approach to the proportion of planning consents that will not be implemented. We would like further consideration to be given to making an allowance for a proportion of consents not being implemented, based on the historic data available.	Would like further consideration of allowance for proportion of consents not being implemented [By TWBC].	Support noted. Any lapsed permissions will be excluded from the calculation of the supply of deliverable sites. These will reflect the actual level of lapsed applications for a specified period	Change
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA172	Agree	Yes this seems a reasonable approach, but it would seem appropriate for the SHLAA to look beyond just the 5 year period and look at the whole of the plan period upto 2026. Some indication of quantities of housing that may be required beyond 2013 should be provided and broad locations identified rather than relying on just windfall sites.	The SHLAA should look beyond the 5 year period	Support noted. The SHLAA output will include an indicative housing trajectory of sites over the period to 2026.  The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA90	Agree	Agree with principles but would want to see demonstration that the deliverability of the outstanding permissions has been critically assessed.	Need robust evidence to calculate deliverability of outstanding planning permissions	Support noted. Any lapsed permissions will be excluded from the calculation of the supply of deliverable sites. These will reflect the actual level of lapsed applications for a specified period	Change
<b>Question 3</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA77	Agree	The list of areas is generally agreed as being appropriate.		Support noted.	No Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA51	Disagree	The proposal to automatically exclude land which falls within these categories from the Assessment is too prescriptive. Kilmartin agrees with the Council that the Assessment should be iterative.  There may be merit in certain cases in building on	Should not automatically exclude land - for example loss of such land may be marginal or could be mitigated as part of development proposals	Comment noted. Any land put forward as potential development sites containing land that would be excluded from the assessment will be considered - the level of	No Change.

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>land in these categories where there is a balance of advantage in doing so, if for example the quality and size of a local nature reserve is of marginal value and if its loss can be mitigated as part of the development proposals. There may be similar considerations in relation to flood mitigation elsewhere.</p> <p>If it is assumed, as did the RSS Panel in recommending the need for a Green Belt review that it was unlikely that the Borough could satisfy housing land needs within the existing built up area, then it would be prudent to consider land that might be deemed subject to these constraints at Stage 7a, assessing suitability for development.</p> <p>There is also an issue of boundary assessment that needs to be considered. For example there may be potential housing land that encompasses a local nature reserve within it, but the site size is sufficient that development might reasonably take place on part of the site without materially harming the reserve, whilst other land, perhaps contiguous with a reserve, might prove harmful to develop, but would, under the Council's criteria be considered appropriate to develop. For this reason this stage should be removed and considered later within current Stage 7a.</p>	[By TWBC]	constraints will be assessed in Stages 6 and 7	
24838	Mr H Moore	Highways Agency	SHLAA47	Agree	The Agency does not wish to suggest that any specific types of land should be excluded from consideration. However, we do recommend that sites should be looked upon more favourably where they are sustainably located in terms of transport infrastructure. The Agency also advocates the re-development of existing brownfield sites where transport infrastructure is already likely to exist and minimal disruption is caused to the highway network.	Sustainable sites, incl PDL, in terms of transport infrastructure should be considered favourably [By TWBC]	Support noted. Stages 6 and 7 will include a consideration of infrastructure.  Will add transport infrastructure to list of criteria to consider.	Change
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA21	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House	SHLAA144	Agree	We would want to add to be excluded:	Other types of land use recommended for	Support noted. Stages 6 and 7 ensure that all SHLAA Practice	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
		Neighbours Association			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic Parks and Gardens,</li> <li>- Arcadian Areas,</li> <li>- Common Land,</li> <li>- Village Greens,</li> <li>- Areas of Important Open Space,</li> <li>- Areas of Landscape Importance,</li> </ul> <p>especially in view of para 4.45 - "PPG17 Sport, Recreation and Open Space Study 2007 established that there is not a surplus of open space".</p> <p>Considering para 4.94 "whilst increasing the density of development will tend to support higher land values, there is a point at which higher densities may become uneconomic if issues of 'cramming' reduce sales values."</p> <p>in the RTW town centre any splitting of family houses into flats should be avoided.</p>	<p>exclusion</p> <p>At some point, higher densities will become unviable [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Guidance makes it clear that scope of Assessment shouldn't be narrowed down except where designations more clear-cut.</p> <p>Stages 6 and 7 ensure that all constraints affecting a site will be considered, including the impact of development upon the character of an area</p>	
25587	Mr Brian Lloyd	Campaign to Protect Rural England	SHLAA66	Disagree	<p>Table 5 proposes that in assessing sites in the planning process the Council will assess sites with planning permission for housing, retail and employment (or a combination of these). This seems to go further than suggested in the Practice Guide, which only refers to permissions for housing development. We would question the need to vary the approach from that in the Practice Guidance. The first bullet point would seem to adequately pick-up the relevant sites that are currently allocated or permitted for other uses.</p>	<p>Concern over including non housing sites within the planning process [by TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. It is necessary to consider as many sites as possible that are currently within the planning process</p>	No Change
25587	Mr Brian Lloyd	Campaign to Protect Rural England	SHLAA67	Disagree	<p>Whilst noting that Figure 4 of the Practice Guidance includes rural exception sites as a source for potential housing, there is a real difficulty for the Council in trying to identify them in the SHLAA, and the Practice Guidance gives no advice on how to do this.</p> <p>By their very definition, being sites that "would not normally be used for housing because, for example, they are subject to policies of restraint" (paragraph 30 of PPS3), they are sites that cannot be easily identified. Firstly, they are usually only identified</p>	<p>Sites identified for Rural Exception Sites should not be used for market housing</p> <p>Site threshold should be lower for rural exceptions sites as sites are often smaller [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Sites located outside and adjacent to the LBD of a village will only be regarded as being potentially suitable for rural exceptions housing</p> <p>The Draft SHLAA methodology stated that the approach to rural exceptions site would be to identify sites that are capable of accommodating 1 or more</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>when there is a specific local need to do so, for example as identified through a parish plan. Secondly, what frequently determines their identification is a willing landowner who is prepared to make land available at below market cost for the benefit of the local community. Thirdly, the identification of such sites will inevitably mean that the Council will have to make judgements about the relative importance of a range of constraints in deciding which sites would be acceptable as an exception to normal policy. If, through the SHLAA the Council seeks to identify rural exception sites without the evidence of local need, there will be a real danger that a) the wrong message will be given to the landowner and housing developers that, in fact, the site is available for general market housing, and b) the Council's ability to actually deliver affordable housing in the villages will be undermined by the potentially raised expectations for these sites.</p> <p>Therefore, if the Council nevertheless considered that it had to seek to identify exception sites, it would need to be clearly explained in the methodology what the criteria were for looking for these sites. One of these, for example, should be the size of the site as rural exception sites are usually very small accommodating as few as 3 or 4 dwellings. It is relatively unusual for a rural exception site to include more than 6 dwellings. Furthermore, if sites were included in the final SHLAA it would need to be made quite clear that these were not sites where there was any hope for general market housing and they must be clearly distinguished from other potential housing sites identified.</p>		housing units. However, other references to this exception to the 0.2ha site size threshold will be made within the methodology.	
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA116	Agree	<p>We agree that it is right to exclude the types of land in Table 7.</p> <p>Other potential candidates for exclusion from the assessment in Table 7 are:</p> <p>Historic Parks and Gardens; defined Arcadian Areas; Common Land;</p>	<p>Additional types of land recommended for exclusion from the Assessment</p> <p>In RTW conversion of houses should be avoided [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Support noted. SHLAA Practice Guidance makes it clear that scope of Assessment shouldn't be narrowed down except where designations more clear-cut.</p> <p>Stages 6 and 7 ensure that all</p>	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					as well, Areas of Important Open Space, Areas of Landscape Importance, subject to revision, as para 4.45 states 'there is not a surplus of open space';  also, in the RTW town centre any splitting of family houses into flats should be avoided.		constraints affecting a site will be considered, including the impact of development upon the character of an area	
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA120	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
3570	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Consultants Ltd	SHLAA5	Disagree	The consideration of employment land should only be considered if it does not meet an employment need for the Borough over the plan period ie 2026. SE plan requires the council to assess its green belt, this should be included in the criteria.	Consider employment need over period and green belt suitability for housing.court	Comment noted. Sites used for alternative purposes would be considered under stage 7b availability of development and also under stage 7c achievability of development.	No Change
3570	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Consultants Ltd	SHLAA6	Disagree	The consideration of employment land should only be considered if it does not meet an employment need for the Borough over the plan period ie 2026. SE plan requires the council to assess its green belt, this should be included in the criteria.	Consider employment need over period and green belt suitability for housing.	Comment noted. Sites used for alternative purposes would be considered under stage 7b availability of development and also under stage 7c achievability of development  Sites within the Green Belt are not to be excluded from the SHLAA process	No Change
55897	Mr Sean Hanna	Natural England	SHLAA42	Agree	Natural England agrees with the exclusion of Sites of Special Scientific Interest, areas of ancient woodland and Local Nature Reserves from the assessment. Natural England also recommends that other biodiversity designations such as Local Wildlife Sites (formerly known as Sites of Nature Conservation Interest) and biodiversity action plan priority habitats and species along with protected species are fully considered in the assessment process.	Other biodiversity designations should be fully considered in the assessment [by TWBC]	Support noted. Within Stage 7a, there is already suitability criteria relating to consider those sites mentioned by Natural England.	No Change
70323	Ms Annabel McKie	Southern Housing Group	SHLAA12	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA173	Agree	This seems a reasonable approach, however important constraints like Green Belt and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty will need to be taken	Other constraints will need to be taken into account.	Support noted. All relevant site constraints are included within Stages 3, 5, 6 and 7.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					into consideration during the process and although not ruled out in the initial stages of the assessment care should be taken to avoid and minimise impact on these areas.			
74446	Benenden Hospital Trust	Benenden Hospital Trust	SHLAA52	Agree	The types of land to be excluded from the Assessment should be strictly limited. On this basis, we agree with the categories set out in Table 7 but would not wish to see this widely expanded from this list.	Agree, on the basis that the types of land to be excluded should be strictly limited [By TWBC]	Support noted.	No Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA91	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
<b>Question 4</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA78		As noted in our response to question 1, it is submitted that there is no justification to seek to make any allowance for windfalls within the first 10 years of the LDF period.  The list of potential windfall sources set out in Table 8 seems a reasonable assessment to be used after year 10.	No justification to make windfall allowance within first 10 years [by TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA104	Disagree	The land uses referred to in Table 8 constitute existing residential land below the threshold that should be included in the SHLAA. They are in effect windfalls.  Empty homes and flats above shops are existing housing stock. They do not constitute net new additions.  Accordingly, they should not be included in the analysis.	Land uses in table 8 are windfalls [By TWBC]	Comment noted. The draft SHLAA methodology recognises that land uses in table 8 are windfalls	No Change
24920	Mr P Errington	Home Builders Federation	SHLAA163	Disagree	Windfall Supply  Again, as stated at our meeting, HBF's view on windfalls is as set out in PPS3 which makes it	Council should not count windfalls in early years.  Don't rule out sites if don't	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>absolutely clear that these should not be counted in the early years of supply. As is clear from the recent SEERA planning committee report on the matter (copy attached for your information), windfalls should be the last port of call for development opportunity.</p> <p>The council should not be starting from the presumption that a windfall allowance will be included in the assessment. The council should carry out the assessment as per the CLG guidance and then consider the issue of windfalls right at the end of the process after it has identified all possible development opportunities. Even then, it will need to be demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances which have prevented the identification of sites. Paragraph 59 of PPS3 is absolutely clear in this regard and this is followed through in the CLG guidance.</p> <p>Stage 4 – Settlement Hierarchy</p> <p>HBF does not object to the principle of the council having such a hierarchy provided that it does not affect the SHLAA process and that all sites are assessed equally. The settlement hierarchy is a policy-based hierarchy and the SHLAA process is supposed to inform future decisions about whether or not there may be a need to review existing policies in order to ensure that the housing requirements will be met. Therefore, sites should not be ruled out early in the process merely because they do not conform to this pre-determined hierarchy. The determination of which sites may or may not be allocated through a future DPD are policy decisions and not technical assessments which should influence the scoring or weighting in a SHLAA; certainly not in the early stages. Again, this concern may be overcome by a commitment to fully assess every site likely to be put forward by developers in the coming years. Clearly the council will have a good idea of which those sites are from future local plan inquiries, informal discussions with</p>	<p>conform to settlement hierarchy. Which sites may or may not be allocated should be through a future DPD are policy decisions</p>	<p>allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.</p> <p>The SHLAA is not a policy document nor an Allocations document. Any decision about which sites to allocate will be made (in) a Development Plan Document(s)</p>	

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					developers and other consultation processes.			
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA22	Agree	Agree subject to comments at stage 4		Support noted.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA145	Disagree	<p>To avoid uncertainty for communities, developers and planners we think that all types of land should be properly and proactively considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>'Empty Homes' are known, so they CANNOT be considered 'windfall' but should be part of a strategic assessment.</p> <p>The present situation as described in the LDF Core Strategy – Preferred Options para 3.3 and 7.9 CANNOT continue. We oppose the quasi 'happiness' with the present windfall supply for the majority of housing.</p> <p>REFERENCE: Core Strategy – Preferred Options (Dec 2007/Jan 2008)</p> <p>Main Urban Area</p> <p>"3.3 Many of the housing allocations identified in the existing Local Plan (2006) have been, or are in the process of being, developed. Windfall sites, which are sites not identified in the Local Plan, have also contributed significantly to housing delivery. However, concerns were raised through the Core Strategy: Issues &amp; Options Report (March 2007) consultation</p> <p>about the cumulative impact of windfall sites on community infrastructure and the character of areas."</p> <p>"7.9 Historically (over the period 2001-2007), some 74% of the Borough's new housing has been built at Royal Tunbridge Wells/Southborough. The majority has been on unidentified previously developed land and through maximising potential of allocated</p>	<p>All types of land should be included in the assessment to avoid uncertainty.</p> <p>Reliance on windfalls could impact up economic strength and diversity of RTW/Southborough - implications for its role as a "Regional Hub" [by TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.</p> <p>The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.</p>	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					brownfield sites. Change of use, or redevelopment, of commercial premises in Royal Tunbridge Wells/Southborough have accounted for the largest proportion of new dwellings compared with other sources. This may imply a loss, or at least displacement, of commercial activity to locations outside the town and possibly the Borough. The impact of this trend on the diversity and strength of the economic base of the town needs to be carefully considered and redressed, particularly in the light of the role of Royal Tunbridge Wells/Southborough as a Regional Hub."			
