

Dear Mr Slater

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Peasmarsh Neighbourhood Development Plan which has been developed by residents with the support of the parish council.

Having now read the document sent to you by Dr Mike Inkson I would like to expand on the policy S1 and hope it helps provide a little more background to the thinking on this point and would welcome any advice / wording that you could suggest.

**Policy S1: Development Size** - The PC believe the points made in paragraphs 42, 43 and 45 are strong arguments in support of the community's desire that there should not be more than 10 houses in a development but also recognises, as you have pointed out, that this could lead to unintended consequences but as two of the four sites are only suitable for less than ten units with the other two only being suitable for ten the PC feels that the figure quoted is appropriate in the context of the plan.

Looking at the longer term should any new developments be proposed then having a low maximum number as a starting point for a development will give the PC the opportunity to address two big concerns it has namely that of viability and affordability which are inextricably linked.

Viability is often a contentious issue which can unfortunately sometimes be used by a developer as an argument to build more houses, apply cuts to the affordable housing ratio or even both and with affordability being defined as 80% of market value then with a median house price in Peasmarsh of around £400,000 this effectively makes it unaffordable for locals.

However, given the potential lifetime of the plan the PC is conscious that not only the current council, but future ones will need to take account of changing situations and needs and therefore, will need a more flexible approach to any proposed development and must be prepared to accept a higher number of houses (25-30?) with the proviso that a satisfactory agreement on affordability and viability is reached with a developer.

### **PC response to comments for Lord and Lady Devonport in relation to Tanyard Field and Tanhouse**

These sites have been rejected several times over the last twenty years or so, the last being by RDC deeming it as unsuitable for development in its 2016 DaSA (Appendix 3)

In early 2020 the PC was approached by a company representing Lord Devonport with a proposal to build on Tanyard Field a mixed community-based living scheme to incorporate units for over 60's, starter homes, family and affordable. Integrated communal amenity space a 20-bed nursing home, doctor's surgery / polyclinic, youth centre, Special Educational Needs centre (SEN) together with an allocated parking area along School Lane for term time use with access to the main site being through the existing access on Main Street.

A proposed second site Tanhouse (the field close to Jempsons supermarket) for 24 semi-detached mixed housing allocation directly associated with the Peasmarsh community, in agreement with RDC and the PC. They also indicated that the immediate needs of the community such as doctor's surgery/clinic and care home would be addressed first, and the rest of the housing rolled out as demand arose. It was estimated that the development rollout period would be in the order of 4-5 years.

In April 2022 Ethical Partnership representing Lord Devonport conducted a 2-day consultation in Peasmarsh Memorial Hall with a somewhat watered-down version of the above 2020 scheme which had more emphasis on providing housing rather than infrastructure. The consultation was not particularly well executed and drew a lot of negative comments about the proposals from those residents who attended.

Given that both the 2020 and 2022 schemes have indicated that up to 100 new dwellings could potentially be built with no reference given to how the current infrastructure problems can be overcome it is hard to envisage how such a large project such as this could be achieved without first resolving the current infrastructure issues identified in the plan.

As regard to the question of a technical solution to the flooding issues on the two sites the answer is quite simply that the whole system needs to be upgraded, modernised, and made fit for purpose which at present it is not.