



Representations of Barratt Strategic

Medway Council's Core Strategy – Examination in Public – response to the issues raised by the Inspector

Medway Council ref 04

Matter 6 – Infrastructure

a) Are the key infrastructure requirements, including transport and water-related (mains and sewerage) capacity, identified in the plan, and is there a reasonable prospect that necessary infrastructure will be provided?

6.1 Given the comments the Highways Agency and Southern Water have made on the Lodge Hill application (MC/11/2516), we do not believe the key infrastructure requirements, associated with this strategic allocation have been properly identified and addressed in the CS, and there appears to be some doubt that there a reasonable prospect that the effects of the Lodge Hill development on the capacity of the Whitewall Creek WWTW can be fully addressed in time to accommodate the housing land supply targets set out in the CS.

6.2 Having regard to the above it is disappointing to note SW are not identified as a participant on Matter 6.

b) Does the CS comply with national policy in relation to development in areas at risk of flooding?

6.3 We have no comment to make on this issue

c) Does the CS provide clear guidance on the circumstances in which developer contributions will be required, and has the impact on viability been quantified?

6.4 As per our reps on policy CS35 of the CS Publication Draft August 2011, we do not believe the CS does provide clear guidance on the circumstances in which developer contributions will be required, or have regard to the impact of many of the proposed policies on a project's viability. The NPPF is clear in paragraph 173 that:-

Pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Plans should be deliverable. Therefore, the sites and the scale of development identified in the plan should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. To ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable. My emphasis.....

6.5 We also note that paragraph 204 of the NPPF makes it clear that planning obligations should only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- Necessary to make a development proposal acceptable in planning terms;

- Directly related to the development; and
- Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development

6.6 Given the above, and having regard to the other financial burdens being placed on developers (i.e. increased affordable housing requirements and higher CSH requirements/ renewable energy requirements) we would suggest that Policy CS35 should make specific reference to the implications infrastructure requirements have on the viability of a development and seek to ensure any contribution sought is fairly and reasonably related to the proposed development so that it is consistent with national government guidance.