

Home Builders Federation

Representor Number 412

Hearing Session: Issue 18

ASHFORD LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION

Issue 18: *Does the Local Plan have clear and effective mechanisms for implementation, delivery and monitoring?*

Question ii) The first two paragraphs of Policy IMP2 and the first sentence of the third do not relate to 'deferred contributions'. For clarity and effectiveness, should consideration be given to addressing these matters under Policy IMP1? What is the justification for requiring 'clawback' from developers in the event viability increases? How would this be assessed and implemented?

We would agree that there is no connection between the first two paragraphs and the first sentence of the third paragraph with the policy's title. However, as reference is also made to both policy and infrastructure requirements shifting these elements to IMP1 may also be inappropriate. A change in the policies title would probably be the most appropriate approach to ensuring clarity and effectiveness.

With regard to the second part of the question we do not consider there to be any justification under current policy for the Council to include a policy to require the "clawback" of contributions as part of the local plan. Paragraph 23b-009 establishes that planning obligations can be renegotiated at any point in time but that this is a voluntary agreement between developer and local authority. Policy IMP2 sets out a requirement for the applicant to enter into such an agreement and as such it is not consistent with national policy.

Recommendation

The policy should be deleted.

Mark Behrendt
Local Plans Manager
Home Builders Federation