25587	Mr Brian Lloyd	Campaign to Protect Rural England	SHLAA68	Agree	We applaud the Council for stating 'up front' its intention to include a windfall supply in its LDF. However, we fear that this will be dismissed by the Government Office as being contrary to PPS3 and the SHLAA Practice Guidance. It would seem from the Practice Guidance that the Council can only turn to windfalls after it has identified all potential sites and 'broad locations'. In our view, therefore, the Council must take a precautionary approach in the SHLAA and seek to identify as many sites as possible within the defined built areas. This will mean that the threshold for site identification must be lower than the 0.2ha currently proposed, and we would suggest that there is no formal site size threshold for within the built areas. It is not uncommon in urban areas for sites to be developed at high densities – often well in excess of 50 dwellings per hectare (dph). Even at a relatively modest density of 50 dph a 0.2ha site will yield 10 dwellings. We appreciate the resource implications of searching for these small site opportunities, but in an area where historically a significant proportion of housing has come via windfalls, it is imperative that the Council seeks to ensure that these opportunities, which will continue to come forward anyway, count towards meeting the housing target. Outside of the defined limits to built development, however, we consider that the proposed 0.2ha size threshold is appropriate.	<p>Council should take precautionary approach to windfalls and seek to identify as many sites as possible within defined built up area.</p> <p>Site threshold must be lower than 0.2ha within limits to built development.</p> <p>Outside limits to built development, site threshold of 0.2ha is appropriate [by TWBC]</p>	<p>Support noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance. The SHLAA will seek to identify all sites with housing potential both within and outside settlements.</p> <p>Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
25772	Mr P Allen	Weald of Kent Protection Society	SHLAA2	Disagree	Realistically, govt is unlikely to accept a TWBC that windfalls should be counted (no matter how unfair this is). So TWBC should beware of designating substantial PDL sources as "windfalls". Several categories above come into this category, certainly including sites below 0.2 hectares. There should be a thorough TWBC examination of such sites.	There are good reasons for NOT designating as "windfalls" certain sources of PDL housing-supply	Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.	No Change
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA118	Disagree	<p>As stated in the RTW Town Forum's response to the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report,</p> <p>- Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy Reasoned Justification (e) The Nature of Development Opportunities (p. 17/18 – para 6.24 - 6.26)</p> <p>- Core Policy 7 – Housing Provision (p. 33 – p.36 and para 7.45 - 7.61)</p> <p>we are against a laissez-faire approach to windfall sites for the good reasons of uncertainty for communities, developers and planners alike, touched upon in Government advice.</p> <p>We think that all types of land should be properly and proactively considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>SEE: RTW Town Forum – submission 11 January 2008:</p> <p>Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy Reasoned Justification (e) The Nature of Development Opportunities (p. 17/18 – para 6.24 - 6.26):</p> <p>We are concerned at the high incidence of 'garden grabbing' in Royal Tunbridge Wells and the lack of opportunity for affordable housing that results from this 'windfall' approach to planning. Para 6.25 seems to accept that "the historical trend is likely to continue".</p>	Against a laissez-faire approach to windfall sites. Should seek to control trend of garden grabbing. Favour a more proactive strategy [by TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA is not a policy document. A more proactive strategy may be pursued through the Core Strategy and/or subsequent Development Plan Documents/Supplementary Plan Documents.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>We feel that the strategy should seek to control that trend to a greater extent, respecting gardens in settled areas and identifying sites where affordable housing is possible .</p> <p>We should like to see these three paragraphs either removed altogether, or considerable revised to provide a more proactive approach.</p> <p>Core Policy 7 Housing Provision (p. 33 – p.36 and para 7.45 - 7.61): We note, too, government advice that “the disadvantage of a windfall allowance is that, because it is not clear exactly where development is likely to occur, there is little certainty for communities or developers”.</p> <p>The government advice (DCLG July 2007) goes on to make the point that “generalised windfall estimates make it more difficult to plan, e.g. in terms of making sure the necessary infrastructure is in place.”</p> <p>For all these reasons, and those in our comments on para 6.25 (p. 18), we favour a more proactive strategy, rather than a laissez-faire windfall one that waits for something to turn up – quite possibly of the wrong sort and in the wrong place.</p>			
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA121	Agree	Add vacant non-residential where appropriate.	Add vacant non-residential where appropriate [by TWBC]	Support noted. Sites under 0.2ha, which may include vacant non-residential sites, will constitute windfalls. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning Associates	SHLAA33	Disagree	<p>As examined further in our response to Question 14, we do not consider that there are sufficiently special circumstances to warrant an allowance for windfalls in the case of Tunbridge Wells District.</p> <p>In terms of the specific categories identified above, we would comment as follows:</p> <p>Empty Homes - the requirement under the South East Plan is to achieve a net increase in the overall housing stock. The requirement for additional homes is above and beyond the existing net housing stock, irrespective of the degree of occupation of the existing stock. Whilst the SHLAA methodology notes the Empty Homes Register as a source of information, it do so in the context of findings sites for redevelopment, as opposed to re-use of empty properties per se. Where such sites exist and can be identified, the SHLAA should do so, and there is therefore no necessity or justification for including a windfall allowance for re-use or redevelopment of empty homes.</p> <p>Residential curtilages/flats above shops/sites below 2ha - every district will have a small increase in dwellings from these sources, and Tunbridge Wells is no different to any other district in terms of the potential for some limited increase from such sources. There are no particular circumstances within Tunbridge Wells that justify an exception to the PPS3 'ten year rule' for windfalls for such sites. It may be that supply within any given 10 year period may be slightly higher than predicted because of the supply from such sites, but that in itself doe snot justify an exception to PPS3, which is seeking to achieve greater certainty of supply rather than reliance on unidentified sources.</p> <p>Sites 'outside of our strategy' - Similar considerations apply to sites from this category - the number of units derived will be immaterial to the overall 10 year supply, and reliance on windfall from this source</p>	<p>We do not agree with a windfall allowance for Tunbridge Wells, or that any special case has been established as to why the '10 year rule' in PPS3 should be set aside for Tunbridge Wells. In respect of the individual categories mentioned, none of these would justify a different approach in Tunbridge Wells compared to other areas, and none individually justify an exception to PPS3 [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.</p> <p>Sites that come forward as windfalls will be capable of being counted within any housing once they have planning permission and factoring in any lapse rate</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					would clearly be inconsistent with the requirement in PPS3 to avoid windfalls in the 10 year supply, to increase certainty. Tunbridge Wells is not unique in terms of having a small number of units that may come forward from agricultural conversions and similar 'exceptions'. Bearing in mind also that by definition, the presumption would be that sites 'outside the strategy' would generally be resisted rather than promoted by the Council, the starting point would be an expectation of 0 for this category.			
3570	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Consultants Ltd	SHLAA10	Disagree	<p>PPs 3 states clearly that Local Authorities should not include windfall sites in their 5 year assessment onland availability.</p> <p>This is a form of double counting as many of these types of land may already have planning consent. In any event the numbers put into the SE PLAN is a minimum or guide not a restrictive total.</p>	<p>Don't include windfalls in 5 year assessment</p> <p>Numbers in SE Plan are a minimum [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.</p> <p>According to policy H1 of the Draft South East Plan, "local authorities should make the following provision in their Local Development Documents 5,000 dwellings between 2006-2026" (subsequently increased to 6,000 dwellings). Policy H1 also states "Local authorities should adopt a Plan, Monitor, Manage approach to housing provision, with appropriate phasing policies in Local Development Documents and taking account of any phasing and provisos set out in the sub-regional strategies/policies". The Council</p>	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
							will have regard to any changes to policies in the adopted South East, once published.	
70323	Ms Annabel McKie	Southern Housing Group	SHLAA13	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA174	Agree	Yes although perhaps underused public open space and allotments areas could also be included.	Include underused public open space and allotment areas.	Support noted. These areas will be considered within Stages 6 and 7	No Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA92	Agree				Support noted
<b>Question 5</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA79	Disagree	<p>The proposed list of sources is considered comprehensive in general terms.</p> <p>However, many of the elements in the list relate back to existing local plan sites, sites currently in or allocated for employment uses or other existing commitments.</p> <p>Where the Council seeks to rely or allocate such sites within the LDF it is respectfully submitted that careful consideration must be given to deliverability. That is, if the site has been allocated previously but not come forward what is the reason for that, will it deliver now? Similarly, if a site is in employment use, is there an existing tenant and if so how long is the remaining lease, will the site be available within the period expected?</p>	Comprehensive list. Need to consider deliverability of local plan sites and sites currently in or allocated for employment uses or other existing commitments [by TWBC]	Comment noted. The Council will consider deliverability of such sites based on the criteria, including availability criteria, in the SHLAA methodology.	No Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA105	Disagree	It would appear that the Annual Monitoring Report is absent from the Council's list. This should be expressly included to assist in monitoring supply.	Annual Monitoring Report should be expressly included to assist in monitoring supply [By TWBC]	Information in the Annual Monitoring Report draws on various sources, rather than being a source of information to identify sites per se. However, the updating of the SHLAA will be an integral part of the AMR exercise as recognised in Chapter 6 Monitoring	No Change
24757	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson	SHLAA59	Disagree	It is suggested that the addition to Table 5 above, should also be reflected in Stage 3, Table 9 as follows (additions in underline) [additions in upper	Explicitly refer to Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan 2006 Rural	Comment noted. Will add reference to Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan 2006	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
	Homes	Homes			<p>case - TWBC]:</p> <p>Table 9: Sources of information to help identify sites</p> <p>Source: Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan 2006 Housing Allocations Purpose: To identify Sites</p> <p>Source: Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan 2006 Employment Allocations Purpose: To identify Sites</p> <p>Source: TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2006 RURAL FRINGE ALLOCATIONS Purpose: TO IDENTIFY SITES</p> <p>Source: Tunbridge Wells Borough Local Plan 2006 Other Allocations Purpose: To identify Sites</p>	Fringe Allocations [By TWBC]	designations	
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA146	Agree	<p>However, we think that Local Plan Policies, which were not materialised before their expiration, should not form a base for the LDF.</p> <p>Other sources to identify sites: - Recreation and Open Space Study (2006) - a further source in its unabridged version could complement "PPG17 – Sports Recreation and Open Space Study 2007". It was regretted that we had been refused at the time to view this document , the Recreation and Open Space Study 2006, which was quoted as Research and Guidance Material to the Community Plan Draft 2006. - TWBC Housing Strategy - Conservation Area Appraisals</p>	<p>Local Plan policies, which hadn't materialised before expiration should not form a base for the LDF</p> <p>Other sources to identify sites should be included - PPG17 Sport, Recreation and Open Space Study 2006; Conservation Area Appraisals and TWBC Housing Strategy [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Support noted. Local Plan policies are automatically saved until March 2009. Existing undeveloped allocations will be considered as part of the SHLAA.</p> <p>PPG17 Sport, Recreation and Open Space Study 2007 already included.</p> <p>Conservation Area Appraisals will be added. Housing Strategy wouldn't help to identify sites/constraints, but will be considered in terms of wider objectives</p>	Partial Change
25587	Mr Brian Lloyd	Campaign to Protect Rural England	SHLAA69	Agree	<p>Table 9 seems to present a comprehensive list of sources of information. An important source would be the landholdings of Registered Social Landlords (RSLs), which should be specifically included under 'other key land holdings'. In particular, RSLs hold a valuable potential supply of small sites, for example</p>	<p>Add landholdings of Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) to table [by TWBC]</p>	<p>Support noted. Will add to "Other key land holdings" category</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					garage courts, and these need to be fully explored.			
