

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

Matter 1 – Duty to Cooperate, Local Development Scheme, consultation, Habitats Regulations, accordance with the Act and Regulations and consistency with national policy

Main issue: Are the Plans (CS and Settlement Proposals DPD) legally compliant in these areas?

Questions:

Duty to cooperate [S20(5) and S33A of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004]

1. What are the relevant 'strategic matters'? [defined as: (a) Sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas ... and (b) sustainable development or use of land in a two tier area if the development or use is a county matter or would have a significant impact on a county matter – S33A(4)]
2. What cooperation has taken place on these 'strategic matters' during the preparation of the plans? Has the engagement been constructive, active and ongoing?
3. What have been the outcomes of this cooperation? Has the cooperation maximised the effectiveness of plan preparation? Has the duty to cooperate been met?

4. Have there been any requests from neighbouring authorities to help accommodate their unmet development needs, including in particular for housing?

Local Development Scheme

5. Have the plans been prepared in accordance with the Local Development Scheme [March 2016], including in terms of timing and content? [S19(1)]
6. Is the plan period of 2016 to 2031 justified?

Consultation

7. Has consultation on the plans been carried out in accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement and the relevant legal requirements in the Act and Regulations? [S19(3)]? Has the process of consultation and engagement been acceptable?
8. Was the consultation process acceptable in relation to those without any or good access to on-line information/evidence and for those with mobility difficulties?

Sustainability appraisal

9. Has an adequate sustainability appraisal been carried out of the plans? [S19(5)] Does this adequately assess the likely environmental, social and economic effects of the plans? In doing so have matters relating to climate change been adequately considered?
10. Have reasonable alternatives been considered where these exist, including for the overall distribution of housing?

Habitats Regulations

Context: A Stage 1 Habitats Regulation Assessment has been prepared for the Council (Nov 2016). Natural England's representation dated 17/1/17 states that Natural England agree with the Report's conclusions that the Core Strategy policies would not be likely to have a significant effect on the European Sites alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

11. Have the requirements of the Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 been complied with? Would the implementation of the plans have any significant likely effects on any European site (either alone or in combination with other plans or projects)? In particular, have the likely effects of housing growth and any tourism proposals been adequately considered, including through the various tourism related policies in the plan and in terms of potential access to the coastline? Is an Appropriate Assessment required?

Climate change

12. Do the plans taken as a whole include policies designed to secure that the development and use of land contribute to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change? [S19(1A)]

National policy

13. In preparing the plans has regard been had to national policies and advice [S19(2)]? Are there any significant inconsistencies with national policy and guidance? If so, have these been justified?

Superseded local plan policies

14. Do the plans set out which development plan policies will be superseded when these plans are adopted? [as required by Regulation 8(5)]

Policies Map

Notes:

Regulation 5(1)(b) refers to a map accompanying a Regulation 5(1)(a) document showing how the adopted policies map would be amended if the document were adopted. This is referred to as the "submission policies map" in Regulation 2(1)).

Regulation 9 sets out the form and content of the adopted policies map and explains that it must illustrate geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan.

1. What comprises the submission policies map? Is it the Settlement Proposals Map, the individual settlement maps in the Settlements DPD and the Protected Open Space map on page 88 of the CS? The Key Diagram on page 5 of the CS is referred to as the 'Proposals Map' – is it? Is the Combined Flood Hazard Map on page 80 of the CS part of the submission policies map?
2. Is the geographic illustration of all relevant policies in both plans shown on the submission policies map?
3. Is it clear which policies in both plans have a geographic illustration on the policies map? Should all such relevant policies state that their geographic illustration is shown on the policies map? *[Note – the keys to the Proposals Map and Settlement Maps do not refer to any policies. In addition, the Settlement Proposals Map is not legible when printed at A4 scale and the resolution of the digital pdf and word versions are not sufficient to make it legible].*

4. On at least one settlement map there are designations which do not appear on the Key (eg Binbrook – a red triangle and an area of land shaded red). Are these the geographic illustration of any plan policies?

Matter 2 - Vision and Objectives for East Lindsey and Sustainable Development (Policy SP2)

Context: The CS sets out the vision for East Lindsey to 2031 and the objectives to achieve that. Policy SP2 sets out the overall approach regarding sustainable development and SP2 2 broadly reiterates the 2nd part of para 14 of the Framework.

Main issue: Are the vision and objectives appropriate and adequately expressed? Is Policy SP2 sound?

Questions:

1. How were the vision and objectives arrived at? Are they justified and adequately expressed?
2. Would Policy SP2 2 be effective if para 14 of the Framework were to be changed at some point?
3. Are the Council's suggested additional modifications to Policy SP2 2 (ADM4) necessary for soundness?
4. Overall, do the plans do enough to encourage the reuse of previously developed land as required by paragraphs 17 and 111 of the NPPF?

Matter 3: Objectively assessed need for housing (OAN) and the housing requirement (Policy SP3 and section on Housing Growth)

Context

*The Plan states that the OAN for the plan period (2016-31) is **7215 homes**.*

*A figure of **553 homes** has been added to this to deal with 'past under supply' as of 1 February 2016, which 'included a 5% buffer'. This results in a housing target of **7768**.*

Policy SP3 states that sites will be allocated for the phased delivery of these homes as follows:

2016-21 av 591/year
2021-25 av 481/year
2025-31 av 482/year

The evidence relating to the OAN for housing is set out in several documents:

- Housing Topic Paper – March 2017
- Demographic Forecasts Updating the Evidence – Oct 2016 (Edge Analytics) **EA2016**
- Updating the Demographic Evidence – June 2015 (Edge Analytics) **EA2015**
- SHMA Update – January 2014 (Opinion Research Services)
- SHMA – Sept 2012 (Opinion Research Services)

Main issues - OAN: Has the HMA been appropriately defined? Does the plan appropriately identify the objectively assessed housing needs for the HMA in accordance with national policy and the planning practice guidance? Is the identified OAN of 7215 homes for 2016-31 (average 481/year) soundly based and supported by robust and credible evidence? Does it correctly take into account household projections, demographic factors, economic factors and market signals?

Main issues – housing requirement: Is the housing target/requirement for 7768 homes justified. What is the justification for the phased delivery?

