

FAO: Andrew Gambrill
Canterbury City Council
Military Road
Canterbury
Kent
CT1 1YW

Gladman House
Alexandria Way
Congleton
CW12 1LB

Sent via email only to: andrew.gambrill@canterbury.gov.uk

1st December 2023

Dear Andy,

Many thanks for opportunity to comment on the appeal decision for Land at Evelench Lane, Tibberton (appeal reference: APP/H1840/W/23/3320041) which I hereafter refer to as 'Tibberton'. I am writing to you in response to your comments regarding the similarities between the Tibberton site and our submitted outline planning application site, Land off The Hill, Littlebourne (hereafter referred to as 'Littlebourne').

Firstly, it is important to clarify that the Tibberton site is located within a different Local Planning Authority, specifically, Wychavon District Council rather than Canterbury City Council. Therefore, the Tibberton and Littlebourne sites are subject to different local planning policies and varying constraints across the districts. However, there are some similarities between the local planning policy contexts. In both cases, the Council's respective adopted Local Plans are more than five years old and consequently, are considered out of date. Neither Local Planning Authority are able to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply and therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged in both cases. Regarding the respective emerging Local Plan's, the Tibberton site is partly allocated for up to 25 dwellings, a very different scale to the 100-dwelling proposal, subject of the appeal decision. Alternatively, the Littlebourne application proposals are for up to 300 units in total, a slight reduction from the 300 dwellings in addition to a minimum of 30 units of older person accommodation set out within Policy R15 of the Draft Canterbury District Local Plan 2045.

One of the main issues at the Tibberton appeal was whether the proposed development was in accordance with the spatial strategy of the development plan, having regard to the size of Tibberton, local character, location and the availability of infrastructure. In that case, the Inspector concluded that, "*The proposal would cause permanent and irreversible change due to its scale, location in the open countryside next to Tibberton, the character of the village and because there is a lack of sufficient infrastructure to support the scale of development proposed* (Paragraph 52 of the appeal decision)," and ultimately, decided that the harm significantly and demonstrably outweighed the benefits, and therefore, the appeal was dismissed.

There are key material differences between Tibberton and Littlebourne which render the Tibberton findings that relate to scale of development incomparable to the Littlebourne application proposals. The Tibberton appeal decision identifies that the existing Tibberton village comprises around 300 houses and has a population of around 600 people based on



the 2011 census. There is no public transport to one of the nearest main settlements, Droitwich Spa and similarly, very few bus services to Worcester. Within Tibberton itself, there is very limited infrastructure and amenities for residents, for instance, there is no convenience store. On the other hand, Littlebourne has an estimated population of 1,603 people (2021 Census ONS Data), a half hourly weekday daytime bus service to Canterbury and other surrounding areas, and local amenities including amongst other things a convenience store, village hall, pubs, and hotel accommodation. Indeed, the application proposals also comprise other benefits which further bolster its sustainability including inter alia: a new community hub, older person's accommodation, improvements to existing public rights of ways and an electric vehicle car club. Contrary to the case at Tibberton, Littlebourne has been assessed as part of the emerging local plan process and has been found that it can capably sustain more than the scale of development proposed by the planning application, considering both the landscape character of the village and its impact on local infrastructure. Indeed, with regard to the latter, it is considered the increased population will positively contribute to the vitality of the village.

Overall, it is acknowledged that at a glance there are some similarities between the Tibberton and Littlebourne cases. However, when delving into the site-specifics and looking at the local planning policy contexts, it quickly becomes apparent that the Inspector's findings at Tibberton are not directly comparable to Littlebourne. It is concluded that Littlebourne is a sustainable village that can accommodate the scale of development proposed both by the planning application and in its emerging Local Plan.

I trust this letter provides sufficient clarification, but if you would like to discuss further, please let me know.

Yours sincerely,
Victoria Richardson
On behalf of Gladman Developments Ltd
v.richardson@gladman.co.uk