

I am dismayed at the substantive changes that have been put forward by the WEP at the eleventh hour, particularly when the matter of addressing urban extensions within Policy 5 has been before them for a considerable time. I am not aware that anyone has formally objected to the inclusion of the 'adopted urban extensions' within Policy 5 and that includes the Local Authorities themselves. The future of urban extensions is uncertain and will be the subject of considerable debate in at least 3 Core Strategies within the WEP, as yet to take place. It is therefore premature for WEP to seek to remove them from a Key Policy of the WCS, when there was no objection to their inclusion in the first place.

The recent legal case regarding the significance of the RSS only serves to confirm the uncertainty that exists around this area of National Planning Policy and equally within local Core Strategies.

WEP have given no adequate justification why they feel it necessary to delete this from Policy 5 and it would seem that the careful wording that exists within the policy already covers the issue of whether this policy of urban extensions is relevant, by the use of the term 'adopted', thereby signalling that the precondition to the consideration of urban extensions is that they are identified in the adopted Local Core Strategy. This seems entirely sensible and reasonable.

Therefore the proposed alteration which is PC 52 we wish to object to most strongly. It should be reinstated in full.

The nature of our objection related to the extent to which the WEP had carried out an adequate HRA to support the policy wording relating to urban extensions. Despite their protestations that they had indeed carried out this work, they were unable to point to the evidence. Their ultimate response to delete part of the policy relating to adopted urban extensions is not rational or sound. We have only sought to refer to an appropriate caveat to this policy to overcome the lack of HRA evidence, in particular the use of thermal treatment.

Consequently we wish to maintain our representation in respect of this element of the policy.

We do suggest that perhaps the most pragmatic solution to the lack of HRA evidence is that the proposed WEP wording in PC54 be used within Policy 5 itself, so that it covers both : urban extensions, and Strategic Areas A&B and indeed all proposals for specific sites, including the Fullers Earth Works Site. We suggest that taking the proposed WEP wording for PC54 and substituting the words "in particular" with the word "however" at the beginning and inserting the revised wording into the Policy 5 following the words: "The facilities proposed will be required to contribute to the Spatial Strategy illustrated in Figure 6.1", .....

This will obviate the need to repeat this in the appendices to the Plan and ensure that the Policy wording itself, adequately addresses HRA requirements.

Yours sincerely

Matthew Macan

This representation is made on behalf of the Hignett Family