

Examination of the East Lindsey Core Strategy and the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals Development Plan Document (DPD)

Inspectors' matters, issues and questions (MIQs)

Stage 1 – Core Strategy

26 May 2017

Note: The MIQs for Stage 2 relating primarily to the Settlement Proposals Development Plan Document and 5 year supply of housing will be made available separately. Some cross-cutting issues relating to both plans will be considered in Stage 1.

Abbreviations:

ADM – additional minor modification proposed by the Council

CS – Core Strategy

Framework – National Planning Policy Framework

Regulations – The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

The Council` s answers are in italics with any suggested modifications in red italics

Matter 6 – The approach to housing development, particularly in the Inland areas (Policies SP3 and SP4)

Context:

The CS (Table A) states that the housing supply is comprised of:

Commitments inland 2777

Commitments coastal 1308

Spilsby site SPY310 350

Inland allocations 3901

Total 8336

Allocations are confined to the inland Towns and Large Villages and are set out in the Settlement Proposals DPD.

Windfall development is accepted in the inland Towns and Large Villages, subject to SP3 5 which allows spatially appropriate development which would not be out of character or isolated from the main body of the settlement (these sites being wholly within or adjoining to the main body of the settlement).

There are no housing allocations in the Medium and Small Villages. In these settlements Policy SP4 only supports the conversion and redevelopment of sites for housing, where they are brownfield and have disused buildings on them, and subject to criteria (including marketing for community, leisure or economic use).

The following policies also accept housing development in specific circumstances:

- *SP5 – specialist housing for older people in towns and large villages*
- *SP8 – affordable housing on rural exception sites in and adjoining medium and small villages*
- *SP9 – affordable housing on single plot exceptions in towns and large, medium and small villages*

Note – these will be considered in detail in Matters 7 and 10

The Framework states; 'To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby.' (para 55)

The PPG on Rural Housing states: '... all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.'

The Settlement Proposals DPD and the housing allocations (including the process and method for selecting them) will be considered at the Stage 2 hearing sessions

Main issue: Is the overall approach to housing development in the inland areas justified?

Questions

1. Is there a policy which specifically allocates the housing sites set out in the Settlement Proposals DPD?

Not definitively, there are words around the subject but no clear policy statement in the clauses of Policy SP3. The Council would suggest a modification with an additional sentence to clause 4 so the clause reads

"Housing growth will be allocated in the Settlement Proposals Document and will be distributed across....."

Questions - inland Towns and Large Villages

2. The plan states (para 14, para 23) that the starting point requirement for the settlement is calculated on the number of households as a percentage. Is this starting point figure for each of the inland Towns and Large Villages set out anywhere?

