

## 2. PLANS AND STRATEGIES, OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES

### 2.1 GENERAL

#### Objections

See Appendix A1

#### Issues

- a. Whether the Potential Development Plan for Spalding, including the western multi-modal transport corridor, is appropriate in the FDD.
- b. Whether it is appropriate to include “The Longer Term” in the Plan.
- c. Whether future development in South Holland should be concentrated in Spalding, or whether a greater proportion should be dispersed to the rural area.
- d. Whether the Plan sufficiently aims to promote the rural economy.
- e. Whether para.2.1, The Overview, needs expanding, as suggested.
- f. Whether the Plan needs to specifically refer in para.2.5 to the principles of net gain.
- g. Whether tourism should be put last in the list of Objectives, as the Council’s primary responsibility is to its residents in para.2.6.
- h. Whether para.2.8 should be extended to reflect the importance of tourism.
- i. Whether the Plan should make provision for road upgrading schemes and improving rail services.
- j. Whether the replacement of ‘soil is one of the District’s primary resources’, with ‘soil is the District’s primary resource’ should be made to para.2.11.
- k. Whether para.2.12 needs amending to refer to international habitat designations.
- l. Whether the words ‘no longer required’ should be removed from para.2.13, and the paragraph subsequently reworded.
- m. Whether para.2.14 needs amending to reflect current water quality.
- n. Whether it would be appropriate to include numbers of Scheduled Ancient Monuments in para.2.16.
- o. Whether paras.2.29-2.35 need amending as suggested.
- p. Whether bullet point 1 of para.2.38 needs amending as suggested.
- q. Whether an additional priority should be added to para.2.40, “safeguarding and enhancing the natural environment and reversing the decline in biodiversity”.
- r. Whether the word ‘usage’ in para.2.43 should be replaced by the word ‘use’.
- s. Whether an additional reference should be incorporated in the Plan, ‘which adopts the landscape character approach to considering development in the countryside’.
- t. Whether the Plan needs a policy on habitat creation schemes.

- u. Whether Policies HS8/HS9 promote a range of tenures for affordable housing provision.
- v. Whether additional wording is required to make reference to consultation with organisations during the decision making process.
- w. Whether maintaining the vernacular character of each settlement should be a priority.

NB. Site specific issues are dealt with in the appropriate sections of this report on Housing and/or Employment.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 2.1.1 **Issue a.** The Plan has been re-written since the FDD version and the longer term vision for Spalding is now omitted. The features objected to, such as the multi-modal transport corridor, are not part of the Plan.
- 2.1.2 **Issue b.** The section of Chapter 2 entitled 'The Longer Term' adds very little of significance to the Plan that is not already included in the Objectives and Priorities (paras.2.39 & 2.40). In fact, it is criticised by some for being too selective and for failing to cover a number of important issues. Some objectors feel the section should be bolder. However, even if it were, it is hard to see how this part of the Plan can influence any planning decisions taken by the local planning authority in the next few years. For example, unless a route is identified for a Whaplode By-Pass, it is not possible for it to be safeguarded, even though it may be supported in principle by the Council. Moreover, there is the distinct possibility that it could unduly fetter the preparation of the next round of development plan documents, set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme [CD/SH/01]. The Council proposes to develop a vision for the area as part of the LDF and, to my mind, that is the proper forum for dealing with this issue. I shall recommend that paras.2.41 – 2.44 are deleted.
- 2.1.3 **Issues c - d.** These matters are dealt with in sections 3.1, 4.1 and 5.1 of this report.
- 2.1.4 **Issue e.** I regard the brief Overview as satisfactory for its purpose in this Plan and see little benefit in the objector's extended version.
- 2.1.5 **Issue f.** This relates to para.2.5 of the FDD, which has now been deleted.
- 2.1.6 **Issue g.** The Objectives are now at para.2.39. They are not in order of importance and there would be no benefit in changing the order.
- 2.1.7 **Issue h.** The Council accepts this point and proposes PIC7 as an acceptable response.
- 2.1.8 **Issue i.** The need or otherwise to make provision for 'buffer zones' alongside the District's main road network is a matter for LCC to consider in its role as Highway Authority. Equally, improvements to rail services between Spalding and Peterborough, and extending rail services to other parts of the District, lie outside the scope of a local plan and are something to address through the LTP. The Council has responded by suggesting IC3, to which I have no objection, although to my mind the Council's position on rail services is adequately stated at paras.8.8 – 8.9.
- 2.1.9 **Issue j.** The objector's revised wording would offer no significant improvement to the Plan.
- 2.1.10 **Issue k.** The Council proposes PIC8 to add reference to international habitat designations. There appears no purpose in adding reference to the archaeological interest of The Wash as the Plan would have no jurisdiction beyond the coast.
- 2.1.11 **Issue l.** Para.2.13 still points to the importance of the Cowbit and Crowland Washes as a safety valve during flooding and I regard no amendment as necessary.

