

REPORT on PUBLIC HEARING on 23rd March 2017 at TBC Council Offices

Liz Beth, the Examiner for our NDP, chaired the meeting. Those taking part were: Paul Hardiman, Matt Barker from TBC Planning, a representative from the TBC legal department, representatives from Charles Church and Gallaghers, Mervyn Dobson from Pembury Estates, Phil Aplin and myself representing Gotherington Parish Council.

Liz Beth stated that she was independent of any groups and was holding this meeting to

- i) clarify aspects of designated sites in the GNDP that have been impacted by recent planning permissions including the suggested capacity and boundary details where relevant; and
- ii) Discuss settlement boundary details and criteria.

The format of the meeting was to ask TBC Planners to comment first, then the representatives of the developers, and finally we were asked to comment.

There was much discussion and comment from the developers on dwellings numbers in that TBC Planners had permitted only 10 dwellings on GNDP2/3 instead of the 24 suggested in the GNDP. Mervyn Dobson protested that Pembury had consulted with our Parish Council and Steering Group who were satisfied with the number of dwellings but TBC gave them no choice but to accept the lower number or they would be refused planning permission. Liz Beth demanded an answer from TBC on why this had occurred and the response was basically tapering at the east end of the village.

Because numbers of dwellings were the main topic at this point, I outlined the Steering Group's approach to gathering data from Gotherington residents which resulted in a summary of what people wished to see in a future Gotherington. These included: multiple sites, maintenance of the linearity of the village and development spread over 15 years. I stressed that we were not against development but we wished to state where it would be sited.

There was some discussion on how many dwellings we would prefer on GNDP2/3 and our response was that whilst the 50 dwellings had been approved for GNDP2/2, we would accept the 10 dwellings on GNDP2/3. This discussion seemed somewhat pointless since planning permissions had already been granted for these two sites, but Liz Beth seemed satisfied with the outcome.

After a short break, settlement boundaries were the subject for discussion and the conclusions were as follows:

The settlement boundary would be redrawn to encompass the four allocated sites, which are:

GNDP2/1 – Land to the north of Malleson Road. I reported that the owner of this site would like to confine the number of dwellings to be a small frontage development of about six to nine units including four bungalows. This would maintain the linear form of the village. He does not wish to "spoil" the village by allowing a larger number of dwellings to

be built but would be prepared to accept a few more dwellings if Gotherington, as a Service Village, has its allocation increased.

GNDP2/2 - Land to the south of Malleson Road where a development of 50 dwellings has been permitted. Charles Church has produced an outline of this development which is in the form of a trapezium where the rest of the site is undeveloped. We suggested that the settlement boundary should be drawn to enclose only the developed area, leaving the undeveloped area outside the boundary.

This was opposed by Charles Church but Liz Beth suggested that the undeveloped area be a 'green space' to give it some protection.

GNDP2/3 – Land to the north of Gretton Road where a development of 10 dwellings has been permitted. Mervyn said that Pembury may apply for further development in the future. We agreed that we would be prepared to accept a few more dwellings on this site if Gotherington, as a Service Village, has its allocation increased.

Red Roofs, Shutter Lane - TBC Ref: 16/01075/FUL for 2 dwellings. There was no further discussion on this development.

Stone Barn Lane Development currently being built out. These last two together would give rise to a crenulation pattern which would be smoothed out.

At this point, Liz Beth summarised the situation and said that she would be sending us her report by Easter. She will obviously place her own interpretations on the results of the Public Hearing.

Paul Hardiman said that we would not be able to reach the referendum stage by May because there had to be agreement with our parish council on any changes, followed by a six-week consultation stage, before the referendum.

Overall the Hearing was well controlled, fairly relaxed and I was permitted to discuss responses with Phil and other members of the Steering Group, which was much appreciated.

David Ward: 24/03/2017