| PROPOSED HOUSING DISTRIBUTION ADJUSTED TABLE | All Usual Residents | Households | | Commitments ² at Feb 16 | 28616 towns+L Vill H/holds | Target 7768 (minus 1308 & 308 coast and other settlements)* | Target minus commitments | Actual allocation |
|--|---------------------|---------------------------------|------|------------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------|
| | Persons | Households | pph | | percent | | | |
| TOWNS | | | | | | | | |
| Alford | 3459 | 1518 | 2.28 | 148 | 5.3% | 326 | 178 | 161 |
| Coningsby & Tattershal | 6698 | 2553 | 2.62 | 159 | 8.9% | 549 | 390 | 417 |
| Horncastle | 6815 | 3178 | 2.14 | 697 | 11.1% | 683 | -14 | 0 |
| Louth | 16419 | 7530 | 2.18 | 625 | 26.3% | 1619 | 994 | 1204 |
| Spilsby | 3045 | 1398 | 2.18 | 73 | 4.9% | 301 | 228 | 264 |
| | | | | | | 0 | | |
| LARGE VILLAGES | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 0 | | |
| Binbrook | 892 | 429 | 2.08 | 8 | 1.5% | 92 | 84 | 0 |
| Burgh le Marsh | 2340 | 1119 | 2.09 | 82 | 3.9% | 241 | 159 | 95 |
| Friskney | 1563 | 262 | 5.97 | 3 | 0.9% | 56 | 53 | 59 |
| Grainthorpe | 749 | 309 | 2.42 | 3 | 1.1% | 66 | 63 | 18 |
| Grimoldby & Manby | 1754 | 734 | 2.39 | 139 | 2.6% | 158 | 19 | 77 |
| Hogsthorpe | 908 | 408 | 2.23 | 21 | 1.4% | 88 | 67 | 100 |
| Holton le Clay | 3691 | 1583 | 2.33 | 7 | 5.5% | 340 | 333 | 326 |
| Huttoft | 585 | 246 | 2.38 | 3 | 0.9% | 53 | 50 | 0 |
| Legbourne | 644 | 282 | 2.28 | 39 | 1.0% | 61 | 22 | 23 |
| Mareham le Fen | 944 | 439 | 2.15 | 43 | 1.5% | 94 | 51 | 113 |
| Marshchapel | 704 | 317 | 2.22 | 3 | 1.1% | 68 | 65 | 84 |
| North Thoresby | 1068 | 489 | 2.18 | 17 | 1.7% | 105 | 88 | 160 |
| Sibsey | 1979 | 880 | 2.25 | 20 | 3.1% | 189 | 169 | 239 |
| Stickney | 1127 | 445 | 2.53 | 64 | 1.6% | 96 | 32 | 24 |
| Tetford | 464 | 205 | 2.26 | 5 | 0.7% | 44 | 39 | 0 |
| Tetney | 1725 | 717 | 2.41 | 98 | 2.5% | 154 | 56 | 57 |
| Wainfleet All Saints | 1604 | 840 | 1.91 | 22 | 2.9% | 181 | 159 | 96 |
| Woodhall Spa | 4003 | 1821 | 2.20 | 52 | 6.4% | 391 | 339 | 352 |
| Wragby | 1768 | 805 | 2.20 | 121 | 2.8% | 173 | 52 | 32 |
| Partney | 237 | 109 | 2.17 | 17 | 0.4% | 23 | 6 | 0 |
| | | 28616 | | | | | | |
| | | | | 2469 | | 6152 | 3683 | 3901 |
| * Minus 360 Commitments in Medium/Small villages | | | | 308 | | | | |
| ² Planning Permissions and under construction | | | | | | | | |
| | | Total inland commitments | | 2777 | | | | |

Please see the table above, this table should have been put in the Housing Topic Paper for information.

3. Taking into account allocations *and* commitments, what is the planned level of housing growth in each of the inland Towns and Large Villages? Do the larger settlements get more housing growth, as stated in CS para 14, page 23?

The planned level of growth is set out in the table below. The larger settlements in the main get more growth.

| PROPOSED HOUSING DISTRIBUTION ADJUSTED TABLE | Commitments ² at Feb 16 | 28616 towns+L Vill H/holds percent | Target 7768 (minus 1308 & 308 coast and other settlements)* | Target minus commitments | Actual allocation | growth in each settlement |
|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| TOWNS | | | | | | |
| Alford | 148 | 5.3% | 326 | 178 | 161 | 309 |
| Coningsby & Tattershal | 159 | 8.9% | 549 | 390 | 417 | 576 |
| Horncastle | 697 | 11.1% | 683 | -14 | 0 | 697 |
| Louth | 625 | 26.3% | 1619 | 994 | 1204 | 1829 |
| Spilsby | 73 | 4.9% | 301 | 228 | 264 | 337 |
| | | | 0 | | | 0 |
| LARGE VILLAGES | | | | | | |
| Binbrook | 8 | 1.5% | 92 | 84 | 0 | 8 |
| Burgh le Marsh | 82 | 3.9% | 241 | 159 | 95 | 177 |
| Friskney | 3 | 0.9% | 56 | 53 | 59 | 62 |
| Grainthorpe | 3 | 1.1% | 66 | 63 | 18 | 21 |
| Grimoldby & Manby | 139 | 2.6% | 158 | 19 | 77 | 216 |
| Hogsthorpe | 21 | 1.4% | 88 | 67 | 100 | 121 |
| Holton le Clay | 7 | 5.5% | 340 | 333 | 326 | 333 |
| Huttoft | 3 | 0.9% | 53 | 50 | 0 | 3 |
| Legbourne | 39 | 1.0% | 61 | 22 | 23 | 62 |
| Mareham le Fen | 43 | 1.5% | 94 | 51 | 113 | 156 |
| Marshchapel | 3 | 1.1% | 68 | 65 | 84 | 87 |
| North Thoresby | 17 | 1.7% | 105 | 88 | 160 | 177 |
| Sibsey | 20 | 3.1% | 189 | 169 | 239 | 259 |
| Stickney | 64 | 1.6% | 96 | 32 | 24 | 88 |
| Tetford | 5 | 0.7% | 44 | 39 | 0 | 5 |
| Tetney | 98 | 2.5% | 154 | 56 | 57 | 155 |
| Wainfleet All Saints | 22 | 2.9% | 181 | 159 | 96 | 118 |
| Woodhall Spa | 52 | 6.4% | 391 | 339 | 352 | 404 |
| Wragby | 121 | 2.8% | 173 | 52 | 32 | 153 |
| Partney | 17 | 0.4% | 23 | 6 | 0 | 17 |
| | | | | | | 0 |
| | 2469 | | 6152 | 3683 | 3901 | 6370 |
| * Minus 360 Commitments | 308 | | | | | |
| ² Planning Permissions and under construction | | | | | | |
| Commitments 2469 plus commitments already in the small and medium villages = 2777 | | | | | | |