The Council should produce a concise and focused summary paper explaining how the OAN has been established in line with the Planning Practice Guidance on 'Housing and economic development needs assessments', including:

- the justification for the **HMA** and then:
- the base date for establishing OAN
- the starting point – **Government household projections** (para 15 of PPG)
- any adjustment due to factors affecting **local demography and household formation rates which are not captured in past trends** (for example, where formation rates may have been suppressed historically by under-supply and worsening affordability of housing and the extent to which household formation rates may have been constrained by supply. (para 15 of the PPG)
- any adjustments based on **specific local circumstances based on alternative assumptions in relation to underlying the demographic projections and household formation rates**, for example relating to migration levels and demographic structure (para 17 of the PPG)

- any adjustment due to **employment trends** and the supply of working age population that is economically active (para 18 of the PPG)
- any adjustment due to **market signals** (para 19 & 20 of the PPG)

This summary paper should set out references to the relevant supporting evidence. It should also take account of the questions set out below. The aim of the paper should be to set out the justification for the OAN figure of 7215 in a clear and transparent manner.

HMA

1. What is the justification for treating East Lindsey as the HMA for the purposes of establishing the OAN? [the PPG refers to house prices, household migration and search patterns and contextual data, for example including travel to work area boundaries]
2. Is the HMA clearly set out in the Plan?
3. The Council's DtC statement (3.31) states that East Lindsey lies in a housing market with Boston? How does this relate to the HMA used to inform the OAN in this plan?

OAN - general

4. The establishment of the OAN does not appear to be directly based on the standard methodology which is strongly recommended by the PPG (para 5). Are there local circumstances that have led to the approach used?

OAN time period

5. What period is the OAN figure based on? The plan refers to the OAN for the plan period (2016-2031) but the Housing Topic Paper refers to other time periods (eg 2014-2039 and 2011-2037 and, in paras 1.6 and 2.12, to a 2011 date).

OAN – starting point

6. The PPG states that the starting point estimate to establish need is the DCLG *household* projections. EA2016 (Table 7 – '*starting point*' estimate) states that the 2014-based DCLG household projections, suggest an increase in households of **356/year** from 2016-2031 and para 2.16 of the Topic Paper suggests **333/year** for 2014- 2039 [using the 2014-based household projections underpinned by the 2014-based SNPP] or **399/year** using the earlier '2012-based model'. However, the scenarios in the Topic Paper (page 8) appear to be based on the 2012 sub-national *population*

projections? Why have these been used as a starting point rather than the DCLG household projections as suggested in the PPG?

OAN – adjustments to the starting point (demographic factors)

7. Have any adjustments been made to the DCLG household projections (or the household projections used) due to factors affecting local demography and household formation rates (ie PPG paras 15 and 17). If so, what scale of adjustment has been applied, where is this set out and with what justification? Does the OAN figure of 481/year include any such adjustments?
8. Scenarios 1 to 3 in the Housing Topic Paper (page 8) are based on population growth and net in-migration assumptions as set out below. These appear to be based on ONS 2012 sub-national population projections rather than the DCLG household projections. Do these scenarios represent an adjustment to, or divergence from, the demographic starting point set by the national household projections? If so, for what reasons? Which of the scenarios is the most realistic and why, including in terms of population growth and migration? Why is a 10 year migration trend preferred to a 5 year trend? Why does a 10 year trend lead to a higher OAN figure?

(period 2011-37?)	Population growth	Net in-migration/year	Dwellings/year
1. ONS 2012 SNPP	12.4%	1259 persons	413
2. 5 year migration	5.4%	900 persons	230
3. 10 year migration	13.4%	1309 persons	460

9. The scenarios set out above vary from those presented in EA2016 (page 25) which are based on the period 2016 to 2031. Which are the most appropriate in terms of establishing the OAN for the plan period?

(period 2016-2031)	Dwellings/year
SNPP-2014 scenario	381
SNPP-2012 scenario	453
10 year scenario	425
5 year scenario	334

10. The Topic Paper concludes that the district wide 'target' (should this reference be to the OAN – ie 'need?') should be **481/year** (7215 for 2016-31) based on a 10 year migration scenario and 'at an average with the 2008-based headship rate'. What justifies this upward adjustment from 460 to 481/year?
11. Has the OAN taken into account any under delivery of housing in the years before 2016 which may have resulted in unmet housing needs and

household formation rates which have been constrained by supply? If so, what relevant period was considered?

OAN – adjustments for employment trends

*Note: EA2016 (page 32) states that the preferred scenario based on 10 year migration trends would support an estimated annual employment growth of **124 jobs/year** (2016-2031). It also states that East Lindsey Economic Baseline 2016 (Document CD42 – page 77) has a jobs growth outlook/forecast of **240/year** averaged over a 25 year period.*

12. Given the estimated jobs growth based on the assessment of housing needs (124 jobs/year) is less than the stated economic forecast (240 jobs/year), has the OAN adequately taken account of projected employment trends? Are the plans premised on meeting a jobs growth target of 240 jobs/year? Will the supply of working age population be sufficient to support the projected or planned job growth? Has any adjustment been included in the OAN figure of 481/year to account for this? What might be the effect on commuting patterns and the resilience of local businesses? (PPG para 18)

OAN – adjustments for market signals

Note: The PPG (para 19) states that the housing need number (starting point) should be adjusted to reflect appropriate market signals and other indicators of the balance between the demand for, and supply of, dwellings. The market signals are: land prices, house prices, rents, affordability, rate of development and overcrowding.

13. Have the market signals in the PPG been considered and what conclusions have been drawn from them? [Section 6 of the Housing Topic Paper refers to house prices, house sales and housing completions] Is there a worsening trend in any of these indicators and if so, should there be an upward adjustment to the OAN? Does the 481/year figure include any adjustment for this reason?

Conclusion on OAN

14. Is the OAN of **7215** for 2016-2031 (average **481/year**) justified?
15. Should there be a commitment to an early review of the plan within 5 years to re-assess the OAN for housing? If so, should this be expressed in a policy and what should the time period be?

Housing requirement questions:

Past under supply and the 553 figure

16. What is the justification for adding **553** homes to the OAN of **7215** to arrive at a housing target or requirement of **7768** homes? The plan states that the 553 figure represents past under supply as of 2016 (para 8, page 22), whereas the Housing Topic Paper (para 3.5 page 17) appears to indicate it has been added to help ensure that there is a 5 year supply of housing? [on the basis that there was a 3.85 year supply as of Feb 2016] How was this 'undersupply' calculated, to what time period does it apply and is it justified? Is the approach applied here justified by national policy or guidance?
17. Is the 553 figure intended to represent any under-supply since the plan base date and, if so, is it justified?
18. Is the housing *target* of **7768** justified? Should this be referred to as the housing *requirement*? Should the plan indicate that this is a *minimum* requirement (as indicated in para 2.25, page 9 of the Housing Topic Paper)?