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA123	Agree	<p>However, we think that Local Plan Policies that are set to expire soon and be replaced with the LDF should be viewed with extreme caution, together with the June 2001 Urban Capacity Study.</p> <p>We would like the RTW Town Forum's 'Position Statement on Planning' June 2007 added to the sources and would draw attention to the 'Areas of Opportunity', a preliminary map (page 7).</p> <p><a href="http://www.townforum.org.uk/planning/tf_positionstatement_planning_june2007.pdf">www.townforum.org.uk/planning/tf_positionstatement_planning_june2007.pdf</a></p>	<p>Local Plan policies are set to expire soon and be replaced by the LDF. Caution about Urban Capacity Study.</p> <p>Include Forum's 'Position Statement on Planning' June 2007 as a source</p> <p><a href="http://www.townforum.org.uk/planning/tf_positionstatement_planning_june2007.pdf">www.townforum.org.uk/planning/tf_positionstatement_planning_june2007.pdf</a> [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Support noted. Policies in the Local Plan are automatically saved until March 2009 and the Council will seek to save some of these policies beyond that date.</p> <p>Will add reference to the source of information suggested.</p>	Change
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA122	Agree				Support noted
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning Associates	SHLAA34	Disagree	<p>Although we appreciate that landowner/developer representations is mentioned elsewhere in the text, it would be helpful for the sake of completeness to include this item within the list of sources of information i.e. a specific entry for Sites put forward by landowners/developers for consideration as part of this process and as part of previous rounds of consultation on the LDF.</p>	<p>Add sites put forward by landowners/developers for consideration [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. The table showing sources of information to help identify sites already refers to representations made through Local Plan and Issues and Options and Preferred Options stage. However, a further reference will be made to sites put forward by landowners/developers/agents</p>	Change
55897	Mr Sean Hanna	Natural England	SHLAA43	Agree	<p>Natural England welcomes the use of the Ancient Woodland Inventory and the Kent Habitat Survey of 2003. Details of the Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) within the Borough can be found online at <a href="http://www.magic.gov.uk">www.magic.gov.uk</a> or <a href="http://www.natureonthemap.org.uk">www.natureonthemap.org.uk</a>. In addition, the Kent and Medway Biological Records Centre would be able to supply information relating to protected and biodiversity action plan priority species within the Borough.</p>	<p>Details of SSSIs can be found via websites. Kent and Medway Biological Records Centre can supply information about protected and BAP priority species within the Borough [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Support noted and will draw on information if required</p>	No Change
70323	Ms Annabel McKie	Southern Housing Group	SHLAA15	Agree			Support noted.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA175	Agree	<p>The following sources of information should also be accessed:</p> <p>Tunbridge Wells BC Local Air Quality Management Review and Assessment documents - To identify areas of existing poor air quality</p> <p>Environment Agency Flood Risk maps - To identify areas vulnerable to flooding</p> <p>Kent and Medway Biological Records Centre - Biological Records - To identify constraints on the site and in the surrounding area. Lack of records only indicate a lack of recording within the area it does not mean species are not present.</p> <p>A Living Landscape for Kent <a href="http://www.kentwildlifetrust.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=119&amp;Itemid=238">www.kentwildlifetrust.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&amp;task=view&amp;id=119&amp;Itemid=238</a> - To identify constraints - ensuring that the ecological network is not impacted</p> <p>Biodiversity Requires Adaptation in NW Europe under a Changing Climate (BRANCH) Project <a href="http://www.branchproject.org/">www.branchproject.org/</a> - To identify constraints and opportunities - ensuring that current ecological network are not impacted and further connectivity is designed and implemented.</p>	Suggested other sources of information to identify sites	Support noted. The suggested sources are included within the desktop suitability criteria	No Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA93	Agree	Should also give consideration to sites the subject of pre-application queries or discussion.	Include sites that have had pre-application queries [by TWBC]	Support noted. Sites that have been subject to pre-application discussions will be included within the Assessment	Change
<b>Question 6</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA80	Disagree	The criteria set out are generally appropriate in principle. However, it is submitted that certain elements should be weighted more heavily than others. For example where a site is physically constrained by the flood plain this may be seen as a much more serious constraint than for example a local (non statutory) landscape designation. That is, physical site issues may be considered more of an obstacle to overcome than planning designations	<p>Suitability criteria should be weighed</p> <p>Sites should not be considered in isolation from surrounding development/planned redevelopment</p>	<p>Comment noted. Each site will be considered on its own merits, including information gained from a site visit. This is necessary to ensure that a robust analytical consideration is made of each site.</p> <p>Within Stage 6 consideration</p>	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>and therefore more of a hindrance to eventual deliverability.</p> <p>We submit it would be inequitable to consider all constraints to be of equal importance.</p> <p>We also submit that one additional criterion should be added to the proposed list.</p> <p>Account should be taken of whether a site would simply stand alone or whether there would be any advantageous links with existing sites or planned redevelopment opportunities nearby with the effect that the development of the proposed site would be beneficial in the wider context.</p> <p>For example, we are aware of the comprehensive re-development proposals for the Pembury Hospital site as set out in the draft development brief. The re-development and expansion of the hospital will give rise to a significant need for more affordable local housing for the high numbers of staff that will work at the site.</p> <p>Development of our clients land at Pembury (as shown on the attached plan) would greatly assist in meeting this need and minimise the need for staff to travel longer distances. This is a good example of why in addition to the existing proposed criteria the sites context and its linkage with planned development in a particular area should be considered as part of the site assessment. Weight given to proposals that do have such an additional dimension and are not simply a stand alone proposal with little or no added benefit.</p>	[by TWBC]	will be given to any existing/proposed development within the surrounding area.	
117374	Mr Asher Ross	Indigo Planning	SHLAA158	Disagree	<p>This approach to identifying constraints is extremely simplistic and would not take into account opportunities to overcome these, such as enhancements to landscape or provision of new schools. In addition, we would question whether officers are able to determine the amount of housing to be provided on a site as there is significant</p>	<p>Approach to identifying constraints is simplistic and would not take into account opportunities to overcome these. Question whether officers are able to determine the amount</p>	<p>Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed</p> <p>Initial assessment of site</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					evidence that officers underestimate the amount of housing that would be delivered on a site and err on the side of caution. The strategy should be to identify the sites and advise on the constraints rather than limit the area of development.	of housing to be provided on a site as evidence that Officers underestimate amount of housing that would be delivered [By TWBC]	potential likely to be made by Officers although this could include drawing on information already submitted by developers, etc. Intention is also to use expertise of development industry to ascertain development potential.	
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA106	Disagree	<p>As previous advised, there needs to be an overall review of potential Green Belt land at the outset, as recommended by the RSS Panel.</p> <p>Constraints may then need to be added on a conventional seive analysis to assess the housing land availability within the Assessment Area.</p> <p>In relation to redundant school sites, presumably these will be considered against the needs for new school sites and the possibility of recycling land for this purpose.</p>	<p>Needs to be overall review of potential Green Belt land at the outset.</p> <p>Presumably redundant school sites will be considered against needs for new school sites [by TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Sites within the Green belt are not to be excluded from the SHLAA process. Review of Green Belt. Sites within the Green belt are not to be excluded from the SHLAA process. The SHLAA is not a policy document. Any revision to the Green Belt boundaries would have to be done through a Development Plan Document.</p> <p>Redundant school sites would be considered against the need for new school sites.</p>	No Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA107	Disagree	<p>Land previously removed from the Green Belt and designated Rural Fringe should be regarded as being potentially suitable for development, taken together with other material considerations. The weightings to be applied to the criteria that the Council eventually decides to adopt need careful evaluation. It is not clear that there should be an absolute set of weightings as these should reflect the characteristics of particular sites.</p> <p>Walking or time distance from existing social infrastructure should not be regarded as a good indicator. This is because new development may be accompanied by new social infrastructure which might mitigate/ overcome any shortfalls. This could make sites sustainable that at present may appear deficient. This would be an appropriate approach</p>	<p>Designated rural fringe should be regarded as being potentially suitable for development. Not clear that there should be weightings as these should reflect characteristics of particular sites</p> <p>Walking or time distance from existing social infrastructure not good indicator. New development may be accompanied by new social infrastructure which</p>	<p>Comment noted. Rural Fringe will still be assessed in terms of its suitability.</p> <p>Characteristics of sites will be considered as set out in the SHLAA methodology. It is still appropriate to assess accessibility to social infrastructure as this is a key objective in government guidance, the emerging RSS and other plans, programmes and strategies. Overcoming constraints, such as new infrastructure are to be considered as part of stage 7d</p>	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					under Circular 05/2005.	might mitigate/ overcome any shortfalls [by TWBC].	as set out in the SHLAA methodology.	
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA170					N/A
129772	Councillor F Williams		SHLAA73	Disagree	<p>1. Re: sites within 30 minutes' public transport time of GP Surgery.</p> <p>If, as in Sherwood, the local GPs' list are full so they are not taking new patients, then the stated criteria is not useful to help ensure new residents have access to a GP's services. Therefore the criterion should be allowed to reflect</p> <p>(a) whether vacancies exist and if not then (b) whether the local Health Trust agrees to construct new facilities</p> <p>2. The same criticism applies to the schooling criteria, both primary and secondary.</p> <p>3. There is no reference to the easy availability or access to a Church. Given the pace of life in this area now, and the very real support delivered by Churches in this Borough, then the absence of reference to Church provision seems an oversight.</p>	<p>Local GPs lists may be full such as in Sherwood so criterion should be allowed to reflect; (a) whether vacancies exist and if not then (b) whether the local Health Trust agrees to construct new facilities. Same criticism applies to schooling criteria.</p> <p>No reference to easy availability or access to Church [By TWBC].</p>	Comment noted. Will leave criteria unaltered but will contact service providers to reflect concerns. Will add reference to access to place of worship.	Partial Change
130875	Mr Alan Byrne	English Heritage	SHLAA185		<p>Also at stage 7a of the SHLAA, and with reference to paragraph 38 of the CLG practice guide, it is clear that one needs to consider the historic environment as a determining factor in the process of establishing when and whether sites are likely to be developed: i.e their suitability.</p> <p>The extent to which the historic environment affects the principle of deliverability will depend on the particular characteristic of the site/area in question; e.g. a modest appropriate infill development in a conservation area may have greater potential (deliverability) than a suggested development within a designated historic park and garden. Therefore our advice should not necessarily be seen as a constraint on the delivery of more homes but as a</p>	Historic environment needs to be considered and the extent to which it impacts upon the site's potential for development	Comment noted. Stages 6 and 7 will consider the impact of any surrounding historic environment upon the potential for development of each site	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>means to provide greater certainty, clearly identifying at an early stage the likely deliverability of the estimations you may suggest.</p> <p>To determine the aspects of the historic environment that should be considered in the assessment of a site's potential, the inclusion of the following paragraphs may be helpful:</p> <p>"All designated historic assets should be considered together with non-designated features of local historic or architectural interest and value since these can make an important contribution to creating a sense of place and local identity. This covers buildings, and other structures and features, archaeological remains, historic open spaces and the historic character of the Districts' rural landscapes and townscapes.</p> <p>Key features may include: Scheduled Monuments; Registered Battlefields; Registered Historic Parks and Gardens; Listed Buildings; World Heritage Sites; Conservation Areas; other significant known or likely archaeology, locally listed buildings / buildings of townscape value; and other historic rural landscapes and urban townscapes."</p>			
24757	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	SHLAA60	Disagree	<p>Stage 4: Determining which sites and areas will be surveyed.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.23 sets out that the Council will follow the strategic approach set out in its Core Strategy to determine within which geographical areas sites will be surveyed. A hierarchy of locations is set out as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Previously developed land within the main urban areas (RTW and Southborough);</li> <li>2. Previously developed land within small rural towns (Paddock Wood, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst);</li> <li>3. Previously developed land within villages; followed by:</li> <li>4. Certain types of Greenfield sites within the limits</li> </ol>	<p>Representations to Core Strategy have discounted hierarchy of locations for development. Sequential approach is not in PPS3. Council should allow all sites to be considered on own merits before any site discounted.</p> <p>Ability to respond to change is essential given possibility for South East Plan housing requirement to be considered.</p>	<p>Comment noted. SHLAA methodology will be altered so no direct reference to the Core Strategy search sequence. All sites with housing potential in and around settlements will be considered.</p> <p>The SHLAA will take account of any changes to housing requirement once the South East Plan is finalised.</p> <p>Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>to built development; followed by:</p> <p>5. Sites around the edge of the main urban area;</p> <p>6. Sites around the small rural towns;</p> <p>7. Sites outside the Limits to the Built Development of those villages, but only for rural exceptions affordable housing.</p> <p>Representations submitted on behalf of Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes to the Core Strategy Preferred Option (11 January 2008) have discounted this hierarchy of locations for development. For ease of reference, representations to the Preferred Options stage are attached to this letter at Annex One. Paragraph 4.23 of the SHLAA Methodology identifies that the above approach to identifying sites for assessment is based on the Spatial Strategy in the Core Strategy Preferred Options. The Spatial Strategy is considered to be flawed and 'unsound' as it is centred on a 'sequential approach' to development around a settlement hierarchy. This follows guidance set out in PPG3: Housing (March 2000) not current housing planning policy guidance in PPS3.</p> <p>The Council should revert to the approach set out in paragraphs 24 to 27 in the Practice Guidance which would allow all sites to be considered on their own merits with a robust assessment of their deliverability and developability being carried out, before any site is discounted. A 'sequential approach' to the SHLAA assessment is flawed and 'unsound'. Only when the Practice Guidance is adhered to will the Council have a SHLAA which can be reviewed annually to enable the Council to respond to changing circumstances in housing provision. This ability to respond to change is considered an essential element given the possibility for the South East Plan housing requirement to be increased in the Proposed Modifications (expected Summer 2008). This is widely anticipated to respond to the current Government agenda centring on increased housing</p>	<p>New development might be accompanied by new infrastructure which might mitigate/overcome any shortfalls [By TWBC].</p>	<p>development potential of the site has been assessed.</p> <p>Overcoming constraints, such as new infrastructure are to be considered as part of stage 7d as set out in the SHLAA methodology</p>	

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>delivery.</p> <p>Reverting to the approach set out in the Practice Guidance would eliminate the following suggestions in the SHLAA methodology. Responses to each suggestion in the methodology are set out in italics [upper case: TWBC]:</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.31 and 4.32 – Determining which specific sites will be surveyed</p> <p>Sites will be eliminated at Stage 7a through a desk top analysis. PARAGRAPH 4.31 REFERS TO THE PRACTICE GUIDANCE REQUIREMENT THAT 'AS A MINIMUM ALL SITES SHOULD BE VISITED'. THE PRACTICE GUIDANCE SHOULD THEREFORE APPLY AND NO SITES BE DISCOUNTED ON A DESK TOP ANALYSIS. AS SET OUT PREVIOUSLY THE SHLAA ASSESSMENT WILL BE USED AS A TOOL TO BE REVIEWED ANNUALLY, IT IS ESSENTIAL THAT A ROBUST ASSESSMENT OF EVERY SITE IDENTIFIED IS COMPLETED AT THIS EARLY STAGE.</p> <p>· Paragraphs 4.33 to 4.35 and Table 9 – Assessing Suitability and Desktop Suitability Criteria</p> <p>Sets out a desktop assessment methodology for the inclusion and discount of sites based on the Spatial Strategy in the Core Strategy Preferred Options (January 2008). THIS APPROACH IS FOUNDED ON THE 'SEQUENTIAL APPROACH' SET OUT IN PPG3: HOUSING. THIS IS FLAWED AND 'UN SOUND'.</p>			
24838	Mr H Moore	Highways Agency	SHLAA48		<p>The Agency considers that paragraph 4.34 should be amended to include 'transport infrastructure' under the specified heading of 'physical problems or limitations', when assessing the suitability of a site for housing allocation. The preceding paragraph of the document states that a 'site is considered to be suitable for housing if it offers a suitable location for</p>	<p>Para 4.34 should include 'transport infrastructure'. Good accessibility to transport infrastructure is a key driver in facilitating a sustainable community [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Para 4.34 is a direct quote from the SHLAA Practice Guidance so not appropriate to alter. However, the table will be altered to refer to transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>Partial Change</p>

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					development and would contribute to the creation of sustainable communities'. The Agency strongly believes that good accessibility to transport infrastructure is also a key driver in facilitating a sustainable community, in terms of reducing the need to travel and in private car trip making.			
