Matter 1 Legal compliance

Sustainability Appraisal

5. Has the plan been subject to Sustainability Appraisal (SA), including a report on the published plan, which demonstrates, in a transparent manner, how the SA has influenced the evolution of the plan making process and have the requirements for Strategic Environmental Assessment been met?

6. Is the non-technical summary suitably concise? Has the SA followed the correct processes in terms of content and consultation? In particular, is the scoring methodology within the SA consistent, coherent and accurate?

7. What are the implications, if any, to the Sustainability Appraisal, as amended, of the proposed Main Modification put forward by the Council to remove reference to air quality impacts to the Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar sites?

8. Have all reasonable alternatives been considered in terms of strategy, policies and sites? Have these reasonable alternatives, including those set out within the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum 2019, been considered on a like for like basis? Is the evidence on which the scenarios are predicated consistent? Are there any policies, or strategies, where there were no reasonable alternative options to consider? If so, what is the justification?

Preamble

As members of the Ashdown Forest Stakeholders Forum, Wates agree with and support the submission of the Forum on Matter 1. In doing so Wates do however have additional comments to make given their specific interests in the District.

The Robustness of the SA and the issue of Reasonable Alternatives – Questions 5 and 8

1.1 The SA encompass the WLP Sustainability Appraisal Report (SAR) – March 20171, the WLP SAR of August 20182 and the SA addendum of Jan 20193. Given its length4 the full SA cannot be said to be a document that demonstrates, in a transparent manner, how the SA has influenced the evolution of the plan making process. Not only does it require one to go through a paper chase to try and establish why the WLP is as it is, but in many respects it is contradictory and confusing.

1.5 In this regard, we note that the SAR of March 2017 assesses 8 housing growth scenarios in chapter 55, the highest of which appears to be scenario C: 21,279 dwellings6. This is said to equal 23,333 dwellings including completions and covers the period 2013 – 2037 i.e. 972dpa7, and is not that dissimilar to the annual housing target promoted in the WLP. Table 13 explains why scenarios A – G were rejected.

---

1 We note Para 1.2 states: ‘This SA Report relates solely to the work undertaken, and the Local Plan produced, in March 2017, which was presented to Full Council on 22nd March 2017’
2 Which appraises the alternatives considered after March 2017
3 Which appraises two further growth scenarios
4 The SAR of Aug 2018 alone runs to nearly 3,000 pages, with a further 3,000 pages of appendices
5 See p99 March 2017 SAR
6 Not including completions of 2,054 from January 2013 to June 2016
7 23,333/24 = 972
and scenario H (11,456 dwellings\(^8\) over the period 2013 -2028 i.e. 763dpa), was chosen. The SAR of March 2017 then looks at the where to focus growth having regard to the sustainability of the settlements and the growth scenarios. It is only by going through tables 14 to 35 that one arrives at the final housing distribution strategy. This is not however a clear cut exercise and can hardly be called transparent. In this regard I note the following:

### JAA table 1.1\(^9\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth Scenario</th>
<th>Crowborough</th>
<th>Stone Cross</th>
<th>Hailsham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 19,586 2013-37</td>
<td>37 Table 21 P142</td>
<td>350 Table 21 P144</td>
<td>9,100 Table 21 P139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 21,556 2013-37</td>
<td>0 Table 22 P152</td>
<td>559 Table 22 P154</td>
<td>8,700 Table 22 p151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 23,333 2013-37</td>
<td>37 Table 23 P163</td>
<td>856 Table 23 P167</td>
<td>10,433 Table 23 P161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 14,101 2013-37</td>
<td>37 Table 24 P182</td>
<td>833 Table 24 P189</td>
<td>3,613 Table 24 P180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 11,456 2013-37</td>
<td>0 Table 25 P206</td>
<td>833 Table 25 P212</td>
<td>2,420 Table 25 P203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F PP as at 1.10.2017+470</td>
<td>37 Table 26 P224</td>
<td>833 Table 26 P228</td>
<td>3,613 Table 26 P223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 14,101 2013-28</td>
<td>0 Table 27 p238</td>
<td>833 Table 27 p241</td>
<td>2,420 Table 27 p237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 11,456 2013-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6 Not only does the SAR of March 2017 when assessing the districts settlements (tables 16 – 20) provide no clear guidance on which settlements in WDC’s opinion are the most sustainable and why, but as far as the chosen growth scenario and distribution of growth within each scenario is concerned, results in a situation where the level of growth to be directed to Hailsham is totally unclear, as all growth options for Hailsham are rejected. Furthermore the overall level of growth that is selected in the SAR of March 2017 does not correspond with that set out in policy WLP7 of the LP\(^10\). The Aug 2018 SAR\(^11\) explains that scenario H had since been rejected because it did not achieve the OAHN, did not take into account windfalls that proceeded to take place after March 2017, and because it was considered that further growth could now be accommodated.