Phased delivery

19. Is the phased delivery of the 7768 homes in Policy SP3 2 justified? Is this intended as a control over the amount of housing to be delivered in these three time periods, as a prediction of likely delivery based on when sites will be developed or an intention that the 'under supply' of 553 homes will be recovered in the first 5 years of the plan? Should this be made clear in the plan?
20. Is the reference in the policy to the phased delivery applying to allocated sites correct, given the supply includes commitments?

Matter 4 – Settlement pattern (Policy SP1)

Context: Policy SP1 divides settlements into four types – towns, large villages, medium villages and small villages. Anything outside of these settlements is open countryside which includes hamlets and isolated groups of houses.

Main issue: Is the settlement pattern justified?

Questions:

1. Is the settlement pattern in Policy SP1 justified? Have settlements been appropriately categorised, including Tetford, Tetney, Croft, Goulceby and Orby?
2. What role did the settlement pattern have in determining the distribution of housing and employment development?

Matter 5 – The overall distribution of development, between the Coastal Zone/area and Inland, in particular for housing (Policies SP3 and SP17)

Context: The district wide housing target is 7768 homes. The plan seeks to restrict housing in the Coastal Zone/area to existing commitments (1308) because this is an area of high coastal flood risk. This leaves a minimum of 6460 to be met inland.

The plan states that the Council has chosen a 'zero population growth' scenario for the coast, amounting to 96 homes/year or 735 for the plan period. This assumes no significant growth in the coastal population and a rise in the formation of new households of approximately 4.9%. The figure of 735 is less than the existing commitments total of 1308 as of Feb 2016. [paras 9 and 12, pages 22-23]

Policy SP17 lists the settlements in the coastal area/zone.

Policy SP18 sets out the circumstances where new housing will be accepted in the Coastal Zone. In addition, to sites which already have planning permission this includes: (1) sites with permission where improved layouts, designs or flood mitigation come forward [provided house numbers do not increase], (2) open market housing meeting specified criteria (including brownfield and disused sites, subject to active marketing for other uses and not being viable for other uses), (3) housing for specific identified vulnerable minority groups. This policy will be covered in detail under Matter 15.

The representation from the Environment Agency (23/1/17) states: 'We strongly support the Council's approach to direct housing growth to areas at lowest risk of flooding (ie away from the coastal settlements) in order to avoid increasing the population at risk of flooding. We commend the Council for its approach in adhering to national planning policy and directing vulnerable development away from areas of highest flood risk, whilst meeting the needs of the existing community with the provision of 1308 new homes in the form of existing commitments.'

Main issue: Is the division of the District into discrete Coastal and Inland Zones justified? Is the overall policy of restraining housing development in the coastal zone justified by coastal flood risk?

Questions:

1. Is the Coastal Zone clearly shown on the submission policies map? Does the Plan clearly set out which Towns, Large Villages and other settlements are in the coastal zone.
2. Is the extent of the Coastal Zone justified and how was it established? What is the probability of river and sea flooding in this area? How many people live in this area? Have there been any incidents of tidal flooding?
3. Is the restriction of new housing in the Coastal Zone to existing commitments (apart from the exceptions set out in Policy SP18), including in the Towns of Skegness and Mablethorpe/Sutton/Trusthorpe, a justified response to coastal flood risk? If not, should an alternative approach have been followed based on an assessment of flood risk and development needs in individual settlements (for example, such as North Somercotes)?
4. There appear to be housing allocations in some Large Villages which may fall within (or partially within) the coastal zone shown on the Key Diagram (page 5) [eg Grainthorpe, Hogsthorpe and Marshchapel]. What is the justification for this?
5. Is the overall split in housing numbers between the inland and coastal areas justified? Will any need arising in relation to the coastal area, which is not met by existing commitments and the various policy exceptions, be capable of being met in the inland area? Could this policy affect levels of in-migration to East Lindsey?
6. In setting overall policies of restraint in the Coastal Zone, has adequate account been taken of the protection offered by coastal sea defences?
7. The supporting text states that the Council will carry out a plan review *in 5 years* (page 28), a full review of its housing policy *within 5 years* (page 29) and a full review of the coastal policy *at the end of the first five years* (page 84). Given the approach taken in the coastal area, should the plan include a policy which sets out this intent? Should the policy set out what stage will be reached by a specific date (eg a target date submission for examination within # years of adoption)?

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:

<i>Commitments inland</i>	<i>2777</i>
<i>Commitments coastal</i>	<i>1308</i>
<i>Spilsby site SPY310</i>	<i>350</i>
<i>Inland allocations</i>	<i>3901</i>
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?

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

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

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)?
13. Is it justified that there are no housing allocations in the Medium or Small Villages
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?
15. Should the plan allow for appropriate infilling within these villages?

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

Questions - general

17. Is ADM8 necessary for soundness? (reference to *minimum* allocations and not *targets*).
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]
19. Is ADM5 necessary for soundness? (relating to the approach on allocating growth and large urban extensions)
20. Is ADM13 necessary for soundness? (definition of a windfall site)
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')?
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)?
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*)?
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)

Matter 7: Housing for older people and to meet the needs of other different groups (Policy SP5)

Context: Para 50 and 159 of the Framework refer to LPAs planning for a mix of housing to meet the different groups in the community.

Main issues: Does the plan adequately address the needs of different groups in the community, including older people through Policy SP5? Have these accommodation needs been assessed and will the plan make appropriate provision for them?

Note: Affordable housing will be considered under Matter 10

Questions:

1. Does the local plan adequately address the needs for all types of housing and the needs of different groups in the community (as set out in paragraphs 50 and 159 of NPPF)?
2. Has the need for housing specifically to meet the needs of older people been established and, if so, should that need be set out in the plan?
3. Will Policy SP5 help ensure that the specific housing needs of older people are met?
4. Policy SP5 supports the provision of specialist housing for older people in Towns and Large Villages, including in the Coastal Zone. Is such housing appropriate in principle within the Coastal Zone?
5. Policy SP5 supports the provision of specialist housing for older people *only* in Towns and Large Villages. Is this justified? Why would it not be appropriate to provide for such for development in Medium and Small Villages?
6. Is the flood risk mitigation proposed in Policy SP5/final bullet justified? Are there any circumstances where ground floor sleeping accommodation would be justified?
7. In SP5/final bullet, is it realistic to expect that all specialist housing for older people in the **coastal zone** will be occupied by those with a local need (eg for example in nursing and care homes and flats designed specifically for older people)? Will this have any effect on viability and deliverability? Is it the intention to apply the Local Connection Criteria in Annex 1 and, if so, is this justified?
8. What is the justification for Policy SP5/3rd bullet which requires that 'development' should demonstrate how occupiers/users will work with other local providers of services for local people?