24952	Mr Michael Coggles	National Federation of the Blind	SHLAA169	Agree	<p>First of all thank you for inviting me to participate in the work shop and providing the correspondence in large print for me.</p> <p>I have had an opportunity to discuss the outcome of the workshop and the additional papers with our committee.</p> <p>Personally, I thought that the SHLAA, step by step assessment methodology was sound and put forward a transparent way of assessing available land use. However, like my colleagues, I do have one major concern with the methodology. It is our view, that at an earlier stage in the process site accessibility should be included, together with availability of infrastructure, which we see as vital, especially in housing projects.</p> <p>By way of example:</p> <p>Some years ago, when the Longfield Trading Estate was planned, the then Chair of the Tunbridge Wells Access Group, warned that all roads within the planned estate should be dual carriageway, to ensure the long term access needs of the Trading Estate were met. Today, we can see the wisdom of that request. The single track routes throughout the estate are regularly clogged with slow moving/stationary traffic. Recent new developments, such as Argos and the other multi shopping complex, have contributed to the growing tailbacks which block the A21, especially at weekends and are the cause of several traffic accidents (shunts) on the roundabout at the junction with the estate. The proposed private hospital to be built will add to the congestion and the delays in movements between it</p>	<p>At an earlier stage in the process site accessibility should be included, together with availability of infrastructure.</p> <p>Infrastructure should precede new development.</p> <p>Infrastructure means access to public transport, local schools, GP surgeries and local shopping facilities, water, power and other public services [By TWBC].</p>	<p>Support noted. Access to infrastructure already included. Overcoming constraints, such as new infrastructure are to be considered as part of stage 7d as set out in the SHLAA methodology. The SHLAA is not a policy document nor an Allocations document. Any decision about which sites to allocate will be made in (a) Development Plan Document(s) and this will need to consider whether need infrastructure prior to development taking place</p>	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>and the proposed new Pembury Hospital may well endanger life.</p> <p>Had the SHLAA methodology, at stage one, applied "access" to this proposed scheme the result may well have been entirely different. I have done some initial research and found that the early versions of the SHLAA methodology pilots included Lakeside, in Essex. That development was built with the expectation of increased traffic flows to and from the site and its existing, although long planned facilities, ensure that access is facilitated to all its various sites within that estate.</p> <p>When it comes to housing development, infrastructure must form an essential prerequisite. Without it, no new development should take place. Government policy fails to take account of this at present and has been one of the reasons that has hamstrung the East Kent Corridor Development, according to KCC Planners.</p> <p>Hence within the SHLAA methodology, it is our view, that at the earliest phase of assessment, the infrastructure assessment should be applied.</p> <p>By infrastructure, we mean access to public transport, local schools, GP's surgery's and local shopping facilities, water, power and other public services. AS the local planning authority it is vital that infrastructure precede new developments, not the other way around. Shortages of water within the south east may well determine the level of future housing development.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Group felt that the scheme was workable and better than previous methods.</p>			
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA23		<p>Whilst all of the criteria are relevant considerations in making the assessments ultimately a common sense approach must be taken. For example, a site may be in the Green Belt but is it fulfilling its Green Belt function? Should the first question be "is this</p>	<p>Danger of being too superficial. Reasons for and against development must be "weighted" before ruling site survey out</p>	<p>Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed.</p>	<p>Partial Change</p>

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>designation correct?"</p> <p>Should a greenfield site within the limits to Built Development be considered ahead of a site which is PDL ,possibly of better configuration etc ,but which is outside the Limit to Built Development?</p>		<p>Ultimately, a judgement will be made about the deliverability of a site. The SHLAA is not a policy document nor an Allocations document. Any decision about which sites to allocate will be made in (a) Development Plan Document(s)</p>	
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA147	Disagree	<p>We especially refer to criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- "sites that are equal to, or above, 0.2ha / majority of residential planning permissions are on small sites / strategy – sites that are below 0.2 ha will be considered as windfalls"</li> <li>- "Areas of Important Open Space / Local Plan EN21 / strategy as may need to reconsider sites in terms of their designation, development area/amount of development"</li> <li>- "Areas of Land Landscape Importance / Local Plan EN22 / strategy as may need to reconsider sites in terms of their designation, development area/amount of development"</li> <li>- "Important Landscape Approaches / Local Plan EN23 / development area/amount of development"</li> </ul> <p>We believe setting a site size threshold of 0.2ha or ANY threshold for that matter is wrong.</p> <p>All sites should be defined as built or non-built land right at the beginning, to take out speculation with its risks of becoming grot spots and to avoid uncertainties among residents about the future of their community.</p> <p>The present situation as described in LDF Core Strategy – Preferred Options para 3.3 and 7.9 CANNOT continue. We oppose the quasi 'happiness' with the present windfall supply for the majority of housing. (SEE Question 04)</p>	<p>There should be no site threshold</p> <p>Considering sites in terms of designation will be a pro-development approach</p> <p>Time measurements should be changed to distance units [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.</p> <p>It is considered that the use of time measurements are more accurate in measuring levels of accessibility</p> <p>Stages 6 and 7 will ensure that all site designations are fully recognised and taken into account when assessing sites</p>	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>We are afraid that reconsidering sites in terms of their designation e.g. Open Spaces will end up one-sided: Pro-Development! We oppose this approach.</p> <p>Change unreliable time measurements to distance units (metres, kilometres)</p> <p>e.g. "sites within 30 minutes public transport time of retail areas"</p> <p>Small industrial sites overlapping with residential areas should be eliminated and used for housing.</p>			
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA133	Agree	<p>Table 10 "Desktop Suitability Criteria" could be the basis of a useful check list.</p> <p>However, we should like the first item, DELETED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sites that are equal to, or above, 0.2ha</li> </ul> <p>together with items which should be excluded (SEE: Question 03):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Historic Parks and Gardens</li> <li>- Arcadian Areas</li> <li>- Common Land</li> </ul> <p>Some other items should be REVIEWED:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Green Belt</li> <li>- Areas of Important Open Space</li> <li>- Areas of Land Landscape Importance</li> <li>- Important Landscape Approaches</li> <li>- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</li> <li>- Kent Special Landscape Area</li> </ul> <p>INFRASTRUCTURE points of water supply and drainage are especially important criteria.</p> <p>REPLACE all time criteria (e.g. 30 minutes) with a proper distance (m or km).</p>	<p>Delete windfalls.</p> <p>Exclude Historic Parks; Arcadian Areas, Common Land.</p> <p>Review Green Belt; Areas of Important Open Space; Areas of Landscape Importance; Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty; Kent Special Landscape Area.</p> <p>Infrastructure points of water supply and drainage especially important.</p> <p>Replace all time criteria with a proper distance.</p> <p>Typical Urban Character Analysis unreliable [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.</p> <p>SHLAA Practice Guidance makes it clear that scope of Assessment shouldn't be narrowed down except where designations more clear-cut.</p> <p>SHLAA is not a policy document nor an Allocations document. Any decision to review designations will be made through a Development Plan Document.</p> <p>Not appropriate to replace all time criteria with a distance as this will vary</p> <p>The Typical Urban Character</p>	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					Following criteria is unreliable: "Typical Urban Character Area Analysis"  (SEE Question 11)		Area gives an indication of potential intensification of Character Areas. As set out in the Draft SHLAA methodology, using TUCA and other information should provide a robust assessment of the likely potential of the site.	
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA124	Agree	Agree, but is it really necessary or practical to operate a sieve with 66 criteria? Suggest undertaking on-site surveys at an earlier stage would eliminate the need for much of this processing.	Agree but question practicality of sieve with 66 criteria. Undertake on-site surveys at an earlier stage [by TWBC]	Support noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed	Change
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning Associates	SHLAA35	Disagree	<p>We are concerned generally at the over-reliance placed on the desk-top survey. As the Council notes in para 4.31, the SHLAA methodology suggests that as a minimum all sites identified in the desk top study should be visited, but it is our understanding from the text and from the workshop session that the Council intends to use the desk top exercise as an initial 'sieving' of sites. One of the key messages coming out of the workshop session from almost all the groups was that the desk-top study was overly simplistic and was not a sound basis for either 'ruling in' or 'ruling out' individual sites, and that a more rounded appraisal of sites would be required.</p> <p>We do not therefore agree with the use of the desk based analysis in this way, and trust that the Council will heed the feedback from the workshop session on this matter.</p> <p>In respect of Table 10, we do not generally disagree with the list of subjects per se. However, the list of considerations range from the very minor (e.g. a site with a TPO) to the very major (e.g. a site in an active floodplain), and from the very vague (e.g. sites not containing land within the 'rural fringe') to the curiously specific (sites within 571 metres of a neighbourhood shopping area). Again we would caution against placing too much reliance on a simple 'tick box' approach to assessing sites at the</p>	<p>There is an over-reliance on the desk-top element, and we disagree with the sieving of sites on this basis only.</p> <p>Site assessment criteria are not weighted but cover a range of considerations, some of which are more significant and easy to quantify than others. The criteria can help to inform professional judgement, but should not be used instead of professional judgement i.e. as a simple 'tick box' approach to site assessment.</p> <p>Disagree with the use of the Core Strategy search sequence at this stage, since it has no status, and is a 'crude' indicator of the merits or otherwise of an individual site, not an absolute indicator.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed.</p> <p>Sites used for alternative purposes would be considered under stage 7b availability of development and also under stage 7c achievability of development.</p> <p>SHLAA methodology will be altered so no direct reference to the Core Strategy search sequence. All sites with housing potential in and around settlements will be considered.</p> <p>Professional judgement will be exercised in terms of deliverability of sites.</p> <p>Settlement boundaries have recently been established, as is already referred to in the draft SHLAA methodology.</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>initial assessment stage. Selecting appropriate sites for development requires a qualitative professional judgement, informed by relevant considerations, not dictated by a pre-set procedure. In each case, the list of criteria in Table 10 will provide 'indicators' of the issues to be addressed in any particular site, but should not be taken too literally as being determinants of site suitability, nor should they replace professional judgement.</p> <p>We would add however that there appear to be some criteria missing - for example, although the list of criteria includes reference to sites 'allocated' for alternative uses (and notes these may be better retained for their allocated purpose), it does not refer to sites 'used' for alternative purposes, even if they are not allocated for a specific use. The same consideration would apply as to whether such sites would be better retained in their existing use.</p> <p>We would also wish to comment in relation to paragraph 4.23, and the suggested use of the Core Strategy search sequence. At this stage, the Core Strategy search sequence has not been adopted, and technically has no weight. At a later stage, when it has been adopted, sites that are not in conformity with the Core Strategy would be rejected. At this stage, we do not see that including the Core Strategy search sequence adds much, since sites that are in poor locations in terms of being remote from the main urban areas, facilities, and public transport etc will perform relatively poorly against the criteria, and sites which accord with it will tend to perform better when measured against the criteria.</p> <p>In addition, and as demonstrated by the workshop sessions, it does not necessarily follow that a strict use of a sequential approach necessarily results in the most appropriate sites being selected. For example, a site in category 4 (a greenfield site within the limits of an urban area) may not necessarily be more desirable than a site in category 5 (a greenfield</p>	<p>Council should take on board the lesson from the workshop sessions, which demonstrated the need for a more refined and less 'formulaic' approach to site assessment [By TWBC]</p>	<p>The SHLAA is not a policy document nor an Allocations document. Any decision about which sites to allocate and any changes to settlement boundaries will be made in (a) Development Plan Document(s)</p>	

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					site on the edge of an urban area). The latter may actually perform better when measured against the Council's criteria in Table 10, and indeed there may be very sound reasons for retaining the former in its current use as discussed above. A methodology that requires unsuitable sites in 'higher' categories to be used in advance of suitable sites in 'lower' categories will not produce the best result, and therefore whilst there may be a presumption that this sequence applies, we would again stress the need for professional judgement, and the need to ensure that the drive for the delivery of suitable residential sites is not at the expense of the balance of other urban land uses. Bearing in mind that the definition of a settlement boundary is essentially a policy constraint rather than an absolute physical or environmental constraint, it seems inappropriate at the initial site assessment stage to pre-judge where the settlement boundary should be.			
