

## **Examination of the Rother Development and Site Allocations Local Plan**

### **Response from Peasmarsh Residents**

#### **Matters, Issues and Questions**

#### **Matter 7 Selection of sites allocated for development**

#### **Issue: For each area, are the individual sites selected sound?**

#### ***Peasmarsh***

#### ***Policy PEA1 Land south of Main Street, Peasmarsh***

- *Does the evidence indicate that the site is deliverable within the plan period given the need to acquire land to secure access?*

#### **Access**

The residents of Peasmarsh have already set out their concerns regarding the suitability of the access to this site (including the inadequate visibility) and these concerns will be amplified at the inquiry.

Additional land besides that allocated needs to be acquired for the development to be able to be constructed and accessed.

It is acknowledged by the authority that the scheme will require the acquisition and demolition of a property, known as 'Pippins'. This property forms part of the period streetscape and it is considered a waste to demolish this dwelling with the aim of creating other dwellings in its place.

In addition, Paragraph 11.178 of the DASA states that "a priority solution to traffic will be required on a narrow section of the access road, some 70 metres into the site". This 'solution' is necessary even with the acquisition of Pippins. This is an acceptance that the width of the access road is insufficient for traditional two-way traffic. The evidence submitted on behalf of the residents of Peasmarsh showed, in Appendix 4, that the vehicular access bisects two neighbouring properties, known as 'Welbeck' to the west and the 'Wheelers' to the east. At the point in question there is simply a width of approximately 3.5 metres to accommodate an access road, which is tightly enclosed by tall trees and hedges. This width can accommodate only a single lane of traffic, and fails to provide sufficient room for any pedestrian access. It is submitted that a proper and safe access solution for the allocation must be provided to ensure an adequate and safe means of access that meets modern standards or the allocation should not proceed. To achieve a proper access additional third party land, which does not form part of the current allocation, would be required.

There are therefore two obstacles to the delivery of the site: firstly the fact that the allocation does not include all necessary land for the site to be accessed properly; secondly the need for the acquisition of third party land for a safe and effective access to be constructed, which third party land is not included within the proposed allocation.

With regard to the narrow section that lies between 'Welbeck' and 'Wheelers', the owners of both dwellings are able to confirm that they have not been approached by any party (being either the land owner or the local planning authority) with a view to any additional land being acquired for the access either voluntarily or under compulsory purchase powers. Nor is there any evidence that the local planning authority is prepared to use its powers of compulsory purchase to acquire such land in the absence of agreement. Even if there was any evidence that the local planning authority was

willing to use its CPO powers to acquire such land the authority would have difficulty in doing so as the land in question is not identified in the local plan allocation.

In the circumstances there are serious doubts as to whether the site is deliverable during the plan period.