



### About you

- First name: Gabrielle
- Surname: Ceriden Morse
- Address: 
- I am completing this form as: A resident
- If other, please specify: •
- Job title: •
- Organisation: •
- On behalf of: •
- Email address: 
- Did you submit comments on the Regulation 18 (First Draft) Local Plan?: No
- Local Plan Consultee List: I would like to be added to the Local Plan consultee list

### Share your comments

- Does your comment relate to a paragraph, policy or policies map?: Policy
- Please tell us which paragraph/policy your comment relates to: Proposed Policy 3.7(2) 'Residential alterations, extensions and outbuildings'.
- Do you consider the Local Plan to be legally compliant?: Yes
- Do you consider the Local Plan to be sound?: No
- Do you consider the Local Plan to be Yes

compliant with the duty to co-operate?:

- Please tell us why you have answered yes and/or no to the questions above:

Proposed Policy 3.7(2) 'Residential alterations, extensions and outbuildings'. The Final Draft Local Plan states that it proposes to supersede the adopted Local Plan Policy DMD25 'Ancillary residential development' with a replacement; Policy 3.7(2) 'Residential alterations, extensions and outbuildings'. The draft policy not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and therefore this policy is unsound. (1) The draft policy 3.7(2) merges previous policy relating to ancillary use of outbuildings with that relating to extensions and the creation of new dwellings. In doing so, it muddies the water and prevents applications for the use of outbuildings for ancillary use to be determined fairly and on their own merits. Whilst it is understood and reasonable that the planning authority should wish to prevent uncontrolled increases in the size of properties, the policy, as drafted, is out of step with national planning policy, is unjustified and unreasonable. Ancillary use of an outbuilding should not be confused with an extension to the main dwelling house, nor with the creation of new dwellings. The DNP should follow national planning policy whereby ancillary use of an outbuilding is permitted, based upon a clear, uncomplicated and just basis. Critically, as drafted, the Final Draft Local Plan and more specifically Policy 3.7(2), makes no specific reference to 'ancillary use'. It appears merely in the context of the index of replacement policies; stating that adopted Policy DMD25 is to be replaced with draft Policy 3.7(2). (2) Draft policy 3.7(2) also introduces a restriction on the area of an outbuilding which is to be used for ancillary use, restricting it on the basis that it does not increase the habitable floorspace of the original dwelling by more than 30%. The need for this part of the policy, in terms of reference to a 30% restriction, is not justified and serves only to cause confusion and conflict. If the draft policy 3.7(2) were to be adopted as proposed, with a 30% restriction, it would create a complex and confusing situation whereby one property would be permitted to use an outbuilding for ancillary use, yet another would not be able to do so, based upon the fact that the later example had, at some time in the past, increased its size by 30%. The reference to 30% is entirely arbitrary and does not help the sensible determination of an application on its merits. If the DNPA had particular concerns about a scheme it could refuse planning permission. Alternatively, it could impose a condition to restrict the ancillary use with the option to specify, should it wish, the permitted range of ancillary uses allowed. If

need be, and subject to the relevant guidance on the use of conditions versus the use of planning obligations, a planning obligation could be sought.

Draft Policy 3.7(2) causes confusion. The Policy should not merge ancillary use, extensions and new dwellings into one long winded and cluttered policy. The 30% restriction is entirely arbitrary. It adds nothing to the sensible consideration of a scheme on its' merits; and nothing to the Policy that preceded it which has no such restriction. On the above basis, it is asked that draft Policy 3.7(2) should be adopted but without reference to ancillary use. Ancillary use should be controlled (i) by a separate policy and also; (ii) without reference to the 30% restriction.

- What modifications do you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and/or sound?:

- Do you wish to participate in hearing session(s)?:

No, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

- If you answered yes to the hearing session(s), please tell us why you consider this to be necessary:

-