55897	Mr Sean Hanna	Natural England	SHLAA44	Agree	Natural England believes that the suitability criteria in Table 10 appear appropriate for a desk based analysis before a site is visited.	Suitability criteria appropriate [By TWBC]	Support noted. SHLAA methodology will be altered so that Stage 7a follows Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed.	Change
70323	Ms Annabel McKie	Southern Housing Group	SHLAA16	Agree	Broadly agree with list of criteria but would like to see it expanded to include consideration of access issues e.g. does site directly abut adopted highway; would access onto highway contravene planning policies e.g. due to proximity to major junction.	Propose additional issues should also be considered, especially access [by TWBC].	Support noted. The SHLAA methodology does refer to access issues. Access will be considered further when assessing sites such as whether site is not accessible at present but has potential for access.	No Change
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA176	Disagree	At the workshop there was some discussion that in certain circumstances the 0.2 ha baseline might usefully be breached - for instance when several small packets of land within a village could make a substantial contribution to local needs.  There doesn't appear to be a definition of the concept of neighbourhood centres. Priority should be	Parcels of land could be amalgamated to create an area over .2h  Priority should be given to sites close to community and medical facilities, recreational facilities	Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>given to sites close to community and medical facilities. This is particularly relevant in the rural hinterland where distance from such resources can exacerbate loneliness and delay referral to much needed services. Similarly accessibility to sports or recreational facilities would be a key issue for the health and well being of residents. One key development in Kent Adult Social Services over coming years will be to encourage eligible users to identify their own day support. Local facilities in this category would therefore be valuable.</p> <p>A key issue for Tunbridge Wells is transport, and an important issue will be whether sites are served adequately by public transport. This should however not rule out sites as mitigation can be introduced. A subsidised bus service to amenities, provision of community resources etc could be funded through s106.</p> <p>The following desktop suitability criteria should be considered:</p> <p>Suitability Criteria: Protected and BAP Species and habitats</p> <p>Justification: Wildlife and countryside Act (1981), Conservation (Natural Habitats &amp;c.) Regulations (1994), PPS9</p> <p>Potential Implications for: Developable area/amount of development</p> <p>Suitability Criteria: Land which results in isolation or fragmentation of habitats and doesn't allow species to react to climate change.</p> <p>Justification: Development of an area may result in other habitats becoming fragmented or isolated. If species are not able to react to climate change they may become locally extinct within an area. There is a need to ensure that wildlife corridors are designed</p>	Need for sites to be accessible by public transport	<p>appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.</p> <p>Proximity to services and accessibility will be considered within Stages 6 and 7</p>	

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					and implemented and that development decisions do not further fragment habitats or foreclose on options to reconnect them and species can move between areas. The South East Plan: Policy CC2 Climate Change – Ensuring that opportunities and options for sustainable flood management and migration of habitats and species are not foreclosed. KMS Policy NRM4: Conservation and Improvement of Biodiversity and EN8 Protection, conservation and enhancement of biodiversity to local authorities shall avoid a net loss of biodiversity and actively pursue opportunities to achieve a net gain across the region.  Potential Implications for: Developable area/amount of development			
74446	Benenden Hospital Trust	Benenden Hospital Trust	SHLAA53	Disagree	<p>The use of such criteria bears the risk of scoring down sites which would be appropriate for development. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in reality, if a site is 600m walk of a GP surgery rather than 571m, why should that count against it?</li> <li>- why should a site automatically be marked down because it contains one or more TPOs? In some cases (as in the case study at the recent workshop session), if such trees are located along a boundary, this may not be a constraint to development at all providing that the trees are retained.</li> <li>- why should a site have to be within 30 mins of Knights Park as opposed to any other cultural or leisure facility? This would automatically score down any site outside the Tunbridge Wells area.</li> </ul> <p>I strongly object to the idea that a site should be marked down if it is in or affects a Conservation Area or Listed Building. Whilst I recognise that such sites may be more complex to develop, there are several examples of Conservation Area sites across the Borough which are currently in a very poor state and where development should be actively encouraged. Being in a CA should NOT be viewed as a constraint</p>	<p>The use of such criteria would lead to some suitable sites receiving poor scores simply because the "computer says no", regardless of benefits on the ground. Need through appraisal of any potential site rather than over-reliance on set criteria [By TWBC].</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SHLAA practice guidance makes it clear that it is appropriate to use criteria. Paragraph 4.59 of the Draft SHLAA methodology did refer to the example of the Conservation Area, and it is recognised that this can have a positive impact. Stage 7a will follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed. It is recognised that professional judgement will be exercised.</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					to development. It just requires particularly close attention to be paid to design, etc.  This is a fundamental problem with the whole proposed system. In reality, the only sensible way of assessing sites is to do a thorough appraisal of any potential site. Over-reliance on set criteria will simply lead to the computer saying no to otherwise perfectly good sites.			
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA94	Agree	Generally agree. AONB designations should not prevent development where a need for that development exists and it can be demonstrated that no harm would be caused to the function of the AONB.	Land within AONB can be developed where appropriate [By TWBC]	Support noted. Stages 6 and 7 will ensure that each site is considered on its own merits	No Change
<b>Question 7</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA81	Agree	It is agreed that sites smaller than 0.2 hectares should not be considered as part of the SHLAA	Site threshold of 0.2 hectares is appropriate [By TWBC]	Support noted.	No Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA108	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
24757	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	SHLAA61	Disagree	As set out above [see comment no. SHLAA60 TWBC] the review of Stage 7a of the SHLAA assessment at an earlier stage is flawed and 'unsound' as it is based on a 'sequential approach' which no longer features in current planning guidance.  The SHLAA methodology needs to reflect the requirements set out in paragraph 54 of PPS3 which states that:  'Drawing on information from the SHLAA and or other relevant evidence, Local Planning Authorities should identify sufficient specific deliverable sites to DELIVER housing in the first five years. To be considered deliverable, sites should, at the point of adoption of the relevant Development Plan Document:  · Be AVAILABLE – the site is available now. · Be SUITABLE – the site offers a sustainable	SHLAA based on sequential approach, which no longer features in current planning guidance. SHLAA methodology should reflect requirements set out in paragraphs 54 and 55 of PPS3 [By TWBC]	Comment noted. SHLAA methodology will be altered so no direct reference to the Core Strategy search sequence. All sites with housing potential in and around settlements will be considered.	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>location for development now and would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities.</p> <p>· Be ACHIEVABLE – there is reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.' (PPS3 own emphasis)</p> <p>PPS3 goes further to suggest that for years 6-10 and where possible years 11-15 a specific supply of developable sites should be identified (paragraph 55). To be considered developable sites should be in a suitable location for development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available for, and could be developed at the point envisaged. At that point the site would be required to be Available, Suitable and Achievable. It is these criteria and these criteria only which should guide the preparation of the SHLAA and identification of sites for development to meet housing requirement in the near and more distant future.</p> <p>It is considered that the current methodology would not ensure that a continuous supply of deliverable sites would be maintained, this is contrary to guidance in PPS3 (paragraph 57).</p>			
24920	Mr P Errington	Home Builders Federation	SHLAA164		<p>Sites to be Surveyed – a summary</p> <p>Until reaching this stage in the methodology HBF was not clear that the council was proposing to carry out the SHLAA in such a sequential approach. It may be reasonable to have a policy which seeks to comply with PPS3 in terms of prioritising the development of PDL, however, that is a very different thing to an old PPG3-style sequential approach. As stated above, a SHLAA is supposed to be a technical exercise to identify potential development sites and, as such, is supposed to be largely free from policy constraints (other than the obvious high level policy constraints such as SSSI, AONB, SPA and so on). HBF had not appreciated from earlier discussions nor from the early parts of the methodology that the council was planning on carrying out the SHLAA in this sequential manner</p>	<p>SHLAA should not aim to prioritise sites in line with PPG3 sequential test. Sequential 'staged' approach does not comply with the requirements of either PPS3 or the CLG guidance [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. SHLAA methodology will be altered so no direct reference to the Core Strategy search sequence. All sites with housing potential in and around settlements will be considered.</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>which, in essence, seems to be suggesting stopping the work once sufficient sites have been found to meet requirements.</p> <p>This is not the purpose of a SHLAA. The purpose, as stated a number of times above, is to identify (within reason) all potential development sites which meet the criteria set out in PPS3. The aim is to identify more than enough sites in order that they can then, as a matter of policy, be prioritised through the LDF process. The SHLAA should not aim to perform that prioritisation function.</p> <p>HBF considers that this sequential 'staged' approach described in paragraphs 4.37 to 4.57 does not comply with the requirements of either PPS3 or the CLG guidance. The assessment should consider all suitable development sites equally as part of the assessment process (in terms of the process of carrying out the assessments and site visits) with the policy judgement only coming at the end of the process. Therefore, HBF does not agree with this approach.</p>			
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA24	Agree	We agree with the size threshold and in principle we agree with the approach. However again it is important to rank sites not simply on the number of attributes and constraints, but also the relative importance or "weighting" of those attributes or constraints .	Agree with size threshold and approach in principle. Need to consider relative importance of attributes or constraints [By TWBC].	Support noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed. Assessing suitability of sites will inevitably require professional judgement to be utilised.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA148	Disagree	<p>We strongly disagree with ANY site size threshold. A small site with high density might affect an area far more negatively than a large site with low density.</p> <p>There should also be a requirement to the minimum size of any dwelling.</p> <p>The assessment needs to inform on the type of buildings thought to be suitable especially in view of para 4.64 - "As set out elsewhere in this Paper, the SHLAA will not solely consider whether a site is</p>	<p>Disagree with any site size. Small site at high density could well prove more significant in housing terms than a larger site with a lower density.</p> <p>Requirement for a minimum size of dwelling in square metres.</p>	Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					suitable for residential use. In this respect, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council will have regard to other information, such as the initial capacity estimates for the Local Plan employment allocations, in order to inform the likely potential of the site for employment uses."	Assessment needs to inform type of buildings thought to be suitable [By TWBC]	SHLAA will be a material consideration and can inform decision making about windfall sites.	
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA134	Disagree	<p>We strongly disagree with any site size threshold and think the "windfall allowance" to be a cop out.</p> <p>The job needs to be done properly, regardless of site size. A small site at a high density could well prove more significant in housing terms than a larger site with a lower density.</p> <p>The assessment needs to focus on the type of housing required, especially affordable and terraced housing.</p> <p>There should also be a requirement for a minimum size of any dwelling in square metres</p>	<p>Disagree with any site size. Small site at high density could well prove more significant in housing terms than a larger site with a lower density.</p> <p>Focus on type of housing required, especially affordable and terraced housing. Requirement for a minimum size of dwelling in square metres [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.</p> <p>SHLAA will be a material consideration and can inform decision making about windfall sites.</p> <p>Type of housing required will be considered.</p> <p>The SHLAA is not a policy document. Therefore, if there is a need for a minimum size of dwelling, this would have to be done through a Development Plan Document and/or a Supplementary Planning Document</p>	No Change
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA125	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning Associates	SHLAA36	Disagree	Again, we are concerned with the simplistic formula of the approach - a site may comply with the requirements of Step 2, but that does not necessarily mean that it is suitable for redevelopment. There	Concerned that PDL sites within settlements may not be suitable.	Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					may, for example, be other physical or environmental constraints, or indeed the site might simply be better used for some other purpose.		of the site has been assessed. Assessing suitability of sites will inevitably require professional judgement to be utilised.	
70323	Ms Annabel McKie	Southern Housing Group	SHLAA17	Agree			Support noted.	
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA177	Agree	A number of small sites of less than 0.2 ha could cumulatively provide a suitable contribution. The County Council agrees that the focus should be on previously developed land within the Limits to Built Development.	Sites less than .2h could be suitable	Support noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.	No Change
74446	Benenden Hospital Trust	Benenden Hospital Trust	SHLAA54	Disagree	Whilst clearly previously developed sites in urban areas should be prioritised, the system should also take account of existing major developed sites outside urban areas which may also be able to make some form of contribution to housing supply.	The system should also take account of existing major developed sites outside urban areas [By TWBC].	Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed. Assessing suitability of sites will inevitably require professional judgement to be utilised. The Council in accordance with the SHLAA guidance will only seek to identify sites with housing potential in and around settlements. Major developed sites, which are outside and not contiguous with urban areas will be considered if they have been promoted by developers/landowners/agents.	Partial Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA95	Agree	Agree. But also need to have regard to the need to ensure the land identified is of a size, type and location capable of meeting identified needs. Not all PDL land is capable of doing this.	Not all PDL land will be of a size, type and location capable of meeting identified needs [By TWBC]	Support noted. Assessing suitability of sites will inevitably require professional judgement to be utilised.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
<b>Question 8</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA82	Agree	It is agreed that the 'Areas of Landscape Importance' should be reviewed as part of the SHLAA.	Agree that 'Areas of Landscape Importance' should be reviewed as part of SHLAA [By TWBC]	Support for approach and comments noted.	No Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA109	Disagree	Rural Fringe sites should be considered and Green Belt sites should be considered as part of the Assessment.	Rural Fringe and Green Belt sites should be considered [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Sites within the Green belt and Rural Fringe are not to be excluded from the SHLAA process.	No Change
24757	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	SHLAA62	Disagree	<p>As set out above [see comment no. SHLAA60 TWBC] the review of Stage 7a of the SHLAA assessment at an earlier stage is flawed and 'unsound' as it is based on a 'sequential approach' which no longer features in current planning guidance.</p> <p>The SHLAA methodology needs to reflect the requirements set out in paragraph 54 of PPS3 which states that:</p> <p>'Drawing on information from the SHLAA and or other relevant evidence, Local Planning Authorities should identify sufficient specific deliverable sites to DELIVER housing in the first five years. To be considered deliverable, sites should, at the point of adoption of the relevant Development Plan Document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Be AVAILABLE – the site is available now.</li> <li>· Be SUITABLE – the site offers a sustainable location for development now and would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities.</li> <li>· Be ACHIEVABLE – there is reasonable prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within five years.' (PPS3 own emphasis) <p>PPS3 goes further to suggest that for years 6-10 and where possible years 11-15 a specific supply of developable sites should be identified (paragraph 55). To be considered developable sites should be in a suitable location for development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available</p> </li></ul>	Disagrees to the proposed sequential approach - the criteria of available, suitable and achievable should guide the SHLAA [by TWBC]	<p>Comment noted. Stages 6 and 7 consider the availability, suitability and achievability of sites.</p> <p>SHLAA methodology will be altered so no direct reference to the Core Strategy search sequence. All sites with housing potential in and around settlements will be considered.</p>	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>for, and could be developed at the point envisaged. At that point the site would be required to be Available, Suitable and Achievable. It is these criteria and these criteria only which should guide the preparation of the SHLAA and identification of sites for development to meet housing requirement in the near and more distant future.</p> <p>It is considered that the current methodology would not ensure that a continuous supply of deliverable sites would be maintained, this is contrary to guidance in PPS3 (paragraph 57).</p>			
24920	Mr P Errington	Home Builders Federation	SHLAA165		<p>Sites to be Surveyed – a summary</p> <p>Until reaching this stage in the methodology HBF was not clear that the council was proposing to carry out the SHLAA in such a sequential approach. It may be reasonable to have a policy which seeks to comply with PPS3 in terms of prioritising the development of PDL, however, that is a very different thing to an old PPG3-style sequential approach. As stated above, a SHLAA is supposed to be a technical exercise to identify potential development sites and, as such, is supposed to be largely free from policy constraints (other than the obvious high level policy constraints such as SSSI, AONB, SPA and so on). HBF had not appreciated from earlier discussions nor from the early parts of the methodology that the council was planning on carrying out the SHLAA in this sequential manner which, in essence, seems to be suggesting stopping the work once sufficient sites have been found to meet requirements.</p> <p>This is not the purpose of a SHLAA. The purpose, as stated a number of times above, is to identify (within reason) all potential development sites which meet the criteria set out in PPS3. The aim is to identify more than enough sites in order that they can then, as a matter of policy, be prioritised through the LDF process. The SHLAA should not aim to perform that prioritisation function.</p>	<p>SHLAA should not aim to prioritise sites in line with PPG3 sequential test. Sequential 'staged' approach does not comply with the requirements of PPS3. The aim is to identify more than enough sites in order that they can then, as a matter of policy, be prioritised through the LDF process [By TWBC].</p>	<p>Comment noted. SHLAA methodology will be altered so no direct reference to the Core Strategy search sequence. All sites with housing potential in and around settlements will be considered.</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					HBF considers that this sequential 'staged' approach described in paragraphs 4.37 to 4.57 does not comply with the requirements of either PPS3 or the CLG guidance. The assessment should consider all suitable development sites equally as part of the assessment process (in terms of the process of carrying out the assessments and site visits) with the policy judgement only coming at the end of the process. Therefore, HBF does not agree with this approach.			
