To: Stephen Frost
Development Plan Inspector

Recipient ID No: CS 002

Supplementing submission regarding Huncote.

I refer a questionably elegant neologism to characterize the speculative atmosphere which surrounds (or threatens) to envelope at least Huncote's neck of the late September words: material provisionality.

It may envelop the clearer and more familiar concept of procedural subsidiarity, which seems to entail that at least one of my earlier-raised concerns be regarded as better suited to be determined by the local planners themselves at Site Allocation Stage.

How inappropriate (or not so) might it perhaps come to feel, that the Draft NPFF ("back in Sept. 2011") had its policies "accorded little weight" in its registration?

By whose processes entrusted to which authorities, but at what stage, are such issues as I refer now to (in more detail than in Sep. 2010's submission) determined?

At the Pre-Hearing in July 2011, I expressed with some vehemence my concerns that the Soundness of the proposed Core Strategy housing allocation "swap" in favour might be jeopardised by yet to be resolved uncertainties regarding the Soundness of the "Swapped-to" colliery site.

There is a cognate and/or overlapping concern which Michael Lovell has recommended I make sure can be regarded as properly treated in advance of today's deadline.

Regarding the de-allocation (from housing to 'open space') upper Spout House Fields: a simple visual representation of the multiple ownership (i.e. separate ownership) of these - East of the woodlands - readily alerts the curious mind to the speculative significance of the L-shaped (and somewhat recent - less than 19 years) incursion of ownership by the same firm (Woodhams) who bought and prepared the adjoining (recent, brown field) Bluebell Estate site for housing development (now in being).
HBC (Hythe Borough Council) themselves own approximately half of the area of these fields.

As development of the rather slender 'L' shape on its own, without being linked with either [both] the Shawness-owned strips (on either side of the upper stretch of the Woottons' 'L') or the lower stretch adjoining Blackburn-owned field, I feel it crucial to ensure attention is drawn to a poser, as follows.

Since only the Shawness family have submitted a case for review for virtual compensation for frustrated speculative land value hopes, (a) is it that only they have seen fit to legally contest, with the other land owners (HBC included) resigned to the altered allocation?

Or (b) is it strongly permissible to raise a postulated and perhaps more clearly pronounced legal question?

With ten or (now) 15 year Core Strategy arrangements liable to involve such relocation allocations of speculative land areas:

(i) Do owners, for however long or short a time they have owned the land, have "a legal leg to stand on" in calling for reversal and/or compensatory purchase?

(ii) How well foreseen and protected against is the temptation to conduct behind the scenes major dubious ethical negotiations between such potentially frustrated land owners and their local planning authorities?

The question-style presentation does not, I hope and trust, obscure the intention to state focussed concerns. Nor do I intend this than to show a timely (albeit last minute) timely alarm (perhaps an even empathetic awareness) in face of the hydra-headed matriarchal reality confronting you/us for the time being!

(Signed)

26. VIII. 2011