4. Taking commitments into account, is the overall extent and distribution of the housing allocations to **the inland Towns** justified (ie - Louth 1204, Alford 161, Coningsby/Tattershal 417, Horncastle 0, Spilsby 264)? How were the minimum allocation figures in Table B on page 26 arrived at? In

some cases these figures are less than in some of the Large Villages (eg Holton le Clay 326, Sibsey 239 and Woodhall Spa 352) – is this justified? How does this relate to the Settlement Pattern in Policy SP1 (see Policy SP3 4 which refers to housing growth being distributed as set out in the Settlement Pattern).

Some of the Districts large villages are larger than the town of Alford or near to Spilsby in size, such as Holton le Clay, Woodhall Spa, Sibsey and Burgh le Marsh but they do not have the level of services and facilities of the towns. It's a "quirk" of the District.

5. Why are no allocations proposed in Horncastle? Is the planned level of housing growth in Horncastle appropriate, having regard to existing housing commitments?

Horncastle has a very large number of housing commitments, over the proposed level of growth. As at the end of May 2017 the town had 833 housing commitments. Out of those 31 had started. When the site allocations were being prepared the town had 697 commitments with more housing waiting to go through the system for permission. Given that the allocation would only have been 683, it was felt that this was sufficient housing to address any need over the Plan period.

6. A significant proportion of the total from inland allocations is to be provided in Louth (1204 out of 3901). Taking commitments into account, is the scale of increase justified?

Louth is the largest inland town with the greatest population by far, set on the A16, with good infrastructure connections, and the largest level of services and facilities including schools, doctors, a hospital, main shopping and many leisure activities. The amount of growth in Louth is therefore justified and considered to be sustainable given its size and dominance within the District.

7. Taking commitments into account, is the overall extent, distribution and scale of the housing allocations in the **inland Large Villages** justified (these vary from 0 in some settlements to 352 in Woodhall Spa)? How were the minimum allocation figures in Table B on page 26 arrived at? How does this distribution relate to the Settlement Pattern in Policy SP1 and does it take adequate account of the availability of services and facilities in the Large Villages? (see Policy SP3 4 which refers to housing growth being distributed as set out in the Settlement Pattern).

The Council believes that the extent, distribution and scale of housing allocations in the inland large villages is justified. The minimum figures were derived from the table above. Then matters were presented to Members, with discussions around Partney, Binbrook and Tetford. Partney being a (small) large village but having its actual services and facilities mainly outside the village it was determined not to give it an allocation and Binbrook and Tetford were in the AONB. It would not mean that housing coming forward would not be considered because they remain large

villages, but they were not considered for strategic growth. Then the sites were looked at, which adjusted the figures again. In the main the larger villages and towns with more facilities get more growth.

