



# Statement on Matter 3 Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Growth

Examination of Central Lincolnshire Local Plan

On behalf of Mr R Sykes

9274

Project : 9274  
Site address : Land between 27 and 33  
West Bank, Saxilby,  
Lincoln, LN1 2LU  
Client : Mr R Sykes  
Date : 10 October 2016  
Author : Teresa Cook  
Approved by : Stephen Harris

This report has been prepared for the client by Emery Planning with all reasonable skill, care and diligence.

No part of this document may be reproduced without the prior written approval of Emery Planning.

Emery Planning Partnership Limited  
trading as Emery Planning.

# Contents:

1. Introduction	1
2. Policy LP2 – Settlement Hierarchy	1
3. Policy LP2 - Large Villages	1
4. Conclusion	2

## 1. Introduction

- 1.1 This statement provides our comments in relation to Matter 3 – Spatial Strategy and Distribution of Growth, and on the Inspector's questions Q16, Q17 in particular. In doing so, we refer to our statement on Matter 6 and the latest housing land supply assessment as set out in the Five Year Land Supply Report for 1 April 2017 to 31 March 2022, published in September 2016.
- 1.2 The Inspector will be aware that we have previously made representations on the Central Lincolnshire Submission Draft Local Plan and Policies Map.
- 1.3 We have previously set out our objection to Policy LP2 as currently drafted as there is no supporting evidence for restricting the size of non-allocated development sites in 'Large Villages' to below 25 dwellings/1 ha per site.
- 1.4 We have also set out our objection to Policy LP52 as currently drafted as this does not provide for future housing growth at Saxilby, commensurate with its role as a large village, its size and the identified range of services that it provides.

## 2. Policy LP2 – Settlement Hierarchy

- 2.1 Our previous representations with respect to Policy LP52 note that in our view the potential for Saxilby to support growth in population has not been adequately reflected in the submission draft Plan. In response to the Inspector's Question 11, it follows that we do not consider that the 12% growth (in aggregate) identified for locations outside the Lincoln Strategy area, Gainsborough and Sleaford to be sufficient to support a sustainable future for the 'elsewhere' settlements and large villages in particular.

## 3. Policy LP2 - Large Villages

- 3.1 We note the thrust of the Inspector's Questions 16 and 17 and consider that there is indeed insufficient justification put forward to limit development on non-allocated sites to below 25 dwellings.
- 3.2 Also, in light of the comments we make on Matter 6 and the potential risk to the five year housing land supply, there should be greater clarity in the plan on where applications on non-allocated sites would be expected to be supported. This is especially true with respect to the

nature of the 'exceptional circumstances' that would need to be demonstrated to address the requirements of Policy LP2 for development in large villages as currently drafted.

- 3.3 We also note the Inspector's Question 13 and the concern with how 'appropriate locations' in the Lincoln Urban Area, Main Towns and Market Towns will be identified. We consider that a similar concern should be highlighted for the selection of the 'appropriate locations' on the edge of the Large Villages.
- 3.4 The only allocated site for Saxilby is the 221 dwelling scheme at 'Land off Church Lane' (Ref: CL1432). We consider this to be unacceptably low for a village of Saxilby's size and range of facilities: 1893 dwellings according to the Central Lincolnshire Settlement Hierarchy and Growth Distribution Study (April 2016). Development at Church Lane will represent growth of less than 12%. This figure is particularly low when compared with allocations in other 'Large Villages' of a similar size which benefit from significantly larger allocations, particularly when assessed against the current low housing land supply in Central Lincolnshire.
- 3.5 If Policy LP2 is not amended to encourage and support a greater amount of development at locations such as Saxilby, where the capacity of allocated sites is inadequate to address the potential for growth that could be supported by the existing infrastructure, the ability of the plan as a whole to deliver the change required over the plan period will be constrained.

## 4. Conclusion

- 4.1 While we broadly agree with the assessment that Saxilby is a 'Large Village' within the settlement hierarchy, and that non-allocated sites must be assumed to come forward to address housing growth, there are deficiencies in the Submission Draft Local Plan as set out above which need to be addressed if the Vision is to be achieved and the plan to found to be sound.