

## Hearing Statement – Policy CS12

### Question 2

1. The policy is not considered within itself to be contradictory in terms of the location for development. Objection to the Plan in relation to this policy is on the grounds of contradiction between CS3 and CS12 and our comments under Matter 2 - CS3 refer. Policy CS3 is about strategy and descriptions as to the location of development should be left to CS12 to define.
2. The footprint of the village is not considered unreasonably restrictive provided the aspect of the policy that permits development **within or adjacent to** is interpreted in that manner.

### Question 4

3. We can find no justification for the policy requiring strong local community support by way of a comprehensive pre-application consultation process. In line with the presumption in favour of NPPF and CS1, it is considered that whilst a strong local opposition would be a material consideration against approval, if the local view is in favour, apathy can make it unreasonably difficult to evidence that support. Those concerned about a proposal will voice that concern much more readily than those happy with it. It is suggested that Parish Council support, as the representatives of the local population, should be sufficient evidence of local approval in the absence of significant opposition.
4. The policy as currently phrased is contrary to NPPF and CS1 and as such unsound on the basis of not being justified or consistent with those policies.

Previous objections do not relate to Questions 1 and 3 and no further statement is submitted on these aspects.