8. What is the justification for there being no allocations in the large villages of Huttoft and Partney?

Huttoft had planning permissions granted in between consultations in 2016 which took it past its growth allocation so it was like Horncastle not given any further allocation. Partney is really quite small for its level of services and facilities and all these lie outside the village on the main trunk road, it was therefore decided not to give Partney any allocation.

9. Is the approach to *windfall sites* in the **inland Towns and Large Villages** justified? Does Policy SP3 5 provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal, given there are no settlement boundaries? Will it be clear when a particular site *within* or *adjoining* the *main body of the settlement* would be *spatially appropriate* and would not leave the development *out of character or isolated* from the *main body of the settlement*? Is there any definition or explanation of these terms? Is there intended to be any limit on the extent of housing growth allowed in these settlements under this policy or to the size of individual sites/developments? Is there any intended priority to sites within the main body of the settlement or to previously developed land? The supporting text (para 29) states that historically many windfall sites have been very small scale infill sites – is the continuation of this past position the policy intention here?

The Council wished to be flexible with regard to windfall sites and therefore did not place many restrictions around their coming forward apart from the caveats set out in other policies in the Plan around the coast and medium and small villages, the majority of them should only come forward in the inland towns and large villages.

Consideration was given to placing restrictions around the policy regarding numbers or percentages but it was decided that they were too inflexible and what would happen if a suitable site came forward outside those restrictions, which, given the number of windfalls delivered in the District was inevitable. Also a percentage figure or number would have to be different for every settlement in the towns and large villages because they are all different with different characters, 5 dwellings in Louth could have a different impact than 5 dwellings in Alford. The other matter would be what would happen if all the amount of windfall was delivered in the first five years would there then be a moratorium on this kind of development. In practice, this would not happen. Therefore each site should be judged on its own merits apart from the caveats already placed within the policy.

The District has so few brownfield sites that making them a priority would have little effect in what would come forward, there are only 11 brownfield sites under consideration for Part 2 of the Council`s draft brownfield land register. In regard to design, character, landscaping, historic environment

impact and biodiversity this is covered in other policies in the Plan which sites would have to be in conformity with.

The Council believes that within or adjoining the inland and large villages which should not leave development out of character or isolated from the main body of the settlement is clear. The Plan did have the word "alongside" instead of adjoining but this was changed after the summer 2016 consultation because the Council agreed with one of the consultees that "adjoining" was a more connective and descriptive word. There were no other objections to this part of the Plan in term of its flexibility.

10. Is Policy SP3 5 on windfall development in the **inland Towns and Large Villages** consistent with national policy in the NPPF (paras 115 and 116) regarding Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (given there are Large Villages within the AONB – Binbrook, Tetford and Partney)?

The Council believes the policy is consistent with national policy in the NPPF, paragraphs 115 and 116 do not say you cannot grant planning permission, they say that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, the Broads and Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and that planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest; then it goes onto say that applications should include assessments....

The Council would consider that it is for the applicant of a proposed development to prove that they are an exceptional case and work through the need, impact and sequential assessments. The concern for the Council would be to impose a blanket ban on development in the settlements in the AONB will eventually lead to loss of services and facilities and they will be downgraded in the settlement pattern.

Partney is not in the AONB, the very top of the settlement grazes it but the majority of the built area is outside.

11. Is it intended that windfall development in the **inland Towns and Large Villages** will make any contribution to the anticipated housing supply in Table A of the CS (eg to the *windfall allowance 15% of target* of 1165)?

The Plan sets out that windfall development per se, that is all windfall development will make a 15% contribution to the housing supply.

The figure of 1165 set out in the plan is 15% of the overall target, this is most likely an underestimate. The District in February 2017 had reached 90% of that figure already in the grant of planning permissions. This comes from the historical delivery of windfall sites across the District, whereby, it has been up to 50% plus of delivery. It is hoped this will fall as the Local Plan takes effect.

Questions – inland medium and small villages

12. Does the restrictive approach to housing development in the **inland Medium and Small Villages** in Policy SP4 comply with the Framework and the PPG (see 'context' above) and the approach set out on page 17 (para 2) of the plan which refers to the inter-relationships between smaller and larger settlements? Is the restrictive approach justified having regard to the services and facilities available in these settlements (eg as set out on pages 17 and 18 of the CS)?

