



SUPPLEMENTARY REPRESENTATIONS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF LINCOLN COUNCIL (AS LANDOWNER) (AND SCARBOROUGH FAMILY?) IN RELATION TO MATTERS RAISED BY THE INSPECTOR IN ADVANCE OF EXAMINATION INTO CENTRAL LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN

Matter 4: Sustainable Urban Extensions

Introduction

This brief document represents further comments and representations in relation to Matter 4 (Sustainable Urban Extensions) Issues 4a and 4b relating to particularly the Western Growth Corridor site arising from questions raised by the Inspector in advance of the Examination into the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan. This response is in addition to the representations already made on behalf of the City of Lincoln Council as landowner and will be enlarged upon during the discussion of this matter at the Examination on 10 November.

Issue 4a

Questions 5 and 6

These relate to the amount of employment land proposed and the meaning of employment use for the purposes of planning policy. In the case of the Western Growth Corridor site, this is taken to mean B1, B2 (and also B8 but this may be less suitable from a site specific basis) and these are the uses being tested for the purposes of the Environmental Impact Assessment into the proposed development on the WGC site. As far as the quantum of employment land is concerned, the Council has indicated in general how the amounts are calculated bearing in mind the overall balance between housing and employment it is seeking to provide for in the Local Plan area. In the context of the site specifics, however, the area of land in the north-eastern part of the WGC site (being closest to the railway line and the Swanpool Tip as well as the University) is regarded as being the most suitable and logical for employment purposes given the potential relationship with the University and the amenity issues that may prevent housing immediately adjacent to Swanpool Tip.

Question 8

Whilst the matter of deliverability of the WGC is covered in Issue 4b (see below), the work carried out on behalf of the landowners and potential applicants of the forthcoming planning application for housing and employment and related development on the WGC site indicates that the site is deliverable and viable in the manner envisaged by the Plan.

Questions 12/13

This relates to necessary infrastructure provision on each SUE site with specific regard to schools and health care provision. It is considered that the policies at this stage need not be specific in terms of whether a building or site need be provided. The provision of the school building itself can be done through a number of options either through a financial contribution or through the physical building of the school. In policy terms it is considered the flexibility given is appropriate and can be implemented either as part of the conditions or legal agreement connected to the planning application.

Question 15

The intention on the WGC planning application is to provide for a local centre that would incorporate retail and other community related uses – including local employment that would be provided subject to market and commercial considerations. Whilst it is recognised LP28 could refer to a wider range of facilities to be provided rather than just retail, perhaps the policy wording to include a local centre or

district centre as appropriate may be more suitable. The provision of facilities within a local centre or district centre would rely on market and operator requirements.

Issue 4b Western Growth Corridor

Question 20 – Viability Issues

The applicants/landowners on the WGC site have prepared a number of 'high level' viability assessments which have been based upon the various options being tested for provision of key infrastructure to bring forward the WGC site – notably new highway infrastructure, links over the railway line into the city centre and the provision of development platforms to allow housing to come forward in a manner which is not subject to unacceptable flood risk. It should not be the case the viability assessment should be a matter required to be submitted either through planning policy or indeed a planning application. However, the applicants/landowners are content that the scheme as shown in the Local Plan is fundamentally viable. The reference to a detailed viability assessment relates to the applicants/landowners' intention to carry out a more detailed viability assessment of the chosen option which will arise through the EIA process (including modelling of the various options for highways serving the WGC site). The detailed viability assessment will include matters such as the phasing of development including phasing of provision of affordable housing and the ability of grant funding to bring forward certain parts of the development more quickly than the current viability options suggest, eg if the funding is achieved for the bridge link over the railway onto Beevor Street. This will allow the employment related parts of the site in its north-eastern corner to come forward more quickly than if no grant funding was available.

Question 21

The landowners have and will continue to make applications for funding to enable development of the area to be accelerated over and above the timetable set out in the Topic Paper. These funding applications are primarily for enabling large infrastructure to come forward earlier than currently planned. However, the high level viability assessment of the scheme has been carried out on the assumption that no grant is received. Therefore, the scheme is viable without securing external grant funding.

Question 22

On the basis of the high level viability assessments that have been carried out and the detailed work that has been undertaken in relation to infrastructure provision and phasing over the last two years or so, the potential applicants/landowners of the WGC site consider it is fundamentally deliverable and developable in the Plan period. The 'masterplan' within the topic paper is being considered as part of the EIA that will accompany a planning application to be submitted in Spring 2017.

Question 23

As part of the planning application that will be submitted a phasing plan will be included that would be the subject to either a planning condition or Section 106 Agreement tying the delivery of the housing proposed and the employment land proposed with the delivery of appropriate levels of supporting services, open space and infrastructure linkages. It is not considered that more detailed aspects of the phasing should be set out in the policy, simply a requirement for the need for phased development as set out in the topic paper.

Question 24

It is understood that upon further consideration, Highways England has confirmed to Lincolnshire County Council as Highway Authority that its concerns in relation to Hykeham roundabout in relation to WGC no longer apply.

Question 26

There is a comprehensive solution to reclaiming and restoring the former tip site. The overall cost of this has been taken into account in the viability of the WGC project. Whilst it is clearly a cost to the development, it can be accommodated within the overall project with or without grant funding.

Question 27

The potential applicants/landowners on the WGC site are not convinced that the park and ride area proposal has been justified. At present there is no indication as to the size of the park and ride. The extent for this to be included as a definitive policy requirement is therefore questioned, although the applicants/landowners are not opposed to facilitating a park and ride area on the WGC site subject to its compatibility with the land use proposals within the masterplan and access arrangements. Therefore further discussions about whether such an area is justified need not rule out the identification of land as part of the masterplan for a park and ride should the need be demonstrated.