- 2.1.12 **Issue m.** The Council accepts this and proposes PIC8 as a suitable response.
- 2.1.13 **Issue n.** The Council accepts this and proposes IC64 as a suitable response.
- 2.1.14 **Issue o.** The Council accepts the need to refer to other plans and relevant matters and proposes PIC10 as a suitable response.
- 2.1.15 **Issue p.** The bullet points are simply summarising the Community Plan and it would not be appropriate to amend them.
- 2.1.16 **Issue q.** The Council accepts the validity of this point and proposes PIC12 as a suitable response.
- 2.1.17 **Issue r.** I see no benefit in the objector's alternative.
- 2.1.18 **Issue s.** This matter appears to be adequately covered by Policy SG4, as amended by PIC18.
- 2.1.19 **Issue t.** This matter appears to be suitably addressed elsewhere in the Plan by the amendment to para.3.2 (PIC15) and to para.3.29 (IC44).
- 2.1.20 **Issue u.** This matter is dealt with in Chapter 4 of this report, on affordable housing.
- 2.1.21 **Issue v.** Whilst consultation is an essential part of the decision-making process, there is no need for such a reference in the Plan.
- 2.1.22 **Issue w.** There is no need to insert a new objective at para.2.39. The commitment sought by the objector to quality in the environment is already addressed in an appropriately general form by the first objective and expressed in operational terms within Policy SG14 – Design and Layout of New Development. No material benefit would be obtained by substituting the objector's alternative wording.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

- R.2.1. I recommend that the Plan be amended in accordance with PIC7, PIC8, PIC10, PIC12, IC3 and IC64 and by the deletion of paras.2.41 – 2.44.**

**Chapter 2 - Objections**

015/001	F	Mr Barry Strange
029/007	F	Lincolnshire County Council
031/003	F	Railtrack Plc
062/001	F	Mrs A M Cook
072/001	F	Mr Paul Cook
094/002	F	Mr John Honnor
138/001	F	Mrs H Gotobed
139/004	F	Countryside Agency East Midlands Region
144/004	F	Councillor P M Walls
144/022	F	Councillor P M Walls
175/004	F	J J Allen Esq
207/002	F	Mr & Mrs J Rowland
242/001	F	Mr R Hughes
303/002	F	Boston and Spalding TUC
308/018	F	Country Land and Business Association
308/022	F	Country Land and Business Association
308/023	F	Country Land and Business Association
312/001	F	Mr G M Johnson
314/001	F	RSPB
321/008	F	Spalding & District Civic Society
532/003	R	Government Office for the East Midlands
532/045	R	Fiona Forgham, Government Office for the East Midlands
532/046	R	Fiona Forgham, Government Office for the East Midlands
565/002	R	Welland and Deeping Drainage Board
574/001	R	Councillor Chris Brewis
576/023	R	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
578/001	R	Thornfield Springfield Developments Ltd
588/001	R	The Environment Agency
595/003	R	Peterborough City Council
640/001	R	Pedals
655/020	R	Broadgate Homes Ltd
680/001	R	Donington Parish Council
680/002	R	Donington Parish Council
680/003	R	Donington Parish Council
682/001	R	John Hayes MP
682/002	R	John Hayes MP
682/018	R	John Hayes MP
683/001	R	Spalding & District Civic Society
683/002	R	Spalding & District Civic Society
683/003	R	Spalding & District Civic Society
683/004	R	Spalding & District Civic Society
683/005	R	Spalding & District Civic Society
685/001	R	English Heritage
685/002	R	English Heritage
687/001	R	Wash Estuary Management Group
687/002	R	Wash Estuary Management Group