The medium and small villages of the District are quite spread out and have very few services and facilities as set out in CD11. The Council has carried out a piece of work set out in the Sustainable Communities Topic Paper (CD13) which looked at the correlation of growth to the protection of services and facilities and there is no real link.

The 1995 Adopted Local Plan had a policy of dispersal of housing in order to protect services and facilities, it also grouped settlements in clusters and the Council did follow that policy, and has been following that policy up to now, however, still many settlements lost facilities, despite that policy. Section 3 of the Sustainable Communities Topic Paper (CD13) discusses this and it states that there are no clear patterns emerging in relation to the amount of growth in a settlement and the changes to village facilities. Villages with low growth have retained services and those with high growth have lost facilities. 47.4% of settlements have seen no change in the level of facilities over the period assessed since 2001.

The Council did originally have clusters in the Local Plan but these were removed when it was realized that they did not really bear any correlation to one another. Residents in smaller settlements tend to look to the higher order settlements for the day to day needs such as medical facilities, secondary schools, main shopping and key leisure activities. It does not work the other way.

Last year the Council granted permission for 72 dwellings in the medium and small villages but as far as the Council is aware there were no new services and facilities created in these settlements as a direct result of these permissions.

Given that the age profile of the District is predominantly older persons and the growth is predicated on the in migration of the older birth cohorts; these residents should be directed to those settlements with a higher level of services and facilities in order to sustain their day to day lives and have better access to medical services, shopping, care facilities and leisure activities without having to resort to the use of the car. Only 3 of the medium and small villages have two key facilities of a primary school and a shop and they look to the higher order settlements to provide day to day living needs, the system does not work the other way with those from higher order settlements looking to lower ones to meet their needs.

East Lindsey is rural in its nature and the large inland villages are rural villages which the Council is supporting in regard to growth. The medium and small villages are very rural and supporting small scale housing in

these settlements does not enhance or maintain their vitality, it just provides housing for more residents in a settlement which then have to travel to obtain medical services, shopping, care, often school and preschool facilities, etc. The Council believe that this is not sustainable in the long term for the District.

13. Is it justified that there are no housing allocations in the Medium or Small Villages.

The Council believes it is justified as set out in the answer to question 12 above. There is the opportunity to bring forward affordable housing if the need is proven, build a house via the single plot exceptions policy or develop a brownfield site providing the caveats of the policy SP4 are met. This should provide some housing throughout the plan period which has a justified need or prevents blight to the community.

14. Is it justified to limit housing development in the **inland Medium and Small Villages** in Policy SP4 to sites that are brownfield *and* have buildings on them that have become disused? Is it justified to require that these sites have been actively marketed for a community, economic or leisure use for 12 months? And that first consideration should be given to the conversion of buildings?

The policy does state this this does not fall within the whole remit of brownfield sites. The Council believes that it is important that owners of disused sites demonstrate that those sites cannot be used for a community, economic or leisure uses. If villages are going to become more sustainable then policies need to support and encourage these uses and this was a way of doing this, it also ensures that those considering the closure of existing community services and facilities demonstrate that every effort has been made to retain it in the community and resell the site. Paragraph 70 of the NPPF states that planning policies and decisions should guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services.

Consideration should be given to the conversion of buildings in the first instance because in smaller communities many buildings form part of the distinctive character of that settlement and their loss could be detrimental to that character. The Council is asking developers to consider this when making an application and demonstrate that a building cannot be converted. The Council would suggest a modification to clause 1 of the policy so that the first sentence would read as follows;

Elsewhere, within the medium and small villages, the conversion and redevelopment of sites for housing will be supported, where those sites are brownfield.....

15. Should the plan allow for appropriate infilling within these villages?

The Council does not believe infill development in medium and small villages is appropriate, many of them have important green gaps which help to form the character of the settlement, and there is no total control

over the amount of development nor the cumulative impact such development would have.

The Council would only have to slip into not having a five year supply of housing and the balance of the decision maker would fall to favoring such development which could lead to unacceptable levels of growth in settlements without the necessary services and facilities to support residents. In effect this has been happening for at least the last 25 years with the result that many smaller settlements have grown but their services and facilities have not grown to accommodate new residents.

