

Briefing

Examination of the East Lindsey Core Strategy and the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals DPD: Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions – Stage 1 Core Strategy (May 2017)

June 2017

1. This Hearing Statement has been prepared on behalf of St Andrews Healthcare in respect of their land interests to the south of Tothby Lane, Alford (“the site”).
2. The site is approximately 9.8 hectares in area and is located on the western edge of Alford. The centre of Alford is located 0.8km to the east of the site and it is bound by residential properties on its eastern and southern boundary; whilst a dismantled railway and Tothby Lane bound the site on its western and northern boundaries respectively.
3. The site is available and represents a suitable and achievable opportunity to deliver up to 200 dwellings over the plan period.
4. The site has previously been promoted through the Local Plan by Turley during the public consultation on the Core Strategy Pre-Submission Draft in January 2017 and the Draft Core Strategy in June 2016.

Matter 4 - Settlement Pattern (Policy SP1)

Question 1: Is the settlement pattern in Policy SP1 justified? Have settlements been appropriately categorised, including Tetford, Tetney, Croft, Goulceby and Orby?

5. It is considered that the approach towards the settlement pattern by the Council to shape the strategy for the distribution, scale and nature of housing is justified and consistent with the policies of the NPPF.
6. Specifically, the identification of Alford as a ‘Town’ is supported as the settlement is well established with a wide range of facilities and services for existing and future residents. The pattern is broadly consistent with the core planning principles of paragraph 17 of the NPPF, in particular, for plan-making to focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable.
7. The identification of Alford as a ‘Town’ in an inland area is consistent with paragraph 99 of the NPPF which sets out that new development should be planned to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change such as coastal flood risk.

Question 2: What role did the settlement pattern have in determining the distribution of housing and employment development?

8. The allocation for Alford has not been positively prepared and is unjustified given that Holton le Clay and Woodhall Spa, which are classified as 'Large Villages', both have larger allocations equal to 326 and 352 respectively. The larger allocations to the two Large Villages is both contradictory with SP1 and is inconsistent with the NPPF core planning principle to actively manage patterns of growth in locations which are sustainable. Furthermore, this approach to housing distribution does not meet the overriding aims of plan-making towards balancing housing growth relative to infrastructure and the size of settlements.
9. In all, the spatial distribution does not clearly state why the apportionment between 'Towns' and 'Large Villages' is as set out in Table B at paragraph 21. Further justification text is required in terms of why each settlement has been allocated their respective amount, particularly in respect to Alford.

Contact

Sam Lake
sam.lake@turley.co.uk

21 June 2017

ST Q2002