Matter 8 – Housing supply, including the 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites (Policies SP3 and the section on Housing Growth and the location of inland Growth)

Context: Table A of the CS sets out the overall position regarding the delivery of housing growth. The Housing Topic Paper sets out the Council's position on 5 year supply.

Main issues: Will the plans help deliver the requirement/target of 7768 homes? Is this target realistic and achievable? What should be the 5 year supply requirement?

Overall supply questions

1. Is the total predicted supply intended to be 8336 plus 1935 (if windfalls are included) = **10721**? (CS Table A)
2. Will the policies in the plan ensure that the housing requirement of **7768** can be met? Is the supply from the following sources justified (CS Table A as summarised below)? Are these sites all deliverable or developable? Have any of the planning permissions for these commitments now expired or been approved for less dwellings? Are the commitment sites listed anywhere? Should any 'lapse rate' be applied? Are numbers for the housing allocations based on appropriate density assumptions?
3. Why is the Spilsby site set out separately from the other commitments and allocations? Is the 350 homes in Table A additional to the 264 allocations in Table B for Spilsby?

commitments inland	2777
commitments coastal	1308
Spilsby site SPY310	350
Inland allocations	3901
total	8336

4. Is the supply from windfalls in CS Table A (as set out below) justified and where is this justification set out? How do these forecasts compare with past performance? Is past performance a reasonable forecast of what will happen (given the current Local Plan dates back to 1995/1999 - see para 30, page 28 of the CS which sees the number of windfalls reducing)?
5. Does the windfall allowance of 1165 relate to inland Large Villages and Towns? How is the figure justified?
6. The total for windfalls appears to add up to 1585 rather than the stated figure of 1935 – what is the correct figure?

brownfield sites coastal zone

218

brownfield sites medium and small inland villages	202
windfall allowance 15% of target	1165
total	1935

7. Is the inland supply of 6678 (2777 inland commitments + 3901 inland allocations – Table A) sufficient to meet the inland minimum target of 6460 in Policy SP3?
8. The CS (para 31, page 28) states that the supply of 8336 homes (Table A) includes a *buffer* of approximately 7.3% (568) on top of the housing target of 7768. Is this buffer sufficient to help ensure delivery of the overall housing target?
9. Is ADM12 (which refers to the buffer being the difference between the target and amount of housing allocated) necessary for soundness? If so, should it refer to the amount of housing 'allocated and *committed*'?
10. The Housing Topic Paper states that past 10 year completions average 500/year but that over the 5 year period from 2011 to 2016 some 29% of completions were supported by the Council's Housing Capital Programme which is now coming to an end (para 2.21). In this context is a target of 7768 over the plan lifetime aspirational but also realistic and deliverable?
11. Has it been shown that the proposed housing development will be viable? Have appropriate policy costs been taken into account, including for affordable housing, space standards, building requirements, design and potential infrastructure contributions (for example, education and transport)?

What is the 5 year requirement?

*Note – the 5 year **requirement** will be considered at the Stage 1 hearings. Issues relating to whether the plans will be likely to help ensure that there is a reasonable prospect of a 5 year **supply** of housing being achieved, on adoption and through-out the lifetime of the plan, will be considered at the Stage 2 hearings. The Council will need to frame its response at the Stage 2 MIQs having regard to the questions asked below. In doing so, the Council should set out the supply evidence clearly indicating the sites that will make up the 5 year supply.*

Note: The Council should prepare a succinct note that answers the following questions and sets out the evidence that justifies the answers.

Relevant annual requirement?

1. Why is the 5 year housing land supply in the Housing Topic Paper (Box 1 – page 22) based on an analysis of the overall housing target between 2006 and 2021 and dwellings completed since 2006?

2. What annual requirement should be used as the baseline to calculate the 5 year requirement? Should it be based on the phased delivery set out in Policy SP3 (ie 591/year for 2016-21, 481/year 2021-25 and 482/year 2025-31?) If so, would the baseline 5 year requirement be as follows:

- 2017 to 2022 = **2845** (591 x 4 plus 481 x 1)
- 2018-2023 = **2735** (591 x 3 plus 481 x2) and so on?

Alternatively should the baseline figure be the plan target of 7768 divided by 15 years = 518/year (or **2590** for 5 years)?

Or the OAN of 7215 divided by 15 = 481/year x 5 = **2405** (for example, if the additional 553 was intended to help provide a 5 year supply rather than to meet an under-supply)?

3. What is the base date for calculating the housing requirement in the plan and why? Is it 2011? (Box 1 refers to a target of 481/year from 2011-2015) Or the start of the plan period – 2016?

Shortfall in delivery?

4. Has there been any shortfall in delivery against the annual requirement since the start of the plan period in 2016 or the base date for the plan in terms of the housing requirement if earlier – eg 2011?, whichever is appropriate? (see possible calculations below provided for illustrative purposes)

The possible calculations below are based in information provided in the Housing Topic Paper and are illustrative.

Box 1, Page 22 of the Housing Paper refers to a target for 2011-2015 of 481/year and for 2016-2021 of 591/year.

Page 9 of the Housing Topic Paper refers to total new build from 2011-2016 of 246, 240, 276, 278 and 405 = 1445. Page 36 refers to 323 completions in 2016

If a base date of 2011 is justified and the phasing targets in Box 1 are applied:

- the requirement between 2011 and 2017 would be **2996** (481 x 5 plus 591)?
- delivery between 2011 and 2017 was **1768** (1445 + 323)
- leaving a shortfall of **1228** to be recovered (2996 minus 1768)?

If an annual target of 481 is applied since 2011 for 2011-17 – 481 x 6 = 2886 minus 1768 delivered = **1118** shortfall?

If a base date of 2016 is justified:

- the requirement for 2016-17 would be **591?** (based on Box 1)
- delivery in 2016-17 was **323?**
- leaving a shortfall of **268** to be recovered (591 minus 268)?

These shortfall would be different if any of these figures or dates are varied.

5. If there has been a shortfall since the relevant base date, should this be recovered over the next 5 years ('Sedgefield') or over the lifetime of the plan ('Liverpool') and why? What would the resulting 5 year requirement be for 2017-22 and 2018-23 and thereafter?

5 or 20% buffer?