1.7 The SAR of August 2018 appraises the alternatives considered after March 2017. As far as reasonable alternatives for the housing target are concerned scenarios I to L all looked to provide for 11,724 houses over the plan period (2013 - 2028), i.e. 782dpa\(^12\). The variations being within the spatial distribution, and treatment of brownfield sites and SHELAA sites. Following further refinements to the Ashdown Forest Transport Modell two further scenarios (M and N) were tested\(^13\). Scenario M provided for 13,693 dwellings over the plan period i.e. 913dpa, and scenario N for

---

\(^8\) Including completions from January 2013 to 1st October 2016
\(^9\) Key – red = rejected. Green = selected
\(^10\) para 5.2 of the SAR acknowledges that the figure of 11,456 does not address the OAHN
\(^11\) See table 31 p123 of the Aug 2018 SAR
\(^12\) See p7/8 of Aug 2018 SAR
\(^13\) See p10 of Aug 2018 SAR
14,228 dwellings over the plan period i.e. 950dpa. Scenario N was selected as WDC believe it meets the OAHN, includes a full windfall allowance for growth across the District and provides for a more balanced spatial distribution taking into account need but also landscape and biodiversity designations such as the AONB and the Ashdown Forest SAC.\(^\text{14}\)

1.8 The addendum SA of Jan 2019 indicates\(^\text{15}\) that for completeness two additional housing growth scenarios have been considered and appraised:
- Scenario O (2013 – 2028): 23,333 dwellings including completions (1,556 dpa); &

1.9 If one compares these against the scoring of the higher and preferred housing options in the March 2017 and Aug 2018 SAR we note the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAA Table 1.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SA Objective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.10 This demonstrates that the difference between what had been the preferred option (scenario H) and the higher housing growth option in the 2017 SAR (scenario C) was limited to those parts of the SA that relate to biodiversity impacts and reduction of poverty (see brown shading on JAA table 1.2). When one looks at the difference between the chosen option (scenario N) and the two new scenarios (see orange

\(^{14}\) See table 31 of Aug 2018 SAR – p123.
\(^{15}\) See para 2.1 of addendum SA of Jan 2019
shading on JAA table 1.2), scenario P only differs in a few instances, the main one being impact on objective 16, to reduce poverty etc where it scores more highly than the preferred option. It is however rejected because of its impact on both the biodiversity of the district and infrastructure\(^\text{16}\), which is not necessarily borne out by the scoring.

1.11 Whilst we are pleased to see that WDC have sought to assess these alternative scenarios, we are disappointed that they have so readily rejected them without recourse to a more detailed assessment of how the biodiversity and infrastructure impacts could be off set through developer contributions/ development could be phased to address what are considered to be longer term issues/ the spatial distribution strategy could be amended to reduce pressure on areas nearest to Ashdown Forest.

1.12 We also consider the addendum SA has failed to address the extent to which more housing would help address the districts affordable needs and associated affordability ratio\(^\text{17}\). Providing more housing, especially affordable housing, and improving the affordability ratio will help key workers find accommodation in the District, thus reducing in-commuting and improving existing services/ business access to labour – thus enhancing the economic viability of the District and reducing the need for travel.

1.13 Furthermore more housing need not necessarily have a harmful impact on the Ashdown Forest SAC. Suitably located development i.e. development that is furthest from Ashdown Forest and less likely to impact on the SAC, could provide additional revenue through the proposed Interim Air Quality Mitigation Strategy to help provide the medium to longer term mitigation measures set out in the Interim Air Quality Mitigation Strategy, to the greater good of the Forest and other parts of the district.

