

MATTER

- are therefore not consistent with policy PC1. In particular, these relate to agricultural/forestry dwellings or dwellings for other rural enterprises (criterion a), subdivision of existing dwellings (criterion c) and One Planet Development (criterion g).
- 1.5 It is important that the plan is “*coherent and consistent*” otherwise it fails soundness test 2.
 - 1.6 Anyone reading the Plan and looking at policy PC1 in relation to housing would go directly to policies HN4-A (replacement dwellings), HN4-B (conversion of rural buildings), HN4-C (infilling) and HN4-D (affordable housing exception sites) as that is where policy PC1 directs them. Unless they read policy HN4 separately they would believe that the types of development set out under (a), (c) and (g) were outside of the relevant policies in the Plan. Policy PC1 should therefore also reference policy HN4 itself (not just HN4A, B, C and D).
 - 1.7 In order to meet the test of soundness it is crucial that policy HN4 and policy PC1 are consistent.
 - 1.8 Additionally, paragraph 3.60 of PPW indicates that, as well as infilling, minor extensions to existing settlements may be acceptable particularly where they meet local need for affordable housing or it can be demonstrated that the proposal will increase local economic activity. Whilst policy HN4-D allows affordable housing

evidence of past performance in relation to bringing forward Local Plans (and the previous UDP) would suggest that this would be subject to substantial slippage (we comment on this further in relation to Matter 20). Where the Plan falls below required housing delivery there should be a mechanism within the Plan to allow sustainable sites on the edge of existing settlements to come forward. The policies in relation to housing in the Open Countryside should therefore acknowledge that there may be circumstances later in the plan period if housing delivery is falling short of required numbers where sustainable sites on the edge of existing settlements which