6. Should a buffer of 5 or 20% be added? Has there been a record of persistent under delivery of housing? Over what time period should this be considered (for example, in any of the years preceding 2011)? What were the relevant annual housing requirement targets for each of these past years [for example, based on the relevant and appropriate Regional Strategy or Local Plan target at that time], how many houses were delivered in each of those years, and what was the amount of under or over delivery against the requirement in each year and overall for the selected period?
7. The Housing Topic Paper (page 11) appears to indicate that a 5% buffer should be applied because the under delivery of housing has been caused by a lack of demand? Is this consistent with para 47 of the Framework which seeks a 20% buffer where there has been a persistent under delivery (to provide a realistic prospect of achieving the planned supply and to ensure choice and competition in the market for land)?

Notes relating to questions 6 and 7

Box 1, page 22 in the Housing Topic Paper refers to a target of 600/year from 2006-2010 and 481/year from 2011-2021.

Page 9 of the Housing Topic Paper refers to completions from 2011-2016 of 246, 240, 276, 278 and 405 = 1445 and Page 36 to 323 completions in 2016

Page 38 of the Housing Topic Paper has a graph which does not set out precise figures but appears to show an annual delivery range between 2001 and 2010 of around 500 to 700. And a 30 year average of 548/year

In this context the PPG states that: The assessment of a local delivery record is likely to be more robust if a longer term view is taken, since this is likely to take account of the peaks and troughs of the housing market cycle.

5 year requirement conclusions

8. What would be the 5 year requirement be for 2017-22 and for 2018-23, taking account of the recovery of any shortfall and if 5 *and* 20% buffers are applied – for example would it be as follows (this based on the figures in question 2 and noting that the actual figures will depend on the answers to the questions above – for example, if a different starting point for the 5 year requirement is arrived at – eg 2405 or 2590):

2017-22 - 2845 plus 5% = 2987?

2017-22 - 2845 plus 20% = 3414?

2018-23 – 2735 plus 5% = 2871?

2018-23 – 2735 plus 20% = 3282?

Note: the recovery of any shortfall since 2016 will need to be added to the figures above *before* the % buffer is added – see question 5 above.

9. For clarity, should the overall position on 5 year supply be set out in the plan (ie annual targets/requirement, completions since the start of the plan period/base date, the approach to catching up any shortfall and the 5 or 20% buffer)?
10. Should a Housing Trajectory graph be included in the Plan (showing the average annual requirement as adjusted to recover past shortfall, completions to date, the amount of development forecast each year to the end of the plan period and an overall 'managed delivery' trajectory)?

Matter 9 - Neighbourhood planning (Policy SP6)

Context: The Framework states that neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area Neighbourhood Plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them. Neighbourhood plans should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies. (para 184)

Main issue: Is the approach set out in Policy SP6 justified, effective and consistent with national policy

Questions

1. Have any neighbourhood plans been made (adopted), are any in preparation and are any more proposed?
2. Is any of the housing requirement in the plans or any other development requirement (eg employment, retail etc) intended to be delivered through neighbourhood plans? If so, do the plans provide appropriate strategic policies as required by the Framework, including those which set out the overall amount of development required?
3. In Alford, Table B in the CS indicates an allocation of 161. However, the Settlement Proposals DPD (page 8) states that site allocations and planning policies will be provided in the Neighbourhood Plan being prepared by the Town Council. Is the figure of 161 homes a housing target for Alford (ie to be delivered through the Neighbourhood Plan) and, if so, how was it justified? Is this intended as a strategic policy? Does this situation apply in any other Large Villages or settlements?

4. Criteria 2 and 3 deal with scenarios where intended neighbourhood plans are not delivered. Is the approach justified?
5. Is the CS sufficiently clear regarding the relationship between these plans and neighbourhood plans?
6. Is ADM16 necessary for soundness (reference to *general* conformity)?

Matter 10 - Affordable & low cost housing (Policies SP7; SP8; SP9)

Main issue: Has the objectively assessed need for affordable housing been correctly assessed? Will Policies SP7 and SP8 ensure the delivery of sufficient affordable housing having regard to the viability of development; and are they justified in respect of how financial contributions could be used? Are the policy criteria sound? Should there be an uplift to the housing requirement to help meet affordable housing needs?

Questions

SP7 Affordable & Low Cost Housing

1. Has the objectively assessed need for affordable housing of **2825** homes been established in accordance with national policy and guidance?
2. Is the projected supply of **2611** affordable homes set out on page 36 of the plan justified and realistic and why is the potential supply stated to be **2506** in the Housing Topic Paper (page 54)? For example, will windfall sites deliver the 349 homes anticipated? Will sufficient windfall sites be large enough in size (ie 15 or more houses) to trigger the affordable housing requirement?
3. Are proposed amendments ADM17 and 18 additional/minor amendments or are they necessary for soundness?
4. Is the size threshold of 15 homes justified?
5. The Planning Practice Guidance states that an increase in the total housing requirement included in the Local Plan should be considered where it could help to deliver the necessary amount of affordable homes. Having regard to Q2 above, has this been considered and should the overall housing requirement be increased to help deliver the need for 2825 affordable homes?
6. Are the contribution requirements for the Coast (0%), the rest of the District excluding Woodhall Spa (30%), and Woodhall Spa (40%) justified by the

viability evidence? In particular, would the viability of larger sites subject to the 30% requirement be put at risk? Is the new build sales value used in the Economic Viability Assessment Update 2015 (CD23) realistic? Is it justified to calculate financial contributions *in lieu* of on-site provision on the basis of market sales values rather than land values?

7. Are the precise zones to which the different contribution rates apply clearly set out in the plan? If not, should they be defined in order to ensure clarity and effectiveness?
8. Should Clause 2 be reworded to clarify that Clause 1 will apply unless a detailed, site-specific assessment commissioned by the developer demonstrates that a reduced level of affordable housing is justified on grounds of viability? Is proposed amendment ADM19 required for soundness?
9. Should Clause 4 specify the circumstances in which off-site provision would be acceptable?
10. What mechanisms/processes does the Council have in place to ensure the delivery of affordable housing on land provided by the developer or with financial contributions?
11. Should the policy make reference to starter homes?
12. Would the use of financial contributions to provide affordable sites for Gypsies and Travellers meet the tests set out in Regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 and paragraph 204 of the NPPF?

SP8: Rural Exceptions

13. Will such sites be financially viable without any cross-subsidy from some market housing as suggested in paragraph 54 of the NPPF?
14. Should Clause 2 refer to rural workers accommodation in line with the NPPF, rather than agricultural and forestry workers? Should there be provision for temporary accommodation, where justified, where the rural enterprise is new or is proposed?

