

RAPLEYS

Hearing Statement
Summerbrook Limited (Representor Ref: 51989)
**WINCHESTER LOCAL PLAN
PART 2 EXAMINATION
MATTER 5 POLICY DM13**

16 June 2016
Our Ref: 1088/63/1

Contents

1 Introduction 2
2 Representations..... 2

1 INTRODUCTION

This statement has been prepared on behalf of Summerbrook Limited in response to Inspector's Matter 5.

This statement relates specially to Policy DM13, and responds to the following Inspector's question:

- i) Are policies DM13-33 reasonable and realistic, clear and consistent with national policies/guidance and do they establish suitable and appropriate criteria?

As stated in the previous representations, dated 17 December 2015, to the pre-submission Local Plan Part 2 consultation, our client is the freehold owner of Winchester Trade Park ('WTP') to which this statement relates. WTP lies on Eastern Lane, and the site extends approximately 1.2 hectare, currently comprising 16 purpose built units, in four separate blocks.

Summerbrook manages WTP and continues to invest in the ongoing maintenance and enhancement of the site, in order to ensure that WTP maintains a high level of occupancy and continues to thrive as a major contributor to the local economy.

Our representations seek an appropriate policy framework for WTP so as to ensure that our client's ongoing and future operational needs are met and their growth and enhancements which contribute to the local economy are supported.

2 REPRESENTATIONS

This policy requires a Masterplan for proposals on sites occupied by major landowners/users and supporting paragraph 6.4.7 states that such Masterplans should be prepared before, or in conjunction with, the submission of development proposals. We object to this policy as the requirement is ambiguous, and the wording of the policy does not provide a clear indication or guidance to applicants whether a Masterplan will be required for their proposals.

Furthermore, this ambiguity is contrary to the NPPF which requires Local Plans to set out clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where, and to include only policies which provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the Plan (Paragraph 154). This is to ensure that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay.

For these reasons, the policy is considered to unjustified and ineffective, and could place unnecessary barriers to economic development coming forward. Accordingly, the wording of the policy should be amended to ensure that developments proposed by landowners, which do not warrant a comprehensive masterplan approach, are not subject to any unnecessary delay.

We respectfully request that our client's representations will be fully taken into consideration in the examination.