Many of the smaller settlements of the district have very distinct rural characteristics that the Council wishes to conserve and protect. Infill development does not, once again, provide any additional services or facilities in these small settlements and provision for day to day life has to be provided by the use of the car. Therefore this would not cause a gain for these settlements except to increase a rurally isolated population which does not have access to the basic necessities of day to day life without the use of the car or public transport and with the potential loss of character.

The Council also considered that if the Plan allowed for infill development in the medium and small villages, this could potentially undermine the overall strategy of the Plan, in that development should be directed to those places best equipped to serve it and residents which it the towns and large villages. Given that there are 37 medium villages and 37 small villages, even 10 houses in each medium village and 5 in each small village over 15 years would be a total of 555 dwellings. Given that the Council granted 72 dwellings in these settlements last year over 15 years this is 1080 dwellings. The majority were single dwellings. At 2.2 persons per household that is potentially another 2376 people who would have to use the car to gain access to higher order services and facilities.

16. What evidence is there that there is little correlation between growth and the protection of services? (para 3 page 21 of the CS)

The medium and small villages of the District are quite spread out and have very few services and facilities as set out in CD11. The Council has carried out a piece of work set out in the Sustainable Communities Topic Paper (CD13) which looked at the correlation of growth to the protection of services and facilities and there is no real link.

The 1995 Adopted Local Plan had a policy of dispersal of housing in order to protect services and facilities, it also grouped settlements in clusters and the Council did follow that policy, and has been following that policy up to now, however, still many settlements lost facilities, despite that policy. Section 3 of the Sustainable Communities Topic Paper (CD13) discusses this and it states that there are no clear patterns emerging in relation to the amount of growth in a settlement and the changes to village facilities. Villages with low growth have retained services and those with high growth have lost facilities.

47.4% of settlements have seen no change in the level of facilities over the period assessed since 2001.

Last year the Council granted permission for 72 dwellings in the medium and small villages but as far as the Council is aware there were no new services and facilities created in these settlements as a direct result of these permissions.

What can be deduced is the change to the people's lifestyles in the loss of some facilities. The rise of the use of the internet for shopping, the national closure of post offices, the smoking ban in public houses, local choice in school placements and medical facilities. The increased use of the car.

There are some places that have retained their services and facilities and others have lost them whilst having an equal amount of growth. Even the towns have lost shops but yet have still had a good level of growth.

Questions - general

17. Is ADM8 necessary for soundness? (reference to *minimum* allocations and not targets).

The modification was suggested after the pre submission round of consultation when it was not clear to one of the consultees around the issue of targets being set for each settlement. This is not the case and the additional wording in paragraph 21 should help clarify this. The modification was for clarity not necessarily for soundness.

The Council believes that this is important and that suggestions made by consultees if they improve clarity or if changes make clear matters that appear through consultation to be not understood then the Council should positively consider making minor adjustments to the Plan as long as it then does not become unsound.

18. Is ADM11 necessary for soundness? (reference to *minimum inland target of 6460*). [Note ADM11 shows some text as being changed, even though it is unaltered from the submitted plan]

The modification was suggested after the pre submission round of consultation when it was not clear to one of the consultees what the Council was trying to put across in the paragraph. The modification was for clarity not necessarily for soundness.

The Council believes that this is important and that suggestions made by consultees if they improve clarity or if changes make clear matters that appear through consultation to be not understood then the Council should positively consider making minor adjustments to the Plan as long as it then does not become unsound.

19. Is ADM5 necessary for soundness? (relating to the approach on allocating growth and large urban extensions)

These proposed minor modifications at ADM5 have come about through a consultation response, the consultee appeared to have not understood how the Council allocates its growth and believed that the Council were deliberately not choosing sites above 300 units, which is not the case, as the Spilsby site is over 300 houses. The rewording of this paragraph makes it clearer but it was not necessary for soundness.

The Council believes that this is important and that suggestions made by consultees if they improve clarity or if changes make clear matters that appear through consultation to be not understood then the Council should positively consider making minor adjustments to the Plan as long as it then does not become unsound.

