

**EAST LINDSEY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**LOCAL PLAN**

**LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

**STATEMENT**

**SUBMITTED ON BEHALF OF** 

---

We submit below a brief overview and further commentary on the Local Plan Inquiry process relevant to our client's site at Tattershall.

We do not propose to replicate and assume that previous representations submitted in respect of the aforementioned client and site will have been made available to the Planning Inspector and that they will be available in the document library for consideration as part of the review process. We refer in particular to:

1. The comments which we submitted to East Lindsey District Council (ELDC) to the Local Plan process on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2017 timed at 15:36.
2. Comments made on the Local Plan sent to ELDC on the 8<sup>th</sup> August 2016 timed at 17:06.

We have previously submitted other documents, comments and SHLAA documentation to ELDC.

At the moment our client's site has been omitted from the Site Allocations and we will return to this through the Examination process in respect of the Site Allocations DPD.

At this stage we would like to add some further commentary on issues relating to the Core Strategy document and relevant to Matters 3, 5, 6, 8 and 14 as mentioned in our email of the 15<sup>th</sup> June 13:32. Those are the matters where we may, on behalf of our clients, attend the Public Inquiry to partake in the discussion and where we may have made a few additional comments below.

We will deal with the further comments under the headings below, which relate to the Examination Programme relating to the Core Strategy.

### **Matter 3**

This relates to, in particular, Policy SP3. We have already provided some commentary and would like to emphasise at this stage:

1. The spatial distribution should give a high proportion of development to the towns, followed by the villages and to a much lesser extent, any other village sites. Tattershall is part of the Coningsby/Tattershall town conurbation and although we accept that there is a limited flood risk issue relating to our client's site, as the Flood Risk Assessment shows, there does not appear to have been any previous flooding incidents. If there had, they would have been shown. It is designated land to

reflect the possibility of a flood from the River Witham and River Bain. However, as is indicated in the Flood Risk Assessment relating to Tattershall:

- 1.1. Any development around the core of the village will require a Flood Risk Assessment.
- 1.2. There is no record of flooding from other sources in Tattershall.
- 1.3. The Planning Authority have allowed housing growth within the area which is designated as a Flood 2 Zone, and very recently on land directly adjoining our client's site. The adjoining development was constructed in a way to facilitate access to our client's land. The limited flood risk issue can be managed as part of the design process.

More particularly, the issue is that although the Flood Risk Assessment (October 2016) demonstrates that this is a potential flood area, because it is a town it should be the focus for growth. Provided the flood risk issue can be managed, as it can, then development at this location should be favoured in relation to development in other areas where the Council have either allocated or consented land and in less sustainable locations. The allocations do not, in our view, reasonably represent the principles of sustainable planning and to be determined in accordance with the NPPF.

We would also submit that consideration should be given to the weight to be given to the allocation of sites which are located on the edge of the main body of a settlement. That also relates to the fundamental principles of sustainability. As is alluded to in point 5 in Policy SP3, that is a matter that has been referred to in relation to windfall sites in relation to towns and large villages, but there must be a balance between that and also providing sites which are much closer to the main body of the settlement. This is the case with our client's property, when there is only one manageable constraint which clearly has predominated in ELDC's views over the Site Allocations through the Plan process.

We submit that where the constraint can be managed, as is the case with this site in terms of flood risk, something which is much closer to the core of the village, the facilities/services, etc. should take precedence to some of the other more remote sites which have been allocated. There are examples in the case of Coningsby, where sites are very distant to the main services and facilities which are available in that town.

#### **Matter 5**

Our comments again relate to our client's site and flood risk issues. Allocations and also consents that have been granted by ELDC in the recent past illustrate that they are content that flood issues can be managed and, therefore, they should not automatically discount sites particularly when they are in all other

respects in more sustainable locations. The NPPF does not prevent development occurring on flood risk sites.

#### **Matter 6**

Taking into consideration comments made elsewhere in this paper relating to Matters 3, 5, 8 and 14, we have no additional comments to make at this stage, in addition to those that have already been made, relating to this matter.

#### **Matter 8**

We have no additional comments to make at this stage.

#### **Matter 14**

We refer to the comments we submitted in relation to the Local Plan on the 25<sup>th</sup> January 2017 at 15:36. Our client's site has not been allocated fundamentally on the strength of issues relating to flood risk. Policy SP16 is more enabling and lists criteria that should be taken into consideration. We would particularly draw your attention to the fact that there is a significant amount of housing already in this flood risk area including areas which have been recently consented at a time since there has been no material change to the Flood Risk policies both locally and emerging from Central Government. Also, we would particularly draw your attention to some of the specific criteria listed in Policy SP16 and items 4, 6, 10 and 11. By their own admission, ELDC recognised that provided certain criteria are applied and the site is in conformity, then this does not prevent development taking place. Therefore, we do feel that this site should be allocated and given preference to other less sustainable sites which have been promoted and indeed allocated through the Local Plan process. It would provide a very helpful asset in the area and help to support, in a sustainable way, the needs of the community, the services available locally and the growth targets to be met by ELDC.