1.14 Paragraphs 14 and 17 (bullet point 3) of the NPPF (2012) are clear about the need for positivity in plan making

1.15 Whilst the SHELAA has provided an overview of what is developable, WDC have, through the SAR’s and addendum SA, failed to assess the merits of further allocations/ expanding existing allocations/ increasing the density of existing allocations, which results in a plan approach that is inconsistent with national policy, unjustified and not positively prepared. The affordability ratio, the potential future unmet needs of the HMA and the fact additional growth could actually bring about additional infrastructure works to off-set the impacts of the Ashdown Forest SAC indicate the SA should have assessed other reasonable alternatives for growth.

1.16 The approach adopted to reasonable alternatives in the SA suggests a plan that is predicated on a supply-led figure, not an objective assessment of housing need and objective consideration of alternatives. In this regard generalised and in some cases

---

\(^{16}\) See p 21/22 of Jan 2019 Addendum SA

\(^{17}\) See JAA reps on matter 3 in this regard
questionable assumptions have been made about the impact of higher levels of housing provision, relative to the benefits it could bring about.

The Non-Technical Summary (NTS) and Scoring Methodology – Question 6

1.17 Turning to the NTS, this in our opinion oversimplifies matters. It also cross refers the reader to various document\textsuperscript{18} so is not easy to follow.

1.18 As to the scoring methodology in the SA this is in our opinion far from coherent or consistent – please see example at JAA Appendix A.

Implications of the main mods on the SA – Question 7

1.19 The 2017 SAR is informed by the potential air quality impact on Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar site, and Scenarios A-E and G appear to have been rejected, at least in part, due to this issue. Following the acknowledgement that Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar will not be subject to an adverse effect as a result of air quality impacts and as such does not form a constraint to development, it may be that an overall higher housing number could be accommodated, and should be assessed as part of the SAR.

\textsuperscript{18} I.e. when looking at the rationale behind policy WLP1 (see section 8.1 – p 57 of the SAR NTS Jan 2019), one is taken to the March 2017 SAR, the August 2018 SAR and the addendum SA. The same could be said of the appraisal of policy WLP9 (See section 8.7 – p 64 of the SAR NTS Jan 2019), and the level of development at Stone Cross (See section 4.10 - p 175 of the SAR NTS Jan 2019), albeit this is probably easier to follow and more detailed than the critique of the background to policies WLP1 and WLP9.
Duty to Co-operate

9. Has the Council co-operated with the relevant local planning authorities, County Councils and appropriate prescribed bodies, in the planning of sustainable development relevant to cross boundary strategic matters? If so, who has the Council engaged with, and why?

10. Specifically, in relation to Wealden, what are the matters of cross boundary strategic significance which require co-operation, and how have these matters been identified?

11. In considering such matters, has the Council co-operated with those identified above, constructively, actively, and on an on-going collaborative basis throughout the preparation of the plan?

12. In considering its responsibilities under the duty to co-operate has the Council explored the production of joint research and evidence gathering to support policy choices, and producing relevant joint polices or informal strategies? If so, how, and what has been the result?

13. As a consequence, of the Council’s legal duty to co-operate, how has the effectiveness of plan-making activities been maximised to enable deliverable, effective policies? In doing so, has joint working on areas of common interest been undertaken for the mutual benefit of Wealden and its neighbouring authorities, and if so, what has been the outcome?

14. What is the significance, if any of Wealden District Council’s withdrawal of its objection to South Down’s National Park’s Local Plan?

15. Are there strategic matters which have not been adequately considered on a cross boundary basis? If so, why?

16. Specifically, has the Duty to Co-operate been discharged in a manner consistent with Paragraphs 178-181 of the Framework?

17. Has Wealden been diligent in making every effort to meet cross boundary strategic priorities, including addressing potential unmet development needs arising from neighbouring authorities?

Have WDC co-operated with Eastbourne BC constructively, actively, and on an on-going collaborative basis and has this affected the plan and its policies / addressed the issue of Eastbourne BC’s unmet needs - Questions 11, 13, 16 and 17

1.20 Our reps on the Reg 19 Plan\(^{19}\) set out our position at that time.

1.21 Having reviewed EBC’s reps on the Reg 19 Plan, the DTC Background Paper (A.32) and associated appendices, we remain concerned that WDC have not engaged constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with EBC.

