

SOUTH HOLLAND LOCAL PLAN

Public Local Inquiry

Core Strategy Round Table Session

Combined Responses Supplement
of
South Holland District Council



CORE STRATEGY

Topic 1. Is it appropriate for the Plan to include reference to the Council's 'longer term' aspirations, as set out in paras. 2.41-2.44?

1.0 Summary of Other Participants' Position Statements

1.1 Geoffrey Collings & Co on behalf of various clients (PS/590/CS/E/H)

Yes; it would be surprising if the Council did not support the aspirations expressed in those paragraphs of the Plan.

1.2 Calthrops on behalf of Executors of R Mason Deceased (PS/504/CS/E/H)

No, a more general vision statement would be appropriate. The forthcoming Local Development Framework may be able to contain detail, if properly researched and achievable.

1.3 Barker Storey Matthews on behalf of Mr P Ruysen (PS/665/CS/H)

It is appropriate but needs to be robust to accommodate change and ensure delivery of opportunities in settlements outside Spalding.

1.4 English Nature (PS/025/CS)

There is value in including this long term section but it should be expanded to cover other social, economic and environmental goals and challenges in the pursuit of sustainability. in particular climate change, in addition to transportation,

2.0 Response of the Council

2.1 The Council refers to its Combined Position Statement and Responses LPA/RTS/CS paragraphs 2.1 to 2.4. The following additional points are made.

- 2.2 Regarding the point raised by English Nature, while it is right that the examples given in the paragraphs are concerned with transportation issues, para. 2.42 sets out a wider vision in which Spalding is to become the premier food and horticulture town in the county and in which a better balance between jobs, houses and a more sustainable pattern of development is achieved.
- 2.3 Regarding the point raised by Calthrops, these paragraphs are, in essence, a general vision statement. The Plan has a range of specific objectives (paragraph 2.39) and priorities (paragraph 2.40) relating to the plan period and the 'longer term' section does not replace those.

Topic 2. Is the Plan's strategy for the distribution of development appropriate; in general terms, are the Plan's proposals consistent with the underlying strategy? Are the settlements suitably ranked within the settlement hierarchy? Are the locations of homes and jobs suitably related?

3.0 Summary of Other Participants' Position Statements

3.1 Geoffrey Collings & Co on behalf of various clients (PS/590/CS/E/H)

Concerned that emphasis on Spalding is at the expense of the rest of the District based on the 'excuse' that Spalding is the most sustainable location. Lack of housing allocation at Long Sutton means that provision for homes is not related to provision of jobs. Feel that job creation is a reasonable aspiration but suspect that job creation in the Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge area in recent years has not been very high compared to previously identified requirements.

3.2 Calthrops on behalf of Executors of R Mason Deceased (PS/504/CS/E/H)

The strategy seeks to link housing with employment in the north of the District. However, at Crowland the employment allocation should remain a fully committed site. However the strategy fails fully to consider the relationship between homes and jobs in the wider context, especially across the District's borders. The settlement hierarchy is correct.

3.3 Barker Storey Matthews on behalf of Mr P Ruysen (PS/665/CS/H)

Appears appropriate in general, although debatable whether all settlements are suitably ranked. Some sites with logical development potential have been excluded from defined settlement limits; their development could help support local services.

3.4 Environment Agency (PS/588/CS)

Supportive of the high level approach of the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to inform the process. However, the distribution of development is inappropriate in flood risk terms. The Plan does not appear to have differentiated between land

within the breach envelope and land outside it. In addition there needs to be a clear demonstration of the sequential approach to employment allocations and site specific flood risk assessments may be required.

4.0 Response of the Council

- 4.1 The Council refers to its Combined Position Statement and Responses LPA/RTS/CS paragraphs 4.1 to 4.9. The following additional points are made.
- 4.2 In Long Sutton there has been housing growth over a number of years on sites the allocation of which predated the adopted Local Plan. Those allocations were made at a time when unemployment was relatively high. By contrast unemployment in the District is currently low, at just 1.4% in July 2005 (Figure 3 in CD/SH/36). The Council is hopeful that the current review of RSS8 will lead to an increased strategic housing figure and if that does happen then we will review again the provisions for growth in the settlements and the balance with the achievement of job creation. In the context of the current strategic housing figure the Council believes that the Plan's strategy is appropriate at this time.
- 4.3 The matter concerning the employment allocation at Crowland will be addressed in the Council's Supplementary Response to the Economy Round Table. Regarding the wider relationship between homes and jobs and across the District's borders, the Council believes that this will be appropriately addressed through the review of RSS8 and other regional and sub-regional work and can then be addressed in our Local Development Documents.
- 4.4 Some of the sites recently removed from defined settlement limits may have potential for reallocation in the longer term, particularly in the Area Centres and to a lesser extent the Group Centres. This will be dependent upon future decisions on the strategic housing requirement, its distribution and the suitability of sites.
- 4.5 On the matter of flood risk, it is important to note that physical and environmental constraints, including flood risk (and other factors such as contamination) constitute just one of the criteria identified at paragraph 31 of PPG3 against

