

Comments on Revised Policy GD2 – Gladman

In general, Gladman are supportive of the changes proposed to separate out proposed development within the settlements and proposed development contiguous with settlements.

However, we suggest that the word 'and' in the first line of Parts 1 and 2 of the Policy, is changed to 'or' in both cases e.g. **In addition to sites allocated by this local plan and or neighbourhood plans.....**

In addition, it appears that on the second version of Policy GD2 which was attached to your later email with the reasoned justification, the policy has changed slightly. Criterion (g) has been amended since the first version of the Policy to include reference to Green Wedges and Areas of Separation. Gladman object to this amendment as it does not allow the planning balancing exercise to be undertaken by the decision maker when dealing with a proposal that may be affected by these designations. There may well be instances where a proposed development is located within one of these designations but mitigation would render the impact acceptable, especially when balanced against the benefits of the scheme as required under the Framework. It is considered therefore, that criterion g is amended to change the word 'harmfully' to the word 'unacceptably' e.g. **It does not unacceptably diminish the physical and/or physical separation between settlements.** This amendment would allow the decision maker to balance any harm that may be caused by a proposal against the benefits of the scheme.

Finally, Gladman consider that the term '**as evidenced through a housing needs survey or a neighbourhood plan**' is deleted from Part b of the Policy as many settlements in need of housing may not have a published housing needs survey or may not be progressing a Neighbourhood Plan. This part of the Policy is therefore overly restrictive as any evidence of local housing need or indeed a wider district housing need should be sufficient.

I hope this is useful.

Regards

Phill