Main issue: Is Policy SP9 justified and necessary given the other provisions in the plan designed to secure affordable housing? If it is, would it be effective in restricting development to the intended type for the intended applicants; and in ensuring good quality schemes?

Questions

SP9: Single Plot Exceptions

15. Why is the policy necessary, given that between them, Policies SP7, SP8 and SP18 seek to deliver affordable housing to meet the needs of those unable to access the market across the District? Would a more general "Self and Custom House Building" policy meet the objective of enabling all people to provide their own homes within their own budget?
16. How does this policy provide an "exception" in the towns and large villages where Policy SP3(5) would permit development on windfall sites within or adjoining the main body of the settlement?
17. What type of evidence would be sought from applicants to demonstrate that they qualify to take advantage of this policy?
18. How would the quality of homes built under this policy be guaranteed? Is it realistic that necessary flood mitigation features could be incorporated at low cost on these homes in the coastal zone?

Matter 11: The built environment (Policies SP10 and SP11)

Main issue: Are Policies SP10 and SP11 justified; effective; and consistent with national policy?

Questions

SP10: Design

1. Is it justified and/or necessary to require developments of *all* dwelling houses to complete the place-making checklist? Would all the criteria be relevant to developments of just one dwelling house or other small-scale developments? Is proposed amendment ADM20 an additional/minor amendment or is it necessary to make the plan sound?
2. Is the definition of "Gateway Sites" sufficiently clear that developers can be certain of whether or not a site-specific design brief is required? How could this be strengthened to ensure effectiveness?
3. The Council states that a traffic light system rather than a narrative approach to completing the checklist will avoid an onerous process. Will this provide enough detail for the process to be useful and effective?
4. What is the evidence to demonstrate that East Lindsey is a water scarce area and, in consequence, to justify the adoption of the optional technical

standard for water consumption of 110 litres per person per day? Has the effect on viability been assessed?

5. Is the aim of Clause 1, to “safeguard” the best and most versatile agricultural land, more restrictive than paragraph 112 of the NPPF? If so, is this justified and consistent with national policy?
6. Does this policy (including through the Place Making Checklist), and the plan generally, make sufficient provision for inclusive design and accessible environments in accordance with paragraphs 57, 58, 61 and 69 of NPPF?

SP11: Historic Environment

7. Are bullet points 1 & 2 in Clause 2 justified in requiring proposals to “protect *and* enhance” and “preserve *and* enhance” the relevant features? The statutory duties in respect of listed buildings and conservation areas refer to preservation; and preservation *or* enhancement respectively.
8. For clarity and effectiveness, should Clause 3 of the policy be combined with the last bullet point of Clause 2 as both concern assets at risk? The Council might wish to consider making typographical amendments to clarify the last sentence of paragraph 5, page 51; paragraph 6, sentence 3; and paragraph 7, sentence 2.
9. Are proposed amendments ADM21, 22 & 23 necessary to make the plan sound?

Matter 12: Gypsies, travellers and showpeople (Policy SP12)

Main issue: Is this policy consistent with national policy in respect of providing an on-going supply of land for this type of accommodation throughout the plan period? Is it otherwise effective in its aims?

Questions

SP12: Gypsies, Travellers & Showpeople

1. The policy seeks to meet identified needs within the first 5 years of the plan period, but does not appear to look beyond this time horizon. Why? Has there been an assessment of the likely need for permanent and transit site accommodation for the full plan period to 2031? I.e. is the identified need in paragraph 1, page 56 (20 stopping/transit pitches, 13 permanent pitches and 2 plots for show and circus people) intended to cover the full plan period? (the GTAA 2016 identifies a future need of one pitch arising from existing

authorised sites). If not, is the plan consistent with the NPPF which seeks to ensure that full objectively assessed needs are met over the plan period?

2. If there has been no assessment of need beyond the first five years of the plan period, or if that assessment is not robust, is the policy consistent with national policy at paragraph 10 of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, August 2015?
3. Should the policy make it clear that the relevant sites are allocated in the Settlements Proposals DPD?
4. The policy contemplates sites in, adjacent to or in "reasonable proximity" to towns and large villages but in medium villages, sites should be in or adjacent to the settlement. Why would sites in "reasonable proximity" to medium villages not potentially be suitable and what is the justification for omitting any reference to the potential for such development in small villages?
5. Does Clause 4 require amendment to clarify that extensions to existing sites in medium villages should not result in a site accommodating more than 3 pitches?

Matter 13: Inland employment, centres and shopping; and inland tourism and leisure (Policies SP13, SP14 and SP15)

Main issue: Are Policies SP13 and SP14 based on a robust assessment of the need for land for employment and retail uses? Have the assessments been carried out in accordance with national policy and guidance? Are particular clauses of Policies SP13, SP14 and SP15 sufficiently clear that they would be effective in achieving their aims?

Questions

SP13: Inland Employment

1. Paragraph 5, page 61 of the Core Strategy states that the need for additional employment land has been established using a trend based calculation. How do the calculations for the relevant settlements in the Employment Sites Review 2016 take account of all the factors for consideration set out in the Planning Practice Guidance (appended to the Review)? If they don't, why not?

2. Has projected job creation as a result of population growth been factored into the employment need calculations? (Paragraph 4.2 of the ELR suggests this could be up to 124 jobs per annum).
3. What is the overall need for additional employment land in the plan period and should this be set out in the Core Strategy? Together, do the Core Strategy and Settlement Proposals DPD provide sufficient land to meet this need? Will the proposed employment land support the jobs growth forecast in the East Lindsey Economic Baseline 2016 (Document CD42 – page 77) of 240/year averaged over a 25 year period?
4. For what types of employment use is land required? Should this be defined in the Core Strategy? Should the policy provide more direction in relation to the type of employment sought to ensure that the land provided will support the Council's aim to diversify the economy and upskill the District's workforce?
5. The Council has responded to the risk of the Horncastle allocation not coming forward by proposing to allocate additional land in Louth. Is Louth the right location for this contingency land, or would it be better found closer to Horncastle? Representors suggest that land is available in Woodhall Spa. Has the Council fully considered whether the existing vacant employment land in Louth remains suitable and viable for employment use (ref. Rep Associated British Foods)?
6. The supporting text refers to allocations in Skegness and Mablethorpe, but Policy SP13 relates to the inland area while Policy SP21 relates to the coastal area. Is it justified and necessary to take a different policy approach in the inland and coastal areas? If so, should reference to Skegness and Mablethorpe be moved to SP21? Is there a policy which allocates the employment sites in Skegness?
7. Have the employment allocations been made in accordance with the sequential and exception tests for flood risk as required by paragraph 100 of the NPPF? Do any of the allocations fall within Flood Zones 2 or 3? (Please see question 1 under SP16 below and provide a cross-reference to your answer if appropriate to avoid duplication).
8. Is proposed amendment ADM24 an additional/minor amendment or is it necessary to make the plan sound?