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA149	Agree	<p>It is important for the town centre that all Open Spaces are retained (in view of para 4.45</p> <p>"PPG17 Sport, Recreation and Open Space Study 2007 established that there is not a surplus of open space") and enhanced through Landscaping and Public Art.</p> <p>Emphasis should be on Environment and People and NOT on cars.</p> <p>The trend that every open space can be used as a car park has to be reversed.</p> <p>Many ugly town centre car parks should become more pleasant and green through landscaping or surface space could be better used by forcing car parks underground.</p> <p>In our neighbourhood we greatly value the open space and environs of "TRINITY" and we would wish to have our previous submission request of designation of November 2005, re-submitted for the Community Plan June 2006, being considered for any assessment in this area.</p> <p><a href="http://www.telephonehouse.org.uk/openspace/openspace_trinity_environs_rtw.pdf">http://www.telephonehouse.org.uk/openspace/openspace_trinity_environs_rtw.pdf</a></p>	<p>Open Spaces should be retained.</p> <p>Existing car parks should be enhanced through landscaping/creating underground parking [by TWBC]</p>	<p>Support noted. Designation of certain types of sites should be reconsidered where they are not fulfilling their specified role.</p> <p>SHLAA will consider whether certain car parks could be developed. However, SHLAA is not a policy document so therefore it will not consider the issue of underground car parking except in so far as it relates to deliverability</p>	No Change
25587	Mr Brian Lloyd	Campaign to Protect Rural England	SHLAA70	Agree	<p>We agree that if the Open Space Study identified certain areas as not fulfilling their specified role, they should not be ruled out of the survey. It may be the</p>	<p>Some areas of Open Space that are not fulfilling their specified role</p>	<p>Support for approach and comments noted.</p>	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					case that some limited development will help revitalise an open space area, albeit on a smaller scale.	should not be ruled out of the survey. Limited development may help to revitalise an open space area [By TWBC].		
25772	Mr P Allen	Weald of Kent Protection Society	SHLAA3	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA135	Agree	<p>We agree that it is sensible to review designations such as "Important Open Space" and "Areas of Landscape Importance" as part of the emerging Development Plan Process. We greatly value the open spaces of the town Royal Tunbridge Wells and they should be defended robustly as para 4.45 states "that there is NOT a surplus of open space".</p> <p>However, some designations, such as certain wide verges as 'important open space' and garden centres as 'green belt' may be questionable.</p>	<p>Sensible to review designations such as "Important Open Space" and "Areas of Landscape Importance" as part of the emerging Development Plan Process. Some designations such as certain wide verges may be questionable.</p> <p>[By TWBC]</p>	No comment. Areas of Important Open Space and Areas of Landscape Importance may be reconsidered in terms of their designation. The SHLAA is not a policy document so therefore it will not designate new areas of open space.	Support Noted
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA126	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA178	Agree	Yes		Support noted.	No Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA96	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
<b>Question 9</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA83	Agree	<p>The general approach is considered acceptable, however, clarification is required in respect of the position with Pembury on the east side of Tunbridge Wells.</p> <p>Our clients own land which adjoins the eastern edge of Pembury which itself adjoins Tunbridge Wells. (see attached) We would expect therefore that this land will fall within the definition of "contiguous with the limit to built development of Royal Tunbridge Wells".</p>	<p>Clarification needed in respect of the position with Pembury. Expect clients land to fall within the definition of 'contiguous with the limits to built development of Royal Tunbridge Wells' [by TWBC]</p>	Comment noted. The Council in accordance with the SHLAA guidance will only seek to identify sites with housing potential in and around settlements. Major developed sites, which are outside and not contiguous with urban areas will be considered if they have been promoted by developers/landowners/agents.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					Subject to your acknowledgement on this point we have no objection to this part of the methodology.			
24920	Mr P Errington	Home Builders Federation	SHLAA166		<p>Sites to be Surveyed – a summary</p> <p>Until reaching this stage in the methodology HBF was not clear that the council was proposing to carry out the SHLAA in such a sequential approach. It may be reasonable to have a policy which seeks to comply with PPS3 in terms of prioritising the development of PDL, however, that is a very different thing to an old PPG3-style sequential approach. As stated above, a SHLAA is supposed to be a technical exercise to identify potential development sites and, as such, is supposed to be largely free from policy constraints (other than the obvious high level policy constraints such as SSSI, AONB, SPA and so on). HBF had not appreciated from earlier discussions nor from the early parts of the methodology that the council was planning on carrying out the SHLAA in this sequential manner which, in essence, seems to be suggesting stopping the work once sufficient sites have been found to meet requirements.</p> <p>This is not the purpose of a SHLAA. The purpose, as stated a number of times above, is to identify (within reason) all potential development sites which meet the criteria set out in PPS3. The aim is to identify more than enough sites in order that they can then, as a matter of policy, be prioritised through the LDF process. The SHLAA should not aim to perform that prioritisation function.</p> <p>HBF considers that this sequential 'staged' approach described in paragraphs 4.37 to 4.57 does not comply with the requirements of either PPS3 or the CLG guidance. The assessment should consider all suitable development sites equally as part of the assessment process (in terms of the process of carrying out the assessments and site visits) with the policy judgement only coming at the end of the</p>	Sequential approach is not in PPS3. Aim of SHLAA should be to identify more than enough sites in order that they can then, as a matter of policy, be prioritised through the LDF process [By TWBC].	Comment noted. SHLAA methodology will be altered so no direct reference to the Core Strategy search sequence. All sites with housing potential in and around settlements will be considered	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					process. Therefore, HBF does not agree with this approach.			
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA26		Again we believe that relative constraints and attributes should be "weighted" according to their importance rather than simplistically looking at the numbers of each.	Relative constraints and attributes should be 'weighted' according to their importance [By TWBC]	Comment noted. It is not the intention to weight constraints and attributes. Assessing suitability of sites will inevitably require professional judgement to be utilised when trying to ascertain which sites are deliverable.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA150	Disagree	We strongly disagree with ANY site size threshold.	Strongly disagree with any site size threshold [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.	No Change
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA136	Disagree	We are against the site size threshold of 0.2ha. - We strongly disagree with any size threshold and think the "windfall allowance" to be a cop out. The job needs to be done properly, regardless of site size.  A small site at a high density could well prove more significant in housing terms than a larger site with a lower density. (SEE Question 07)	Disagree with any site size. Small site at high density could well prove more significant in housing terms than a larger site with a lower density [By TWBC].	Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.  SHLAA will be a material consideration and can inform decision making about windfall sites.	No Change
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA127	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning	SHLAA37	Disagree	We do not agree that the quality of the agricultural land is an over-riding consideration when considering the merits of edge of settlement sites - it	Quality of agricultural land not an over-riding consideration [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Methodology will be altered so that best and most versatile agricultural land	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
		Associates			is one of the factors to be considered, but is not a 'primary' factor that would rule a site either 'in' or 'out' at this stage.		will be one consideration.	
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA179	Agree	Yes but should ensure that the local public transport network is easily accessible.	Local transport network should be accessible	Support noted. Stages 6 and 7 will assess accessibility	No Change
74446	Benenden Hospital Trust	Benenden Hospital Trust	SHLAA55	Disagree	In addition, existing major developed sites outside the Limits to Built Development should be considered to assess whether they can make some form of contribution to housing supply.	Existing major developed sites outside the Limits to Built Development should also be considered [By TWBC]	Comment noted. The Council in accordance with the SHLAA guidance will only seek to identify sites with housing potential in and around settlements. Major developed sites, which are outside and not contiguous with urban areas will be considered if they have been promoted by developers/landowners/agents.	No Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA97	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
<b>Question 10</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA84	Agree			Support noted.	
130875	Mr Alan Byrne	English Heritage	SHLAA186		Environmental analysis should look beyond specific designations and consider the wider landscape and townscape impact of housing development.	The wider landscape/townscape should be considered when assessing a site	Comment noted. The processes to be carried out within Stages 6 and 7 will ensure that the wider context of each site is determined and analysed as well as the immediate surroundings	No Change
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA27	Agree	It is also important to look at the sites accessibility and relationship to other related uses.	Look at sites accessibility and relationship to other related uses [By TWBC]	Support noted.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA151	Agree	Other site-specific criteria to be included:  - parking and parking availability;  however it should not be tolerated that front gardens/patios are turned into car parking areas within Conservation Areas (changes to street scene and townscape)	Include other site-specific criteria:  - Parking and parking availability; Odours;  Replace 'utilities' with 'adequate infrastructure'.	Support noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed. The desktop/site specific criteria will be merged in an appendix. Parking and parking	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Odours are a negative factor, not dissimilar to noise.</li> <li>- Replace 'Utilities' with 'Adequate Infrastructure'.</li> </ul>	Don't tolerate hardstanding within Conservation Areas [By TWBC]	availability will be picked up under stages 6 and 7. Transport infrastructure and odours will be added to the list. Hardstanding within Conservation Areas could be controlled through the use of an Article 4 Direction but this is beyond the remit of the SHLAA.	
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA137	Agree	Other site-specific suitability criteria to be included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- parking problems in the area,</li> <li>- parking availability,</li> <li>- public transport.</li> </ul>	Transport related criteria suggested for inclusion [by TWBC]	Support noted. Stages 6 and 7 will include an analysis of the accessibility of each site	No Change
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA128	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
55897	Mr Sean Hanna	Natural England	SHLAA45		Natural England generally welcomes the proposed site specific suitability criteria contained with Table 11 but would recommend that in addition to important landscape features, information on habitats of ecological importance and/or with the potential to support protected or biodiversity action plan species is also collected.	Recommend adding information on habitats of ecological importance and/or with the potential to support protected or biodiversity action plan species [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed.  Within Stage 7a, there is already suitability criteria relating to consider those sites mentioned by Natural England.	Partial Change
70323	Ms Annabel McKie	Southern Housing Group	SHLAA18	Agree	Broadly agree with proposed list but consider that additional factors could also be relevant, including: access; whether site directly abuts adptable highway; title to the site and any legal restrictions to development; services under the ground ; wildlife habitats on site; evidence of likely contamination. Consideration should be given to whether other uses may prove more economically viable than residential use e.g. maintaining existing use may be more viable if significant decontamination work would be required for a residential development.	Broadly agree but suggest some additional factors may be relevant considerations [By TWBC]	Support noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed. Intend to merge desktop/site specific issues in one appendix. The issues mentioned will be picked up under this wider suitability table and/or availability table and/or under achievability considerations. Current use values will be considered.	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA180	Disagree	The following site-specific suitability criteria should be considered:  Intrinsic Value: Potential for Flooding Implications for: Developable Area Intrinsic Value: Biodiversity Value Implications for: Developable Area Intrinsic Value: Connectivity Value Implications for: Developable Area  Contextual Value: Air Quality Implications for: Type of Use	Include  Flood Risk; Biodiversity; Connectivity	Comment noted. All of these potential constraints will be assessed within stages 6 and 7	No Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA98	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
<b>Question 11</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA85	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
117374	Mr Asher Ross	Indigo Planning	SHLAA159	Disagree	While the character of the area may indicate levels of density, PPS3 states that the developments need not reflect the prevailing density in the surrounding area. This is another area where officer's opinions do not reflect the reality of the development world.	PPS3 states that developments need not reflect surrounding densities. Officer's opinions do not reflect reality of development world [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Initial assessment of site potential likely to be made by Officers although this could include drawing on information already submitted by developers, etc. Intention is also to use expertise of development industry to ascertain development potential.	Partial Change
24757	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	SHLAA63	Disagree	This approach is based on a desk top review and not a full site assessment. A full explanation of the inadequacies of this approach is set out above [see Comment Nos. SHLAA61 and 62 TWBC]	Approach is not a full site assessment [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Stage 7a to follow Stage 6 - after a site survey has been carried out and the development potential of the site has been assessed.  Initial assessment of site potential likely to be made by Officers although this could include drawing on information already submitted by developers, etc. Intention is	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
							also to use expertise of development industry to ascertain development potential.	
