



Tendring Local Plan

Examination Hearing Statement Addendum

Question 2.6

Prepared by Strutt & Parker on behalf of Welbeck Strategic Land IV LLP

January 2021

1.0 Introduction and Background

- 1.1 Strutt & Parker made representations on the Tendring District Local Plan Publication (Regulation 19) Draft ('the eLP') on behalf of Wivenhoe Park Estates in 2017 and in respect of policies LP1, SP1, SP2, SP3, SPL1, SPL2, and PP3 (the Regulation 19 representations).
- 1.2 These representations (Comment ID LPPuD 272 and LPPuD 275) were duly made.
- 1.3 Subsequently Wivenhoe Park Estates authorised Welbeck Strategic Land IV LLP (Welbeck Land) to advance these representations through the Local Plan Examination.
- 1.4 A Hearing Statement in relation to Matter 2 was prepared and submitted to the Examination by Strutt & Parker on behalf of Welbeck Land, in response to questions posed in the Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs).
- 1.5 On 8 February 2021, revised Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) were published. These included the following additional question (question 2.6):

Have the sites allocated for development in the plan been appraised and selected in comparison with possible alternatives using a robust and objective process?
- 1.6 This Hearing Statement Addendum provides a response to the above question only. It does not repeat points made in the original Matter 2 Hearing Statement submitted on behalf of Welbeck Land, and should be read in conjunction with that Hearing Statement.

2.0 Response to Question 2.6

Have the sites allocated for development in the plan been appraised and selected in comparison with possible alternatives using a robust and objective process?

- 2.1 We consider that possible alternative / additional sites for allocation through the Local Plan have been rejected for spurious reasons, and based on erroneous assessment of their deliverability.
- 2.2 Examples of such sites include RSC5 and RSC6, the assessment and reasons given for the rejection of which is discussed within our original Hearing Statement.
- 2.3 As set out in paragraphs 2.19 – 2.22 of our original Hearing Statement, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) (2019) provides no evidential basis for the rejection of site RSC5, which adjoins the existing settlement boundary of Elmstead Market. Indeed, the SHLAA (2019) found there were no irresolvable environmental, physical or infrastructure constraints in relation to the site's suitability for residential development. The site would represent a logical extension to an existing settlement that has been found suitable for additional growth through recent planning decision-making, and which is proposed to be designated as a Rural Service Centre in the submitted Local Plan.
- 2.4 In respect of site RSC6 (also adjoining Elmstead Market), the SHLAA (2019) did not conclude that the site was unsuitable. Rather, the basis for concluding the site was not deliverable appears to have been the assertion that the site is not available for development. However, this is simply incorrect. The site was actively promoted for development by Wivenhoe Park Estates (as landowner), and is now being promoted for development by Welbeck Land.