

## 10. APPENDICES

### 10.1 APPENDIX 1 - HOUSING LAND

#### Objections

195/003	F	Sutton St Edmond Parish Council
546/003	R	Kingswood Investments Ltd
655/011	R	Broadgate Homes Ltd

#### Issues

- a. Whether the information within Table 3 of Appendix 2 of the First Deposit is inaccurate.
- b. Whether Table 5 in Appendix 1 should be amended to include the allocation made at Foxes Lowe Road, Holbeach.
- c. Whether Donington should be included in the settlement hierarchy as set out at Policy SG3 as an Area Centre.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.1.1 **Issues a & b.** The tables have been revised and updated since the FDD version and, subject to the corrections which would be made by PIC78 and IC22, are now believed to be accurate.
- 10.1.2 **Issue c.** This matter has been dealt with in Section 3.1 of this report. The Appendix simply reflects the Plan's strategy policy, as set out in Chapter 3.

#### RECOMMENDATION

**R.10.1 I recommend that the Plan be amended in accordance with PIC78 and IC22.**

### 10.2 APPENDIX 2 - PARKING STANDARDS

#### Objections

041/007	F	Holbeach and District Civic Society
195/005	F	Sutton St Edmond Parish Council
532/044	R	Fiona Forgham, Government Office for the East Midlands

#### Issues

- a. Whether 'square metres' is to be preferred to 'm<sup>2</sup>'
- b. Matters relating to disabled parking and mother and toddler parking.
- c. Whether Appendix 2 should be amended to take account of PPG3 paragraphs 59 to 62 and RSS8 Appendix 7 paragraph 6.1.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 10.2.1 **Issue a.** The conventional symbol for square metres is ‘m<sup>2</sup>’. I see no reason for any change.
- 10.2.2 **Issue b.** The objector criticises the District Council for, allegedly, *not* providing disabled parking and mother and toddler parking. This is not a matter for the Plan.
- 10.2.3 **Issue c.** I find it disappointing that the Council has not seen fit to adapt the County residential parking standards [CD/LC/14] to local circumstances. Even the notes to the standards, which have been reproduced faithfully in Appendix 2, state that, “It is hoped that in due course, the other major towns to which standard B applies will be identified in the appropriate Local Plans.” If this is not the time, I am not sure when will be.
- 10.2.4 The effect of the standard is that the *whole* of the District falls with category C, where a standard of a maximum of 2 or 3 car parking spaces would be applied. That is plainly inconsistent with PPG3 and RSS8. Moreover, RSS8 (March 2008) post dates the LCC guide (January 2005). RSS8 advises that local authorities should include in their development plans parking standards that take account of the advice in paragraphs 59 to 62 of PPG3. This says that car parking standards that result, on average, in development with more than 1.5 off street car parking spaces per dwelling are unlikely to reflect the Government’s emphasis on securing sustainable residential environments. I find the Council’s justification for its classification wholly unconvincing.
- 10.2.5 I avoid the use of the term ‘major town’, as employed by the LCC guide, since this does not feature in the nomenclature adopted by the LSP or the Plan. However, Table 4.1 of the LSP identifies the county’s ‘major settlements’ and there nothing to suggest I should not treat them as the equivalent. Spalding – the fourth largest settlement in the county – qualifies as a main town. Indeed, the Plan itself describes Spalding as the District’s principal urban settlement. The other major settlements identified by the LSP include Crowland, Holbeach, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge; they are classed as ‘Small Towns’. In the Plan these settlements are ‘Area Centres’. Donington is also included at this level in the Plan – something I have endorsed elsewhere in this report. Local Plan Policy SG3 describes the Area Centres as providing for housing, employment and commercial development to support their role as service centres for surrounding rural areas. I see no reason why the advice on parking in PGG3 and RSS8 should not be applied to the District’s major settlements and I recommend accordingly. As a result, standard B would be applied by the Plan to Spalding and the Area Centres, including Donington.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**R.10.2. I recommend that the Plan be amended:**

- i. **by deleting the following from Appendix 2:**  

**“RESIDENTIAL – Please note that within the section for Houses and Flats, all locations within South Holland fall within category C.” and**
- ii. **by revising the section of Appendix 2 relating to ‘Houses and Flats’ as indicated below:**

**Appendix 2 – Maximum Car Parking Standards – a modified version of Lincolnshire County Council’s Development Guide on Transport and New Development Issues in Lincolnshire (January 2005)**

TYPE OF DEVELOPMENT	MAXIMUM STANDARD	NOTES
<b>RESIDENTIAL</b>		

<p><b>Houses and Flats</b> (including Aged Person Dwellings)</p>	<p><b><u>In Spalding and the Area Centres:</u></b> A maximum on average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling</p> <p><b><u>In the rest of the District:</u></b> A maximum on average of 2 spaces for dwellings with 3 or less bedrooms and 3 spaces for dwellings with 4 or more bedrooms.</p>	<p>The Area Centres comprise the towns of Holbeach, Long Sutton, Sutton Bridge Crowland and Donington.</p> <p>A garage plus the space immediately in front count as one space.</p>
--	---	--

### 10.3 APPENDIX 4 - GLOSSARY OF TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

#### Objections

029/010	F	Lincolnshire County Council
685/011	R	English Heritage
687/024	R	Wash Estuary Management Group

#### Issues

- a. Whether the definitions in the glossary should be updated in order to be factually correct.
- b. Whether the glossary should include a definition for 'European Marine Site'.
- c. Whether the Plan should contain a definition for 'educational contributions'.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.3.1 **Issues a & b.** The Council's proposed changes in PIC80 and IC75 would suitably address these objections.

10.3.2 **Issue c.** I see no benefit in defining this term, which is commonly understood. Such contributions arising from planning obligations may be wide-ranging in nature and too strict a definition may be counter-productive.

#### RECOMMENDATION

**R.10.3 I recommend that the Plan be amended in accordance with PIC80 and IC75.**

*NB: For the avoidance of doubt, I am content for further factual updating of definitions to take place, if necessary, to ensure the Plan is up to date at the time of adoption.*