1.22 Whilst there have clearly been a number of meetings\(^{20}\), and associated discussions between WDC and EBC, it is also appears that often engagement was limited to each side setting out its own position. Whilst the duty to cooperate is not a duty to agree, once a party (in this case EBC) has stated it cannot accommodate its unmet need, and is looking to the other party (in this case WDC) to assist, that should not be the end of the matter. Having been told by EBC that they could not accommodate

\(^{19}\) Section 3

\(^{20}\) Table 5 of A.32 identifies the number of meetings that have taken place between EBC and WDC
their unmet need, there is little or no evidence that WDC sought to pursue / look to address this point/ come to an agreement as to how it could be addressed longer term if not immediately.

1.23 In that respect WDC did not engage constructively.

1.24 In the context of the above one has also to ask: did the Council consider whether to consult on and prepare / enter into and publish, agreements on joint approaches; or whether to agree to prepare a joint local development document/s.

1.25 Appendix EBC to the DTC Background Paper indicates that a SoCG was first considered in November 2017\(^{21}\), there is no indication as to why one was not progressed at that time. The issue does not arise again until January 2018\(^ {22}\) when in an email to EBC, WDC refer to a SoCG, ‘that has yet to be finalised’. In May 2018\(^ {23}\) the issue was raised again with no clear indication of the outcome.

1.26 In Dec 2018, after EBC had made their position clear on the Reg 19 Plan, we note that discussions commenced on the merits of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)\(^ {24}\). At the same time however WDC make it clear that: \(^ {25}\)

‘… my main issue is that WDC will need to meet its own need first before looking to meet unmet need. However, I wanted to make sure that it is clear that we would also be looking at options to meet unmet need for Eastbourne within the functional economic and employment area.’

1.27 We also note that EBC in an email of the 19\(^ {th}\) Dec 2018 make it clear that:

‘…I’m not sure that agreement on future working together (the MoU) entirely overcomes the issues raised in the EBC rep, and perhaps in particular the lack of acknowledgement in the Plan and SA of the impacts on Eastbourne and the fact that we have not been meaningfully involved with the evidence studies.’

1.28 Thereafter a meeting scheduled for the 9th January 2019 between EBC and WDC on the MoU and DTC was cancelled\(^ {27}\), and EBC wrote to WDC advising that notwithstanding WDC’s letter of the 20\(^ {th}\) Dec 2018\(^ {28}\), they (EBC) were not prepared to withdraw their comments regarding the DTC, that their reps on the Reg 19 Plan stood, and that they remained of the view that WDC ‘has not engaged productively and on an ongoing basis in developing the strategic policies of the Pre-Submission Wealden Local Plan.’\(^ {29}\)

\( ^{21}\) A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 134
\( ^{22}\) A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 138
\( ^{23}\) A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 142
\( ^{24}\) A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 146 – 150
\( ^{25}\) A.32 – app EBC – see email of the 14 December 2018- page EBC 145/46
\( ^{26}\) A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 144
\( ^{27}\) A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 165
\( ^{28}\) A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 159/160
\( ^{29}\) A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 164
1.29 Whilst WDC offered alternative meeting dates before the proposed submission date, and EBC in an email of the 15th January agreed to take the draft MOU to EBC’s Local Plan Steering Group on the 29th January and would feed back after that, the DTC Background Paper/ Appendix EBC goes no further as the plan was then submitted.

1.30 Given the above, and having regard to the advice in pars 178 – 181 of the NPPF, ID: 9-003- 20140306, ID: 9-010- 20140306, and ID: 9-011- 20140306 of PPG and recent case law – especially St Albans DC v. SSCLG, it’s clear that:

- The duty to cooperate has to be fulfilled at the preparation stage. That stage has passed once the plan is submitted. Accordingly, once a plan has been submitted any deficiency in performance of the duty during preparation cannot be overcome by further engagement after the plan has been submitted. If an inspector finds that the LPA have not complied with the DTC he/she will be obliged to recommend non-adoption of the plan; and that
- To comply with the DTC a LPA must demonstrate that engagement has been constructive, active and undertaken on an ongoing basis.