SP14: Town/Village Centres & Shopping

9. Why do the Retail and Economic Assessment 2014, and the Core Strategy, only cover retail need in the town centres of Alford, Horncastle and Louth? Does the table on page 67 of the Core Strategy identify the scale of retail "need" in those settlements to 2028 rather than a "capacity" to accommodate

retail as suggested in paragraph 8? How will the plan ensure that this is met in full as sought by paragraph 23 of the NPPF? Is it to be met through allocations or non-identified sites within centres? Has the need for non-retail uses in these or other centres been considered and provided for by the plans?

10. Do the plans define the extent of town centres for all the towns (for example Coningsby/Tattershall?), as well as primary shopping areas based on a clear definition of primary and secondary frontages in designated centres as required by paragraph 23 of the Framework? Are these areas shown on the policies map? (Are they shown as a solid red line rather than a broken red line as suggested by the key?). What is the reason for the Council seeking to delete reference to secondary frontages?
11. Are ADM25-29 necessary to make the plan sound? Does Clause 5 (under ADM29) of the policy remain relevant if secondary frontages are deleted?
12. Should the policy more explicitly define a hierarchy of centres to clarify that town centres rather than village centres will be the focus for retail growth? Is the policy sufficiently clear in respect of the approach to development in village centres?
13. How has the Council arrived at the 1000sqm threshold for the impact test? Does Clause 4 (under ADM29) adequately reflect the tests in paragraph 26 of the NPPF concerning the impact of a proposal upon committed investment and the vitality and viability of the existing centre? If not, should it be strengthened?
14. Is Clause 10 (under ADM29) clear and effective as drafted, or could it be unduly onerous? Is it clear which types of facilities would fall within its scope; and should the criteria apply if other similar provision would remain? Should a proposal be required to satisfy all three bulleted criteria?

SP15: Widening the Inland Tourism and Leisure Economy

15. Is paragraph 7 consistent with Clause 3 of the policy in respect of where the relevant development could be located in towns, large and medium villages? Paragraph 7 indicates that development will be acceptable in "close proximity" to these settlements where safe access is demonstrated; while the policy specifies that development should be "in or adjoining" a settlement.
16. Why does the requirement that serviced accommodation should not be located in an area of flood risk not also apply to the types of development (caravans, log cabins etc) provided under Clause 3? Should either type of development be required to satisfy the sequential and exceptions tests? Is the definition of "an area of flood risk" clear in this policy?

17. Is ADM30 an additional/minor amendment or is it necessary to make the plan sound?

Matter 14: Inland flood risk (Policy SP16)

Main issue: Would this policy allow development other than housing to locate in flood risk areas without first complying with the sequential test? If so, is this justified and consistent with national policy? Is the policy otherwise justified, clear and effective?

Questions

SP16: Inland Flood Risk

1. In relation to flood risk, this policy does not appear to require proposals for non-residential development to satisfy the sequential test (and, if necessary, the exception test). Why not? Is this consistent with national policy and guidance? Should proposals on non-allocated sites be required to satisfy these tests? Has the sequential test been applied in a plan-making context when considering allocations for employment development?
2. Why does Clause 3, which would allow housing development on sites that are only partly in areas of flood risk, apply only in towns?
3. Should the reference to "foul" water disposal in Clause 6 be omitted because Clause 9 deals with foul water?
4. What is the justification for Clause 7, which would prevent connections to the combined or surface water system other than in exceptional circumstances? In support of Policy SP28 (Infrastructure and S106 Obligations) the text at paragraph 10, page 121, states "there are no issues which indicate that the planned scale, location and timing of planned development within the District is unachievable from the perspective of supplying water and wastewater services...". Is proposed amendment ADM31 necessary to make the plan sound? Should a similar amendment be made to Clause 5 of SP28 as suggested by Anglian Water?
5. To be consistent with paragraph 103, footnote 20 of the NPPF, should Clause 11 be reworded along the lines "*Where required by national planning policy, development proposals in areas at risk of flooding must be accompanied by a site-specific flood risk assessment*"? (I.e. does proposed amendment ADM32 still suggest that *all* development proposals in flood risk areas must provide a FRA?).

Matter 15: Coastal East Lindsey (Policies SP18-21)

Main issue: Assuming that the general policy of restraint on market housing in the Coastal Zone is justified, are the exceptions proposed in Policy SP18 for market housing on brownfield sites, housing for minority groups and affordable housing then justified? Is Policy SP18 clear and effective?

Questions

SP18: Coastal Housing

1. Does the need for people in vulnerable or minority groups, or people requiring affordable housing to remain in their communities justify the approach taken? Have these matters been appropriately balanced in preparing the Core Strategy?
2. Is it intended that people in vulnerable and minority groups should have to demonstrate a local connection to the area in order to qualify for new housing in the Coastal Zone in the same way as those in need of affordable housing? Will Clause 3 achieve this?
3. Are the vulnerable and minority groups in Annex 1 taken directly from the Housing Strategy 2013 – 18? If so, are they all applicable and/or closely enough defined in light of the aims of the policy? For instance, is it justified to provide “exception housing” for all people in black and ethnic minority groups, migrant workers, older or young people, when most might be capable of living elsewhere? Should people with mental health problems be regarded as vulnerable as well as those with physical disabilities or learning difficulties? Should Gypsies and Travellers and those in need of affordable housing be included in the definition of vulnerable and minority groups given that there are other policies in the plan which seek the provision of accommodation specifically for them?
4. What is the justification for supporting open market housing on brownfield and disused/empty sites etc (subject to criteria) as an exception to the overall policy of restraint?
5. Should Clause 2, bullet point 3 also refer to affordable housing?
6. In Clause 4, should ground floor sleeping accommodation always be prohibited, or should this be determined on a case by case basis by reference to site-specific Flood Risk Assessments?

Main issue: Will Policies SP19, SP20 and SP21 achieve the aims set out on page 81 of the Core Strategy to give the Coast a strong, diverse,

growing economy and business sector; and to enable all year round tourism?