20. Is ADM13 necessary for soundness? (definition of a windfall site)

This was raised by one of the consultees through the consultation that there was no definition of a windfall site. The Council agrees that for clarity it should be clear about what the Plan means when it discusses windfall sites. This does improve the soundness of the Plan in that it must be clear what the Council is delivering.

21. In para 23, page 27 the CS states that the Council will ensure that there is an appropriate variety of house types and sizes on developments, with particular reference to *strong* support for smaller houses and housing for older people. Is this intended as a policy requirement and if so, should it be included within a policy? Is it justified? Is it sufficiently flexible? Is ADM10 necessary for soundness (deleting the word 'strong')?

This was raised by one of the consultees through consultation and the Council deleted the word "strong" because it was not necessary as an adjective. There is either support or no support for a matter. The wording of the paragraph could be construed as ambiguous and not clear in terms of whether it is a policy or not. The Council does believe it is justified in ensuring that there is a variety of house types and sizes on development, this leads to more inclusive communities and caters for all residents and not just one type. The council would suggest a modification to paragraph 23 and a new clause at 6 in the dark text of the policy so it reads as follows;

The Council will support development that demonstrates that it can provide a variety of house types and sizes. Given the older demographic of the District and that young people move out, this will include support for the provision of smaller houses, including 1 bedroom units, and outside areas of high flood risk single storey housing. This will provide choice and help meet local needs.

New Clause 6 – The Council will support development that demonstrates that it can provide a variety of house types and sizes.

22. Is the Council's proposed additional modification ADM15 regarding the definition of brownfield land necessary for soundness? What is the justification for seeking to include agricultural buildings within the definition of brownfield land (given that agricultural buildings are specifically excluded from the national definition of previously developed land in Annex 1 of the National Planning Policy Framework)?

Whilst agricultural buildings are excluded from the national definition, East Lindsey is a large rural District with many agricultural buildings in settlements. In a District such as East Lindsey's these buildings represent the greatest proportion of previously used land, if we are to maximize this land over greenfield it would be appropriate to include it.

These types of sites often become empty, disused and run down and therefore the Council wishes to include them in the definition for medium and small villages so that they have a better chance of coming forward, either for community, economic or leisure uses or failing that for housing development. The Council believes the modification at ADM15 is necessary for clarification to those wishing to develop or having sites which could be developed in the relevant settlements and it will prevent old agricultural sites in smaller communities blighting those sites by sitting empty and run down. Last year the Council approved 26 houses on brownfield land (including agricultural sites) in medium and small villages.

23. In Policy SP3 3, is the phasing of development in line with infrastructure requirements for developments of over 30 homes justified? Is it clear what will be required to comply with this criterion? Is the intention that necessary infrastructure should be in place at an appropriate point? Should this be explained in the supporting text? Is ADM9 required for soundness (ie indicating phasing *if required*)?

The modification ADM9 was put in as a result of the pre-submission consultation and it was felt it made that part of the policy more flexible. This part of the policy is not felt to be onerous on those wishing to develop to do very much, just show if they are phasing development how necessary infrastructure improvements will occur. This theme is a reoccurring one with the communities of the District and therefore it was felt important to have something in the Plan about phasing and infrastructure.

24. The supporting text (para 36, page 29) states that the Council will monitor housing development by the imposition of planning conditions on outline approvals to ensure that reserved matters applications are submitted in a reasonable period of time (12 to 18 months according to the proposed additional modification – ADM14). Is this justified, reasonable and realistic, given the Town and Country Planning Act refers to 3 years? Is the ADM necessary for soundness?

Note – the PPG on Use of Planning Conditions states: If the local planning authority considers it appropriate on planning grounds they may use longer or shorter periods, but must clearly give their justification for doing so.(para 28)

The Council believes that it is justified in trying to do everything it can to bring forward sites which have planning permission and the ADM14 is necessary. The Council might have 5140 homes with planning permission but only 829 have actually started. There are some sites which over and over again submit applications and the Council believes that these types of sites should have a shorter time to submit reserved matters applications. The Council supported the Governments White Paper on all the proposals with regard to bringing sites forward and not land banking them.