1.31 Once WDC had identified the local authorities and other bodies with whom they intended to engage, they were under a duty to do so constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis. The situation with EBC has risen out a failure to engage constructively. It’s clear from the DTC Background paper that any real effort to engage with EBC, especially on the issue of unmet need, did not arise until after the consultation on the Reg 19 Plan and the clear objection made by Eastbourne and others.

1.32 It is evident from both the WDC SHMA and EBC SHMA that Eastbourne and Wealden fall within the same HMA, and that EBC identified a need for WDC to meet a shortfall in Eastbourne OAHN within the time frame of the WLP prior to WDC consulting on the Issues, Options and Recommendations stage in October / November 2015. It’s also clear that WDC have always been of the view that they must first seek to meet their OAHN before considering the unmet needs of others; and that WDC believe that the LP (Policy WLP13) allows for opportunities to look at the needs of EBC if certain infrastructure and environmental constraints can be resolved.

1.33 A.32 suggests that testing of higher housing numbers in the southern part of the district to try and meet EBC unmet need was not possible to achieve within the context of increasing OAHN, environmental and infrastructure constraints. Having reviewed the full SA it is not clear where one can see what was tested and what the

---

30 A.32 – app EBC – page EBC 171  
31 The first meeting of the EBC LPSG since the draft MOU was circulated (11th December)  
32 [2017] EWHC 1751 (Admin)  
33 Including us  
34 See A.32 – para 5.5. and 5.8  
35 Para 5.25 and 5.31 refer  
36 The SAR of March 2017 and August 2018 and addendum of Jan 2019
outcomes where. Thus it’s not possible to comment upon the soundness of the councils findings.

1.35 Whilst A.32 suggests there has been continuing and frequent engagement, the extent to which this has been constructive and collaborative is open to debate. Thus it is necessary to ask whether every effort has been made to secure the necessary cooperation/ and what the outcome of the cooperation has been.

1.36 A.32 and appendix EBC would suggest that consultation on the HMA, OAHN and Eastbourne’s unmet need has not been constructive and collaborative. Rather it has just been an exchange of each side’s position.

1.37 Whilst the preparation of a SoCG was considered, this was short-lived and did not progress. Similarly whilst a MoU was considered, this was only after the objections to the Reg 19 Plan and with little time to effect any agreement given the timescales envisaged between the closure of the consultation on the Reg 19 Plan and the deadline for the submission of the plan.

1.38 Given the above we consider WDC have failed to fulfil the DTC
Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA)

Please reference the relevant European site when answering the following questions. To avoid repetition, any reference to the Plan should be read as either alone, or in combination, with other plans or projects.

18. What role has Natural England played in the production of the HRA and how has the Council had due regard to its professional expertise and its guidance? Have other key stakeholders been consulted?

19. Has the Habitat Regulations Assessment been prepared in a manner consistent with the relevant legislation? If not, please set out clearly why not.

20. Is the Plan, as submitted, likely to have a significant effect on European sites either alone, or in combination with other plans or projects? Have these other plans or projects been appropriately identified?

21. Specifically, on what basis have the relevant European sites, including those outside of the district, been selected?

22. Have the appropriate assessments of the implications for those sites been undertaken in a manner consistent with the sites’ conservation objectives?

23. In doing so, are the appropriate assessments capable of ascertaining that the Plan as submitted will not adversely affect the integrity of the European sites and its qualifying features, either alone, or in combination?

24. Specifically, is the evidence, methodology, and the underlying assumptions on which the HRA has been formulated, realistic, robust, accurate, transparent, appropriate, and sufficiently replicable to allow sensitivity testing, so as to justify its conclusions? Has a qualitative, proportionate approach been taken to the potential impacts on the integrity of the sites? If not, should this be the case?

25. Should reference to ‘not adversely affect the integrity of the site’ be taken to mean that, as a result of the Plan, the qualifying elements of the site should not be in a worse state than the recorded baseline condition, i.e. no significant net deterioration? Or, does it mean, in the context of an improving situation, for example, improvements in air quality, that the potential for a theoretical quantum of improvement should not be compromised by the policies of the Plan?

26. Is the approach to the use of evidence underpinning the HRA consistent with the ‘precautionary approach’ as described in the ‘Communication from the Commission on the precautionary principle’?

27. What is the relevance of the recent CJEU Ruling on C-293/17 and C-294-17, as well as C-461/17, to the Council’s approach set out in the HRA?