24920	Mr P Errington	Home Builders Federation	SHLAA167		While the TUCA approach can be a useful general indication of density ranges and site yield it should not be the single determining factor and should be modified to reflect information which becomes apparent upon conducting more detailed assessments of individual sites and discussions with landowners / developers. This flexibility should be built-in to the methodology.	TUCA approach can be a useful general indication of density ranges and site yield. TUCA should be modified to reflect information from landowners/developers. Build in flexibility to methodology [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Will alter methodology to clarify that will also use information provided from landowners/developers/planning agents.	Change
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA28	Agree	Yes as an initial assessment		Support noted.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA152	Disagree	<p>We would be happier to see references to standards within e.g. Kent Design</p> <p>As well to be considered is a requirement to a minimum square metres size of any dwelling.</p> <p>We disagree with para 4.61</p> <p>"As stated in the SHLAA Practice Guidance, an estimation of the development potential of each identified site should be guided by existing or emerging Plan policy, particularly the approach to setting housing densities at the local level."</p> <p>- It is NOT appropriate to copy density figures from the adjacent area where development is anticipated.</p> <p>We disagree with para 4.63</p> <p>"One constraint, set out in Table 10, relates to the Typical Urban Character Area Analysis (TUCA) that TWBC has undertaken. The TUCA will indicate what density ranges are appropriate within any given Character Area."</p> <p>- The density point is important but the Typical Urban</p>	<p>Happier to see references to standards within, e.g. Kent Design</p> <p>Consider requirement for minimum size of any dwelling</p> <p>Not appropriate to copy density figures from adjacent areas.</p> <p>Typical Urban Character Area (TUCA) lacks sustainability</p> <p>Smaller plots with high density can be a negative factor for building strong communities, as often these sites have only transient occupation [By TWBC].</p>	<p>Comment noted. Will include reference to Kent Design in Stage 6</p> <p>If there is a need for a minimum size of dwelling, this would have to be done through a Development Plan Document and/or Supplementary Plan Document</p> <p>PPS3 recognises the need for new development to integrate and complement the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access. However, it is recognised that this should not stifle change.</p> <p>The Typical Urban Character Area gives an indication of potential intensification of Character Areas. As set out in the Draft SHLAA methodology,</p>	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>Character Area (TUCA) lacks sustainability.</p> <p>As confirmed in para 4.94</p> <p>"Where the issue relates to achievability, it will be necessary to review the assumptions made. For example, could the site accommodate more development than was originally estimated? Clearly, this will have been guided by the site's suitability. Furthermore, whilst increasing the density of development will tend to support higher land values, there is a point at which higher densities may become uneconomic if issues of 'cramming' reduce sales values. The issues relating to achievability should be able to be considered relatively quickly. - 4.95 If sufficient sites are suitable, available and achievable, then the need to overcome constraints may not be such a crucial issue. "</p> <p>- Smaller plots with high density can have, not only an economically negative impact but also a negative factor for building strong communities, as often these sites have only transient occupation.</p>		<p>using TUCA and other information should provide a robust assessment of the likely potential of the site.</p> <p>There is a need to provide a choice of dwellings to meet needs. The planning system has limited control over occupation of market housing.</p>	
25587	Mr Brian Lloyd	Campaign to Protect Rural England	SHLAA71	Disagree	<p>We do not endorse an approach to estimating development potential that simply applies a standard density. In determining the development potential of sites, the Council needs to be optimistic (but realistic) about density rather than cautious. Given that the LDF will look forward 15 years or so, design approaches which today are seen as innovative will become mainstream. There are already many examples of high quality, and high density, developments – even developments including family homes within urban areas at densities of 50dph or more. Consequently, we would favour an approach that actually examined what is being achieved on actual schemes in similar locations. CPRE has recently undertaken a study of urban family housing, and a report is to be published very shortly. The Council may find this helpful in estimating the development potential of sites.</p>	<p>Don't simply apply a standard density. Innovate design approaches will become mainstream. Examine what is being achieved on actual schemes in similar locations [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Initial assessment of site potential likely to be made by officers, although this could include drawing on information already submitted by developers, etc. Intention is also to use expertise of development industry to ascertain development potential.</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA138	Disagree	<p>We disagree with para 4.61 and 4.63</p> <p>The density point is important but the Typical Urban Character Area (TUCA) is not always reliable (SEE: Question 06).</p> <p>It is not appropriate to merely copy density figures from surrounding areas where development is planned.</p> <p>The Development Potential needs to take account of the type of housing accommodation. This is not just a numbers game as quoted in para 4.65.</p> <p>Royal Tunbridge Wells does not lack certain types of housing. However, RTW is short of affordable housing (SEE: Housing Needs Survey 2005). The threshold for affordable housing needs to be redefined.</p> <p>As well, a requirement for a minimum size of any dwelling in square metres has to be considered.</p>	<p>TUCA not always reliable - not appropriate to merely copy density figures from surrounding areas. Development potential needs to take account of housing. Threshold for affordable housing needs redefining. Consider minimum size of any dwelling in square metres [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Typical Urban Character Area gives an indication of potential intensification of Character Areas. As set out in the Draft SHLAA methodology, using TUCA and other information should provide a robust assessment of the likely potential of the site.</p> <p>A more refined approach to the type of housing accommodation to be considered will be undertaken as part of stage 7c.</p> <p>SHLAA is not a policy document. Threshold for affordable housing could be considered in a Development Plan Document. If there is a need for a minimum size of dwelling, this would have to be done through a Development Plan Document and/or Supplementary Plan Document</p>	No Change
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA129	Agree	<p>While agreeing with the principle, we have not seen the TUCA and can't comment on capacity assessments derived from this.</p>	<p>Agree with principle but haven't seen TUCA [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Support noted. The Typical Urban Character Area gives an indication of potential intensification of Character Areas. As set out in the Draft SHLAA methodology, using TUCA and other information should provide a robust assessment of the likely potential of the site.</p>	No Change
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning Associates	SHLAA38	Disagree	<p>Where there is no developer input, we do not disagree with the process for estimating capacity, although professional judgement will still need to be exercised in respect of individual sites to determine whether or not the application of the methodology has resulted in a realistic capacity taking into</p>	<p>Where no developer input do not disagree with process although still use professional judgement. Where proposals have been put forward by</p>	<p>Comment noted. Initial assessment of site potential likely to be made by officers, although this could include drawing on information already submitted by developers, etc.</p>	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					account particular site attributes/constraints.  Where however proposals have been put forward by the landowner/developer, these should form the starting point for the Council's consideration.	landowner/developer, should form starting point for the Council's consideration [By TWBC]	Intention is also to use expertise of development industry to ascertain development potential.	
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA181	Disagree	The approach to housing densities should also consider the location of the site and whether the site is close to public transport corridors and existing facilities.	Development density should reflect the accessibility of the site	Comment noted. Stages 6 and 7 will consider the accessibility of each site.	No Change
74446	Benenden Hospital Trust	Benenden Hospital Trust	SHLAA56	Disagree	Rather than the Council trying to calculate the development potential of a site, where a site is known to be being promoted for development, why not just ask the potential developer for their views on how many units the site could accommodate, since they will already have done this work, probably more thoroughly.	The Council should ask developers if they already have an estimate of the number of units that could be accommodated [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Initial assessment of site potential likely to be made by officers, although this could include drawing on information already submitted by developers, etc. Intention is also to use expertise of development industry to ascertain development potential.	Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA99	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
<b>Question 12</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA86	Disagree	It is considered that the availability criteria proposed do comprise the key elements. However, it is submitted that certain criteria are more important than others.  That is, the purpose of the SHLAA is to identify potential development sites for the LDF period to 2026. Therefore whether or not the site currently benefits from permissions or is under construction should not be afforded any great weight.  The key elements should be criterion 2 i.e. that the site is free of ownership problems, 3 that the site does not contain uses requiring re-location, 4 that there are no access or ransom problems, 5 that there is a developer is expressing the intention to develop and 11 that there is a know timescale for delivery.  These elements should be afforded more weight	Certain criteria more important than others, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 11 and should be afforded greater weight [By TWBC].	Comment noted. Still appropriate to consider whether site has planning permission and/or under construction as these are clearly deliverable. Not appropriate to weight constraints as if a site is allocated, it is likely to be suitable, which may not necessarily be true of sites, for example, where a developer has expressed an intention to develop. Existing allocations will be revisited to ascertain deliverability.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					than for example whether the site has been a historic development plan allocation as this has no bearing on deliverability now.			
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA110	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA29	Agree	We do agree with most of the criteria, however just because a site is allocated for a use within a Development Plan does not mean that it will be available within a sensible time period	Allocation does not necessarily mean availability.	Support noted. Deliverability of sites including Allocated sites will be considered as part of the SHLAA process.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA153	Agree	Other availability criteria:  - Empty Houses, whether or not being difficult to achieve, should be at the top of the availability criteria.  - Compulsory purchases for 'grot spots' would make often key sites available for use.  - Council owned surface car parking could be better utilised for housing and the same amount of car parking space could be provided underground.	Empty homes should be at top of availability criteria.  Surface car parks could be better utilised for housing and car parking provided underground  Compulsory purchase for 'grot spots' [By TWBC]	Support noted. Empty homes now to be considered as windfalls  Not appropriate to add Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) to table as this is a means to overcome potential constraints. However, recognise that CPO could theoretically be utilised at a later date to ensure deliverability of sites.  SHLAA will consider whether certain car parks could be developed. Issue of underground car parking could be considered where it relates to deliverability.	No Change
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA139	Agree	Other availability criteria:  Compulsory purchase - with back to back agreements with the Council's Development Partner, could be a factor in the later stages of the plan – provided that a compelling case in the public interest overrides other motives.	Other availability criteria: Compulsory purchase with back to back agreements with Council's Development Partner [By TWBC]	Support noted. Not appropriate to add Compulsory Purchase Orders (CPO) to table as this is a means to overcome potential constraints. However, recognise that CPO could theoretically be utilised at a later date to ensure deliverability of sites.	No Change
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic	SHLAA130	Disagree	This doesn't seem to acknowledge that suitable sites may be held back by owners (land-banking).	Doesn't acknowledge land banking	Comment noted. Landowners/Developers/ Agents will be contacted to	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
		Society					establish likely timeframe when site will be available, if not already known. SHLAA will be a material consideration when determining planning applications.	
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA182		The following criteria should be added to the list;  Sites with low biodiversity value - Surveys carried out prior to site allocation do not remove the need for surveys to be carried out prior to determination of any planning application. There may be a significant period of time between the initial survey and land being used for development and the survey results may alter.	The results of biodiversity surveys may change by the time site is put forward to be developed	Comment noted. Landowners/Developers/Agents will be contacted to establish likely timeframe when site will be available, if not already known and the time to develop these. These estimates should include all possible time delays.	No Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA100	Agree	It should be noted that for the purposes of PPS3 a site need not be entirely vacant to be considered to be available, rather it should be capable of becoming available within the prescribed timeframe.	For a site to be considered available, needs to become vacant, i.e. available within the prescribed timeframe [By TWBC]	Support noted. Landowners/Developers/Agents will be contacted to establish likely timeframe when site will be available, if not already known.	No Change
<b>Question 13</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA87	Agree	Yes. In principle the approach seems appropriate.  It is necessary to test viability to ensure that sites which are allocated can make the necessary S106 contributions and will not seek to resist these on grounds of viability, for example as a result of heavy site clean up cost	Test viability to ensure that sites that are allocated can make the necessary s106 contributions [By TWBC]	Support noted. Testing viability will include consideration of development contributions.	No Change
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA111	Disagree	There appears to be confusion in the LPA's approach. It is agreed that the residual valuation approach is the appropriate method to determine viability and deliverability of development in accordance with para 29 of PPS3. However it is noteworthy that in the LPA's approach that developer's profit does not feature. It should.  The residual approach can be used either to determine the level of developer's profit where land acquisition costs are known, or alternatively to derive residual land value against an assumed developer's	Developer's profit does not feature. Residual approach can be used either to determine level of developer's profit where land acquisition costs are known or alternatively to derive residual land value against an assumed developer's profit / rate of return [By TWBC].	Comment noted. Residual valuation approach set out in stage 7c of the draft SHLAA methodology does refer to target profit.	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					profit / rate of return.  There needs to be clarity in relation to the approach to be used.			
