

Dear Sir, please find below our comments on the above application for an certificate of appropriate alternative development. I am sorry for the delay in responding to this application, though I will point out that as far as we can tell no communication was received in our team as regards this consultation.

It is not disputed that the site forms part of the larger local plan allocation for residential development and therefore it is a reasonable assumption that the land would have been granted planning consent for use for residential purposes. However, it should be noted that, had the TRU programme not be in existence, the site would be expected to contribute towards improvements at Ravensthorpe station as the existing station simply could not cope with an additional 4,000 dwellings on its doorstep. The requirements of Housing Allocation HS61 specifically mention such improvements. It is noted that the submitted transport assessment makes mention of a sum of c.£300k towards public transport services which it is assumed includes a contribution towards the station, though there is no detail on how this figure has been derived. As the planning statement makes mention of this contribution forming part of the S106 Agreement it is anticipated that such funding would be available to further improve public transport facilities (including the railway) as appropriate.

It should also be borne in mind that some of the land in question would have been given over to landscaping to create a buffer between the residential development and the railway and concrete batching plant directly opposite the site (as demonstrated by the submitted masterplan layout with the CAAD application). Whilst it is recognised that the exact detail of disposition of uses, including landscaping, is not a matter for the CAAD itself we would have concern over the provision of an attenuation pond high above but close to the railway cutting as indicated on the masterplan, though again this is a detail that could be refined by means of condition. It is noted that a suggested condition relates to the provision of a detailed drainage strategy, which would be the means to refine the design and location of attenuation ponds, and this is acceptable.

It should also be noted, though not strictly applicable appropriate to the application, that the works of TRU have in fact provided benefits to the development site through the provision of a brand-new station to serve the site and surrounding area, a roundabout to be provided at NR's expense to provide a means of accessing the wider H61 site, and diversion of electricity pylons across the western part of the site. This latter improvement in particular may allow for an increase in the number of dwellings that the site can accommodate.

As such we have no overriding objection to the grant of an alternative development certificate subject to the imposition of relevant conditions to control drainage, landscaping and boundary treatments, and the commitment to a S106 agreement to include contributions towards public transport improvements.

Yours Faithfully