

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 March 2017 16:22
To: Talk Planning
Subject: Comments on the Local Plan Consultation

Dear Sirs,

In relation to the Local Plan Modifications and consultation I would like to make the following comments.

LP2 – MM/2

LP2 for large villages has now been amended to refer to "within the existing developed footprint". As part of choice and review of allocated sites, was this considered, given that in Ruskington there are sites which have closer proximity to the existing development.

Given there have been revisions to the plan how have the site allocations been reviewed to ensure the new requirements are reflected.

Review of site allocations

Through the hearing process there was no factual evidence given as to how the allocated sites in large villages were considered against each other and how this is shown in the local plan. The Council spokesman advised there was an assessment no basis was actually provided.

For example, in Billingham CL4721 Land off Waterside, Billingham is a preferred allocation with 2 reds and 8 ambers whilst in Ruskington there are allocations which have been declined with lesser issues e.g. CL962 Land at Leasingham with 1 red and 4 ambers or CL4013, Land of Priory Road with 2 reds and 6 ambers. This would indicate that the assessment basis is not solely on the indicators the Council have advised are being used.

Therefore, with the lack of a consistent basis and no transparency how can the plan be "justified" & "effective".

Increases in large village sizes

There is no factual justification of the percentage increases applied to each of the larger villages within the plan. Where is the justification that the percentage increase range from 10% in Ruskington (549 new homes against the census population of 5,169) to 27% in Billingham (563 new homes against the census population of 2,190). The infrastructure in Ruskington with train line / secondary school / doctors etc is greater than Billingham but there is no explanation / transparency as to why the percentages differ and Billingham given a higher increase. Should the increases not be more split more evenly across the large villages.

Therefore, with the lack of a consistent basis and no transparency how can the plan be "justified" & "effective".

I would be grateful if you can acknowledge receipt of this email.

Yours faithfully

Tim Wells

[REDACTED]

