



Cranbook Plan
Examination in Public
Matter 16
Hearing Position Statement

Boyer

CRANBROOK PLAN

EXAMINATION IN PUBLIC

MATTER 16: SUBJECT SPECIFIC POLICIES (1)

BOYER ON BEHALF OF MR & MRS PYLE / HARROW ESTATES PLC

REP ID: 144

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Question 192	3
3. Question 193	4

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 On behalf of our clients, Mr & Mrs Pyle/Harrow Estates Plc, Boyer has prepared this Statement in relation to Treasbeare Farm, which comprises approximately 65 ha of land, and is allocated for development as part Policy CB3 in the Submission Draft of the Cranbrook Local Plan.
- 1.2 Both parties fully support this allocation (save for the comments made in the representations made to the Submission Draft and those contained in the Hearing Statement to the Examination) and are working with the Council to prepare a Statement of Common Ground.
- 1.3 For clarity, and as explained in Examination Document PSD2 (Planning Application Summary 2019) the site is subject to two separate planning applications currently held in abeyance (LPA Ref: 15/0045/MOUT and 17/1482/MOUT). These applications were made by Hallam Land and Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd. The Option Agreements prevailing at the time of these previous applications have now expired and Mr and Mrs Pyle (Landowners) are currently in negotiations with Harrow Estates. These negotiations are at an advanced stage with Heads of Terms agreed. .

2. QUESTION 192

What is the delivery mechanism for the alternative low carbon and renewable energy facility through Policy CB14?

- 2.1 Land safeguarded for energy uses relates to land within the Treasbeare Expansion Area and corresponds with the specific policy requirement within Policy CB3 for 2ha of land to be safeguarded for an extension to the District Heating Energy Centre.
- 2.2 There is a discrepancy between the requirements of Policy CB3 (i.e. 2ha) and the supporting text to CB14, where it states that **3 hectares** of land is safeguarded in close proximity to the existing energy centre to facilitate the transition and decarbonisation of the Energy Centre.
- 2.3 There is no detail in the supporting evidence that provides clarity to demonstrate precisely what is required and the timelines for the decarbonisation of the Energy Centre. The Heat Network Strategies for the West End of East Devon [**Cran022**] was produced in 2016 and its value and relevance to the specific strategy to safeguard land is unclear.
- 2.4 For the safeguarded area to be retained there should be greater clarity and evidence to support this and this should include details as to how this expansion of the District Heating Energy Centre is going to be delivered and what certainty there is that this is a realistic prospect within the Plan period.
- 2.5 Understanding the delivery mechanism can provide the ability to monitor the delivery of the extension to the District Heating Energy Centre and also trigger the release of this safeguarded land for alternative uses when it is evident that the safeguarding is no longer necessary.

3. QUESTION 193

Should there be flexibility included within policy CB14 regarding safeguarded land should alternative provision not be delivered?

- 3.1 It cannot be considered effective for a policy to safeguard land without sufficient justification that the intended purpose is achievable and deliverable. It is not effective to safeguard land in perpetuity, particularly when there appears to be an absence of any evidence to justify the decision to safeguard land in the first instance. Where such land is no longer required, then the policy should provide for sufficient flexibility to allow for appropriate alternative uses to come forward.
- 3.2 Moreover, it is not clear why the land proposed to be safeguarded is excluded from the Built up Area boundary at Treasbeare. This land should be incorporated into the Built up Area Boundary as it designated for a specific use that would represent built development. This again demonstrates the inconsistency with the Built Up Area Boundaries. By including this land within the boundary, it would provide the required flexibility, alongside revisions to the wording of CB14, to allow for alternative uses where it is demonstrated that the safeguarding of this land is no longer necessary.