28. On what basis has the threshold for development and its distribution been considered to be acceptable? Are the adverse impacts considered to be ‘real’, not ‘fanciful’?

29. Assuming that the mitigation measures set out in the HRA are required, what evidence is there that these will work?

30. Does the evidence in the HRA support the assertion that suitable air quality mitigation measures are no longer required for the Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar Site within Policy AF1?

31. Is the Plan’s strategy and distribution of development consistent with the recommendations of the HRA?

1.40 In response to Questions 30 and 31 we would like to highlight the following:
1.41 The HRA concludes that the WLP will not result in adverse effects on the ecological integrity of Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar as a result of air quality. This is principally on the basis that:

- The area subject to an exceedance of the critical level for NOx concentrations is limited, extending no more than 10m from the roadside and not reaching the ditch network which supports the SAC and Ramsar interest features;
- Pevensey Levels is established as a phosphorous limited environment and significant levels of nitrogen deposition would be required before nitrogen would have an impact on aquatic plant growth. This is clearly not the case on the basis of the air quality modelling.

1.42 This conclusion accords with comments made by Natural England in December 2017\(^{37}\) and October 2018\(^{38}\). In the October 2018 response it is stated that Natural England’s advice “remains that the Local Plan poses no credible air quality risk to Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar and there would be no likely significant effect as the site is not sensitive to air quality.”

1.43 As set out in our response to Question 7, the development strategy has previously been informed by the potential air quality impact on Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar site, and a higher housing number has been rejected, at least in part, due to this issue. Following the acknowledgement that Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar will not be subject to an adverse effect as a result of air quality impacts, and as such does not form a constraint to development, it may be that an overall higher housing number could be accommodated. As such, the Plan’s strategy has not demonstrated consistency with the recommendations of the HRA.

\(^{37}\) Under DAS
\(^{38}\) Under their Regulation 19 response
JAA Appendix A

A.1 The scoring for SHELAA Site Ref: 151/111 (Land at Orchid Riding Centre south of Walshes Road Crowborough) in appendix T of the 2017 SAR (Crowborough E&SE (site I)) is in many instances, such as the consideration of SA objective 239, more harsh in its assessment of this site when compared with its assessment of its immediate neighbour at site J. Site I is a working commercial equestrian centre with a number of substantial buildings and a sand school as well as associated hard surfacing. It also contains a car mechanics, a removals company and 3 dwelling houses, so is part PDL.

A.2 In addition it formed part of a wider site in the SHELAA 2014 (confusingly also given the same site reference of 151/1110), which WDC concluded had development potential, and part of which now has planning permission for 160 dwellings. Additionally, the site adjoins the new built up area as defined by the WLP 2019 Proposals Map, and WDC have recently resolved to grant planning permission for 100 units to the north of Walshes Road40. As such the land at Orchid Riding School is now directly opposite what will be new built development.

A.3 Given the above we believe sites I and J should both score ‘-/+’ for objective 2. Similarly this sites assessment under SA objective 941 should we believe be ‘-/+’ at least if not ‘+’

A.4 Overall it is disappointing to note that appendix T of the 2017 SAR has not been updated to reflect changes that have occurred since the original site assessments were undertaken.

A.5 Similarly the assessment of the land at Friday Street Farm (FSF), area 14 in appendix N of the 2017 SAR, is in our opinion inaccurate, and inconsistent with table 222 of the main body of the March 2017 SAR42, with appendix N providing different scores in some areas – as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JAA Table 1.3</th>
<th>2017 SAR – Table 222</th>
<th>2017 SAR – Appendix N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective 5</td>
<td>?/+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 7</td>
<td>?/-</td>
<td>?/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 10</td>
<td>?/+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective 15</td>
<td>?/+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.6 We also note that the SAR of March 2017 is predicated upon replacement of the B1, B2 and B8 floorspace currently on site at FSF43. However policy SWGA48 has been

39 p1570 March 2017 SAR – app T
40 WD/2017/0615/MAO refers
41 p1585 March 2017 SAR – app T
42 P1045 of the March 2017 SAR refers
43 See para 6.398 of the March 2017 SAR
amended so as to provide for retention of the existing commercial floorspace, the effects, if any, of this change should be addressed in an updated SAR.