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA30	Agree	<p>The overall approach is agreed but some refinement may be needed. For example, the time period for development will vary dependant upon the strength of the housing market with longer periods for marketing required in a weak market.</p> <p>The type of residential provision is also an essential consideration as to viability. Currently site demand for flat developments is weak whereas sites suitable for family homes are in higher demand and thus more viable.</p> <p>It is stated that it is reasonable to assume that for the majority of residential sites in the Borough viability is not likely to be an issue. With the current downturn in the residential market it may be that a residual valuation for residential shows a site to be viable but if the residual for an alternative commercial use is more viable the site may still not come forward for residential purposes.</p>	Time period for development. Type of residential suitable for site and strength of market for this. Commercial may become more viable.	Support noted. Recognise housing market will vary over time. SHLAA is not a one off study and its updating will be an integral part of the Annual Monitoring Report as stated under Chapter 6 of the draft SHLAA Methodology.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA154	Disagree	<p>We strongly disagree with any site size threshold (0.2ha) and the use of 'windfall allowance'. (SEE: Question 04 and 7)</p> <p>With regard to para 4.83 - "... due to the strength of the market. This is likely to continue due to the existing labour market situation and limited spare housing capacity. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that, for the majority of potential sites within the Borough, viability for residential uses is unlikely to be an issue".</p> <p>- we would not want the Council to rely on near clairvoyance.</p> <p>Please delete this, as with the present crises among Mortgage Banks a prediction to justify achievability for development is not sustainable.</p>	<p>Disagree with site size threshold and use of windfall allowance.</p> <p>Not reasonable to assume that strength of market will continue.</p> <p>Should also involve communities.</p> <p>Delete reference to strength of market...viability for residential uses unlikely to be an issue.</p> <p>Also use community</p>	<p>Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.</p> <p>Intention is to seek advice of a professional survey to test the realism of factors considered. Will also seek views of landowners/developers/agents</p> <p>Wider community involvement</p>	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>Not only Housebuilders, Estate Agents and advice of a professional surveyor , but Community involvement and local knowledge should be a priority in para 4.89.</p> <p>Finally, with regard to APPENDIX 2 - we should like a copy of the FINAL REPORT,</p> <p>to be issued in August 2008.</p>	<p>involvement, who have local knowledge [By TWBC]</p>	<p>will take place at the Submission Stage of the Core Strategy and when producing Development Plan Documents/Supplementary Planning Documents</p> <p>The SHLAA is not a policy document. A more proactive strategy may be pursued through the Core Strategy and/or subsequent Development Plan Documents/Supplementary Planning Documents. SHLAA will be a material consideration and can inform decision making about windfall sites.</p>	
25587	Mr Brian Lloyd	Campaign to Protect Rural England	SHLAA72	Disagree	<p>It is suggested that Stage 7c will involve an assessment of the viability of the site for a range of uses, not just housing. This seems to be unnecessary work as part of the SHLAA, where the assessment should be simply a matter of the viability of the site for housing. Certainly the Practice Guide does not suggest the need to extend the assessment to consider the viability of sites for other uses.</p>	<p>Suggested that Stage 7c will include an assessment of viability of site for a range of uses. Unnecessary work as part of the SHLAA [By TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SHLAA Practice Guidance recognises that there are advantages to undertaking land availability assessments for housing in parallel with those for other uses. Therefore, it is appropriate to consider the achievability of uses although the outcomes will probably not be contained within the SHLAA unless they are mixed use sites.</p>	Partial Change
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA140	Disagree	<p>The approach does not appear to take account of the need of affordable housing.</p> <p>Also, Community involvement should be included in para 4.89 – not just Housebuilders and Estate Agents.</p> <p>With regard to APPENDIX 2 - we should like a copy of the FINAL REPORT, to be issued in August 2008, which should be publicly available.</p>	<p>Approach does not take account of need for affordable housing [By TWBC]</p> <p>Community Involvement should be included in paragraph 4.89</p>	<p>Comment noted. Affordable housing would be considered under the "planning requirements" criterion. Wider community involvement will take place at the Submission Stage of the Core Strategy and when producing Development Plan Documents/Supplementary Planning Documents</p>	No Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA131	Disagree	We doubt the ability of the Council to simulate the costs and margins of a developer on individual sites accurately enough for this purpose.	Doubt ability of Council to simulate costs and margins accurately enough [By TWBC]	Comment noted. Intention is to seek advice of a professional surveyor to test the realism of factors considered. Will also seek views of landowners/developers/ agents.	Partial Change
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning Associates	SHLAA39	Disagree	<p>It will be extremely difficult to get a realistic valuation on any development site without detailed information. There are a myriad of factors that affect viability, and with the best will in the world, the Council's methodology will produce only a cursory assessment.</p> <p>Although we do not disagree with the methodology per se, we would caution against placing undue weight on this part of the assessment. The results may be sufficient to show that a particular site is likely to achieve a negative value and which would therefore raise concerns regarding deliverability, but the lack of a negative value and the existence of a notional profit margin cannot of itself be taken as evidence of viability, particularly since the Council is not in a position to determine land value, the relative importance attached to existing use value, and the many other factors that impact upon development costs and landowner aspirations.</p>	Difficult to get realistic valuation on any development site without detailed information. Don't place undue weight on this part of the assessment. Council not in a position to determine land value.	Comment noted. It is already recognised in the Draft SHLAA methodology that the value of land is determined by a large number of factors. The Council intends to seek the advice of a professional surveyor in testing the realism of the factors to be considered. There is also the intention to seek the views of landowners/ developers/planning agents.	Partial Change
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA183	Agree	Yes		Support noted.	No Change
74446	Benenden Hospital Trust	Benenden Hospital Trust	SHLAA58	Disagree	I can't see how this would work in practice. Calculating whether a development is viable is an incredibly complex process which depends on several factors which can vary significantly over time. If calculating viability can sometimes be difficult for developers looking at one or two sites, how can the Council conduct a meaningful exercise looking at this many sites and have confidence that they have the answer right? If the exercise is to be done properly, the Council would need an immense amount of data and resources to do this work - that simply won't happen and so it is inevitable that the exercise won't be done properly. This leads to a risk	The viability assessment process is fundamentally flawed. The Council cannot possibly have the resources and date to make an accurate and meaningful assessment.	Comment noted. It is already recognised in the Draft SHLAA methodology that the value of land is determined by a large number of factors. The Council intends to seek the advice of a professional surveyor in testing the realism of the factors to be considered. There is also the intention to seek the views of landowners/developers/planning agents. It is recognised that if the site is likely to be required	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>that sites known to developers to be viable may be excluded by the Council on the basis of a flawed exercise. Furthermore, sites which may not be viable (or have marginal viability) now may become viable by the time they pass through the planning process.</p> <p>A better solution would be to consider all sites as being viable unless there is a very good reason to suspect otherwise. If further evidence on viability is required, it should be directly sought from landowners.</p>		<p>for allocation purposes at a later date, then the Council will consider whether it is necessary to commission more detailed information prior to making such an allocation.</p> <p>The SHLAA itself is not a one-off exercise and its updating is an integral part of the Annual Monitoring Report exercise.</p>	
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA101	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
<b>Question14</b>								
108911	Mr P Watson	Phillips Planning	SHLAA88	Disagree	<p>No. Paragraph 59 of PPS3 clearly states that:</p> <p>“Allowances for windfalls should not be included in the first 10 years of land supply unless Local planning Authorities can provide robust evidence of genuine local circumstances that prevent sites being identified.”</p> <p>The consultation paper in effect is suggesting that the Council will seek to rely on windfalls in years 6 – 10 with the justification for this being purely that the Council wishes to avoid Greenfield / Greenbelt development.</p> <p>We respectfully submit that this does not meet the PPS 3 test which requires robust evidence as to why local circumstances prevent sites being identified.</p> <p>The Council's wish to resist Greenfield development does not actually prevent it from identifying sufficient sites. Such a proposition could be made by any authority.</p>	There needs to be robust evidence as to why local circumstances prevent sites being identified [by TWBC]	<p>Comment noted. Sites within the Green Belt are not to be excluded from the SHLAA process. Stages 6 and 7 will ensure that there is a robust evidence base to assess sites.</p> <p>The SHLAA Methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.</p>	Partial Change
117374	Mr Asher Ross	Indigo Planning	SHLAA160	Disagree	There are no specific reasons why windfalls should be part of the of the 6-10 year supply. Windfalls should be considered in addition to allocations (whether these are greenfield or brownfield)	Windfalls should not be looked at in years 6-10 but should be considered in addition to allocations [by TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
							years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	
129403	Kilmartin		SHLAA112	Disagree	This appears to represent an approach to windfalls, by another name. To the extent that other sites come forward in addition to allocations, these should be regarded as a positive benefit to the area, not premature development.	Windfall sites should be regarded as a positive benefit not as premature development [by TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change
129895	Mr Guy Dixon	Savills Ltd	SHLAA113	Disagree	<p>Given the historic windfall figures providing for up to 75% of the total housing provision, the borough council should be doing their utmost to ensure clarity over future housing development sources. A realistic assessment should be made of any windfall allowance to ensure that development is clearly following this development plan and giving priority to allocated sites which have been fully tested in sustainability terms. This would ensure greater clarity on the location of future development within the borough and will uphold the requirements of a plan led system.</p> <p>We also have to question whether a windfall allowance is appropriate at all given that Development Plan Documents should be front loaded and provide as much clarity as possible. If incorporating such an allowance is found to be sound, the allowance should be realistic and fully</p>	Object to windfall allowance being incorporated in projected supply figures [By TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					justified (recognising that many of the windfall opportunities have already been exhausted, and that in future the planning system may be less receptive to windfall development).			
24757	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	Crest Nicholson and Gleeson Homes	SHLAA64	Disagree	As set out in our earlier representations to the Core Strategy Preferred Options, this approach is flawed and against the principles of PPS3. Paragraph 59 of PPS3 states that the decision to include windfalls in the first ten years of housing land supply should be informed by the SHLAA, therefore, not built into the SHLAA methodology. It is considered premature to be considering inclusion of windfall at this preparatory stage.	Use of windfall sites in years 1-10 should be informed by the SHLAA and not form part of its methodology [by TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change
24920	Mr P Errington	Home Builders Federation	SHLAA168		Small Site Windfalls  HBF's answer to this question is "no" for the reasons set out under the 'windfall supply' heading above. Paragraph 59 of PPS3 applies.	Refers to para 59 of PPS3	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change
25081	Ms E McDonald	Notcutt Nurseries Ltd	SHLAA31		Will a review of the Green Belt boundaries which we would support, impact upon the need for such windfall allowance?	A review of Green Belt boundaries may impact upon need to rely upon windfall sites [by TWBC]	Comment noted. Sites within the Green Belt are not to be excluded from the SHLAA process.	No Change
25289	Dr Daniel Bech	Telephone House Neighbours Association	SHLAA155	Disagree	As windfall sites bring up speculation problems, grot spots and uncertainty for communities, we think that all types of land should be properly and proactively form part of the assessment. (SEE Question 04)	All sites, including small sites, should be included within the Assessment  Density should not	Comment noted. Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					<p>We strongly disagree with ANY site size threshold and oppose the notorious use of "windfall allowance". (SEE Question 07)</p> <p>It is not appropriate to copy density figures from the adjacent area.</p> <p>Smaller plots with high density can have, as confirmed in para 4.94, not only an economically negative impact but also a negative factor for building strong communities, as often these sites have only transient occupation.(SEE Question 11)</p> <p>We disagree with the "allowance made on the basis of a thorough understanding of character", in para 5.9 - and disagree with the statement "the TUCA provides a reasonable degree of certainty" in para 5.10.</p>	necessarily copy the adjacent area  [by TWBC]	<p>site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above 0.2ha.</p> <p>Stages 6 and 7 will assess the type of development that is appropriate for each particular site</p>	
25856	Dr Philip Whitbourn	Royal Tunbridge Wells Town Forum	SHLAA141	Disagree	<p>(SEE: Question 04)</p> <p>As stated in the RTW Town Forum's response to the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chapter 6 – Spatial Strategy Reasoned Justification (e) The Nature of Development Opportunities (p. 17/18 – para 6.24 - 6.26)</li> <li>- Core Policy 7 – Housing Provision (p. 33 – p.36 and para 7.45 - 7.61)</li> </ul> <p>we are against a laissez-faire approach to windfall sites for the good reasons of uncertainty for communities, developers and planners alike, touched upon in Government advice.</p> <p>We think that all types of land should be properly and proactively considered as part of the assessment.</p> <p>(SEE: Question 07)</p> <p>We strongly disagree with any site size threshold</p>	<p>Reliance on windfall sites do not provide certainty</p> <p>Disagree with any site size threshold</p> <p>[by TWBC]</p>	<p>Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.</p> <p>Paragraph 25 of the SHLAA Practice Guidance refers to factors to take into account in determining how intensive (minimum size of site to be surveyed) the survey element of the assessment should be. Therefore, it is appropriate to only consider sites above</p>	Partial Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					(0.2ha) and think the "windfall allowance" to be a cop out. The job needs to be done properly, regardless of site size. A small site at a high density could well prove more significant in housing terms than a larger site with a lower density.		0.2ha.	
25861	Dr Alastair Tod	Royal Tunbridge Wells Civic Society	SHLAA132	Agree			Support noted.	No Change
25879	Mr Kevin Coleman	Fairfield Partnership c/o JB Planning Associates	SHLAA40	Disagree	<p>We do not agree that there are particular circumstances which justify a windfall allowance in Tunbridge Wells. The existence of towns surrounded by Green Belt and areas of ecological and landscape sensitivity are essentially common to large numbers of districts throughout the South-East, East of England, East Midlands etc. All of these areas have historically derived part of their housing supply from windfalls, both large and small. The existence of the Green Belt and other environmental/policy constraints cannot be sufficient justification for setting aside the PPS3 presumption against windfalls in years 1-10.</p> <p>The site identification procedure is designed to identify as many specific development locations as possible. Because of that, the rates of windfall development that have occurred in the past will be reduced anyway, since many sites that would previously have been windfall will not be allocated.</p> <p>Since the Council will no doubt be phasing the release of sites through the plan period, there is no reason why the supply from such small sites should not be taken into account as part of annual monitoring, and this can be used to prevent the release of additional land that is not required. The converse, however, and the reason why PPS3 requires more certainty in the 10 year supply, is that the delay in releasing land for housing premised upon an unsubstantiated and unidentifiable source of 'windfall' sites is harmful to the maintenance of a continuous and steady supply of development sites.</p>	Disagree that special circumstances exist to justify a windfall allowance. Any surplus in years 1-10 arising from additional sites can be used to re-phase or delay development envisaged for years 10-15, as part of the process of monitoring and managing a 5 year land supply.	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
					The correct approach is therefore to exclude windfalls from the 10 year supply, but to monitor their delivery and, if need be, delay the release of land in years 10-15 if such sites turn out not to be required because of the extent of additional development realised in years 1-10.			
25920	Mr D Veasey	South East England Regional Assembly	SHLAA74	Disagree	In terms of our task group discussions, perhaps the key point is not to construct the exercise in such a way that it leads inevitably to windfalls comprising a significant part of forecast supply. Such an approach will not find GOSE support and is risky in terms of soundness. In other words, all potential sources of supply should be properly tested. Having done so, if you still find yourself in a position where windfalls contribute any more than a modest fraction of forecast supply we recommend discussing the matter with GOSE. From a soundness perspective you would want GOSE to understand and support the evidence on particular local circumstances that might justify exceptional reliance on windfalls.	There is an need to ensure that GOSE understands and supports the evidence on particular local circumstances that might justify exceptional reliance on windfalls [by TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change
71819	Miss Elizabeth Shier	Kent County Council	SHLAA184		It may be appropriate to consider windfall sites throughout the plan period.	Consider windfall sites throughout plan period	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	Change
74455	Mrs M Tyrwhitt		SHLAA102	Disagree	The Council should be seeking to identify as many sites as possible of a scale, nature and location to correspond with identified housing needs. There should be a move away from dependency on small windfall sites towards the identification of larger scale sites better able to make provision for a range of housing types and tenures.	Sites need to be sought to meet identified housing needs - windfalls should not be depended upon [By TWBC]	Comment noted. The SHLAA methodology will be altered to make it clear that the Council will not seek to include an allowance for small sites within years 6-10. Instead, the Council will follow the SHLAA practice	Change

**TUNBRIDGE WELLS BOROUGH LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK  
DRAFT STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT  
REPORT OF CONSULTATION RESPONSES 25 FEBRUARY TO 24 MARCH 2008**

Consultee ID	Full Name	Organisation	Comment ID	Nature of Response	Response	Summary Response	Officers' Recommendation	Outcome
							guidance and following the review, if there are still insufficient sites, then it will be necessary to consider broad locations for future housing growth and/or the use of a windfall allowance.	