Questions

SP19: Holiday Accommodation

7. Does the Core Strategy aim to provide any specific level of growth in the different types of holiday accommodation? Will the Local Plan deliver the necessary scale of growth?
8. Is the proposed restricted occupancy period for the relevant development of between 15 March and 31 October justified by a robust analysis of flood risk vs. the economic objective to extend the length of the holiday season? Has adequate account been taken of the protection offered by flood defences, early warning systems and evacuation plans? Will it be difficult for newer businesses subject to the condition to compete with older ones without it? Is the occupancy limit consistent with national policy which indicates that holiday caravans for year round use are capable of passing the Exception Test?
9. Is Clause 8, which would permit year round occupancy of holiday accommodation in certain areas for a specified period of 20 years, justified? Is it sufficiently flexible to respond to changing circumstances at the end of that period? Is it otherwise effective in informing potential developers about where its provisions apply and should the plan identify the designated areas?
10. Should new hotels and bed and breakfast accommodation constructed under Clause 1 be subject to the same restriction in respect of no ground floor sleeping as similar accommodation provided as a result of a change of use under Clause 3? If not, why, and is it justified to apply it to changes of use?
11. Are the protected open spaces between Chapel St Leonards, Ingoldmells and Addlethorpe justified by up to date evidence of the harmful impact that caravan development would have? Has adequate account been taken of how the three relevant settlements function as a group? How are these spaces affected by a recent grant of planning permission?
12. Should the purpose of the Serviced Holiday Accommodation Areas be defined in paragraph 2, page 87?

SP20: Visitor Economy

13. Is Clause 2 intended to apply only to Skegness? If so, should this be clearer? What is the rationale for applying slightly different criteria to each of the three relevant foreshores? Will the policy be effective in guiding development

on the Mablethorpe and Sutton-on-Sea foreshores where the provisions are less specific than for Skegness?

SP21 Coastal Employment

14. Should the policy, Clause 2 in particular, include provisions to require new uses to be compatible with the character of the surrounding environment and with the nature of the existing farm use?

Matter 16: Transport and accessibility

Main issue: Can the existing road network accommodate the scale of growth proposed by the Core Strategy; and if new residential development in towns were to be constructed without parking provision, would this give rise to problems on the local road network?

Questions

SP22 Transport & Accessibility

1. CS paragraph 13, page 96 refers to efforts to deal with certain identified issues on the existing road network. Has the effect of development proposed in the plans on the road network been assessed more generally and can any additional traffic be safely accommodated without causing significant congestion? Is any mitigation necessary to reduce car use or mitigate the effects of any additional traffic? If so, how will this be provided?
2. CS paragraph 13, page 96 also refers to a potential bypass at Horncastle to resolve capacity problems at the A158/A153 junction. Is this necessary to support planned development?
3. SP22 does not set a minimum standard for residential car parking provision in town centres, partly because "it may be difficult to provide suitable parking arrangements" (page 96, paragraph 11). Could this lead to on-street parking and consequent problems on the local road network?

Matter 17: The natural environment (Policies SP23-25)

Main issue: Are Policies SP23, SP24 and SP25 justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Questions

SP23 Landscape

1. Is ADM34 necessary to make the plan sound?

SP24 Biodiversity & Geodiversity

2. In addition to ancient woodland and aged or veteran trees, should the policy also afford protection to trees which make a significant contribution of the character and appearance of the area?
3. Do the plans comprehensively identify Sites of Nature Conservation Importance?
4. Do proposed amendments ADM35 and 36 require text to be deleted for clarity as suggested by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership? Are the amendments necessary to make the plan sound?
5. Are proposed amendments ADM37, 38 and 40 necessary to make the plan sound?

SP25 Green Infrastructure

6. For clarity and effectiveness, should the clauses of the policy be reordered so that Clause 3 follows Clause 1? Both concern spaces identified in the Settlement Proposals DPD.

Matter 18: Open space, sport and recreation (Policy SP26)

Main issue: Is this policy based upon up to date evidence of local need and is it sound?

Questions

SP26 Open Space, Sport and Recreation

1. Does the Sport and Recreation Audit carried out in 2013 constitute the most recent audit of outdoor provision and, if so, does this represent robust and up to date evidence of need?
2. Specifically which provision standards for which type of amenity/facility does the policy seek to apply? Where are the standards set out? Is it appropriate to rely upon standards which are not set out in the plan? If the standards are national standards, are they applicable to East Lindsey?
3. In Clause 2, what is meant by "extensions to existing residential developments"? Does this include house extensions?

4. In respect of the loss of buildings, is it intended that a proposal should satisfy either one of the criteria in order to be acceptable? If so, should this be clarified?
5. In respect of the loss of outdoor sports/recreation/open space, is the policy consistent with paragraph 74 of the NPPF? This requires that facilities should not be built on unless an assessment has clearly shown the open space to be surplus; or the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision etc? What is the purpose in marketing such a site?

Matter 19: Renewable and low carbon energy

Main issue: Is Policy SP27 justified and consistent with national policy, particularly insofar as it applies to wind energy development?

Questions

SP27 Renewable & Low Carbon Energy

1. The Ministerial Statement (MS) of 18 June 2015 is clear that planning permission for wind energy development should only be granted if, amongst other things, the development site *is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development* in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan (my emphasis). In that the Core Strategy does not identify specific areas considered suitable for wind energy development, is it consistent with national policy? The MS also refers to the planning impacts identified by affected local communities being fully addressed and having their backing. Are any changes necessary to achieve soundness?
2. Is proposed amendment ADM39 necessary to make the plan sound?

Matter 20: Infrastructure, S106 obligations (Policy SP28) and viability

Main issue: Is Policy SP28 sufficiently clear in respect of the type and scale of contributions which might be expected from different developments; and will sufficient funds be collected to deliver the necessary infrastructure?

Questions

SP28 Infrastructure and S106 Obligations

1. Given the restrictions on the pooling of S106 contributions since April 2015 (as explained in the Planning Practice Guidance), will the Council's approach

secure sufficient funds to address any identified infrastructure capacity issues in water supply, drainage, education and healthcare? If not, how will these issues be addressed to meet the demands arising from new development?

2. Is the policy sufficiently clear about the circumstances in which financial contributions towards the delivery of infrastructure will be sought from developers and how they will be calculated? How would a developer know, for example, what type of infrastructure might be required; what type and scale of development would be expected to contribute; and how much money would be sought? Is it necessary to refer specifically to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for this information, or to some other document?