which the potential and suitability of housing allocations should be assessed. That factor was taken into account, in addition to others, in determining the allocations in the Plan. The Council's more detailed responses to the Environment Agency's site specific objections will be given in our proofs of evidence for those hearings. Applicants for planning permission will be expected to submit site specific flood risk assessments for their proposals and to identify mitigation measures if necessary.

- 4.6 The Council considers that Spalding is the most sustainable location for future development. It is not an 'excuse' to justify allocations which are made for other, unspecified, reasons.
- 4.7 The ranking of settlements is based on the services and facilities study and on the regional and county hierarchies, with which it is compliant.

Topic 3. Is it appropriate to restrict development in the Other Rural Settlements by removal of defined settlement limits?

5.0 Summary of Other Participants' Position Statements

5.1 Geoffrey Collings & Co on behalf of various clients (PS/590/CS/E/H)

No, because no growth in some Other Rural Settlements will prejudice the future of the existing facilities in those villages.

5.2 Calthrops on behalf of Executors of R Mason Deceased (PS/504/CS/E/H)

Yes, this is accepted.

6.0 Response of the Council

6.1 The Council refers to its Combined Position Statement and Responses LPA/RTS/CS paragraphs 6.1 to 6.5. The following additional points are made.

6.2 Geoffrey Collings and Co.'s submission is concerned with the policy of restricting growth in the Other Rural Settlements and not with the method of achieving this - through the removal of settlement boundaries. As far as the policy itself is concerned, the principle of sustainability demands that most development takes place in the larger settlements. Providing growth in villages would give no certainty that existing services would be retained. Furthermore, in Other Rural Settlements the range of services available is limited. New development on a large scale, whilst potentially providing greater additional custom for local services, would not be appropriate. Development fulfilling genuine local needs is not ruled out by the Plan.

6.3 As far as the methodology is concerned, this is addressed at para. 6.3 of our Combined Position Statement and Responses LPA/RTS/CS.

Topic 4. Is Policy SG6 consistent with national policy on planning obligations? Is it an adequate basis on which to base negotiations? If not, should this be expanded upon in the Plan or in a Supplementary Planning Document?

7.0 Summary of Other Participants' Position Statements

7.1 Geoffrey Collings & Co on behalf of various clients (PS/590/CS/E/H)

Applying this approach to new employment development may impact on what is delivered by overloading developers with infrastructure costs. Local and Central government should bear at least some costs. Otherwise the allocations, particularly that at Long Sutton, need rethinking.

7.2 Barker Storey Matthews on behalf of Mr P Ruysen (PS/665/CS/H)

It is in accordance but it appears that the onus is placed on the developer to assess impact. The Council should inform the process by providing appropriate supplementary planning documents.

7.3 English Nature (PS/025/CS)

Yes, it is broadly consistent with Government policy. The intended Supplementary Planning Document will be an appropriate and responsive document to provide more information on the assessment of impact of proposals. Biodiversity should be included in the list of potential benefits at paragraph 3.39 of the Plan.

7.4 Environment Agency (PS/588/CS)

Support Policy SG6. Ensuring necessary infrastructure is in place is paramount to ensuring sustainable development.

8.0 Response of the Council

8.1 The Council refers to its Combined Position Statement and Responses LPA/RTS/CS paragraphs 8.1 to 8.4. The following additional points are made.

8.2 It is agreed that infrastructure requests must be reasonable. The Council will need to work with other organisations and individual developers and firms to focus investment in the employment allocations, to help deliver them.

8.3 The list of potential benefits at paragraph 3.39 of the Plan is only intended to give examples, rather than providing a definitive list. The Council does not therefore consider it strictly necessary to include reference to biodiversity in that list. However, we recognise that biodiversity and the protection and enhancement of natural resources are at least as important as a number of objectives that are referred to in the paragraph and we therefore invite the Inspector to add to that paragraph:

- the protection and enhancement of natural resources and biodiversity.
-