

Cabinet 9 June 2016 – Tabled Papers

Agenda Item No.10 – The Local Plan to 2030 – Regulation 19 Draft Plan for Publication

Please note the following comments received from Mr Davison.

As the ABC Councillor for Hamstreet up to May 2015, the Orlestone Parish Council Chairman George Sparks has asked me to forward comments representative of the residents of Hamstreet. In general the section on Hamstreet in the Agenda, which is the basis for consultation omits several key issues that should we believe be included. They are:

- a) There is no local need for this development.*
- b) The site is outside the village envelope and cut off from the village centre by the railway line.*
- c) 100% of village residents attending the ABC site display in the village voted AGAINST using this site for development.*
- d) Alternative sites are available.*
- e) Site S30 is productive farmland.*
- f) Houses built at the far end (North East) will be too far for residents to walk to the shops in the village centre. Not only an inconvenience but a cause for extra car use in an already crowded village.*
- g) The Site owners had offered the school land to rent without it being tied to housing. Why therefore was this option not investigated first.*
- h) ABC has recognised that Hamstreet has had a series of housebuilding developments in recent years (eg Bank Side, Lancaster Close 1, Orlestone View, Lancaster Close 2) and should not be the subject of continual major development.*
- i) The houses in S30 are not for local people. 80 houses could bring some 300 residents with their parking and road congestion. The site has only one access point to the road system.*
- j) Hamstreet has a population of circa 1500. An extra 300 would create a severe social and physical impact, contrary to local policy.*
- k) Existing residents are concerned at losing their rural identity and village way of life.*

- l) The site will be clearly visible form the surrounding area including from Romney Marsh.*
- m) Planning policies refer to the protection of countryside for its own sake and protection from any adverse impact of development.*
- n) Requests from OPC to discuss this site once it became obvious that the likely choice had gone from other sites was not agreed by ABC. OPC therefore had a likely proposal for a site rejected by the village which ABC would not discuss. However it appears that ABC did hold discussions with the School, which of course does not represent the village.*

Keith Fearon
Member Services and Scrutiny Manager