

## **Matter 9: Housing Allocations**

### **Further questions**

The following matters will be discussed at the forthcoming hearing sessions, with particular reference to the additional documents and evidence provided in response to the questions raised at earlier hearing sessions.

#### **Approach to non-strategic site allocations**

1. How has the assessment of individual sites been undertaken? Has this followed a robust process?
2. How has the Sustainability Appraisal contributed to this process?
3. How were issues of viability and flood risk assessed?
4. Is it clear how assessment criteria were used to influence site selection, including for proposed reserve sites? Is the selection process transparent? Were reasonable alternatives considered and is it clear why these were not allocated?
5. How have the main constraints and requirements for individual sites been identified? Have these been used to assess site capacity?
6. A new Appendix 5 is proposed to the Plan, to provide detail on site specific constraints, mitigation and infrastructure requirements. Has a consistent approach been taken with the identification of the need for further assessment, such as heritage impact assessments, for example?
7. Where all proposed site allocations are proposed to contribute to identified infrastructure requirements for a settlement (e.g. new or expanded education facilities), does the Plan clearly identify how each proposed site would be expected to contribute? How is the issue of 'pooled contributions' proposed to be addressed?
8. Does this Appendix provide an appropriate level of detail on the form, scale, access and quantum of development proposed for allocated sites? (NPPF, paragraph 157)
9. With reference to ED123, how would the Plan require development of the proposed allocations to take account of these matters? Should the reasoned justification to Policy 11 make specific reference to the Appendix (for example, in paragraph 5.2.8)?

10. Would the Plan provide 'a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency'? (NPPF, paragraph 17)
11. Has a consistent approach been taken regarding 'lead-in' times for the sites proposed? Are the timeframes identified realistic and achievable for all proposed allocations?
12. Is the clarification provided in ED124, relating to the depiction of housing sites on the Policies Map, consistent with the responses provided elsewhere (e.g. ED118 response to Q3; ED120 response to Q35)? If not, what is the position of the JC on this point?

### **Non-strategic sites in the sub-regional centres**

1. Boston: Pil006 – should the proposed Appendix 5 of the Plan identify the need for a specific heritage impact assessment?
2. Spalding: Mon005 – the response to ED073 Q18 referred to the need for the development of the proposed allocation to contribute to the Spalding Transport Strategy. Is there a need to amend proposed Appendix 5 of the Plan to reflect this?

### **Non-strategic sites in the main service centres**

1. Kirton: Kir041 – Have planning applications been submitted on the 4.13ha or 0.41ha parcels of the site?
2. Long Sutton: a significant proportion of the development proposed for this settlement is identified to be met through existing housing commitments. Concerns have been expressed about the likelihood of some of these sites being delivered. How has this issue been considered? Is there a need to identify further allocations or reserve sites in Long Sutton to address this matter?
3. Pinchbeck: Can further clarification be given to the response to ED118 Q22, with regards to flood risk? Should the second reference to Pin065 in the second paragraph refer to Pin002?
4. Sutton Bridge: Can the JC confirm that the reference to flood depth in the second sentence of the response to ED118 Q30 is incorrect and should read 1.0-2.0m? In undertaking the flood risk sequential test in relation to

the proposed allocation site and in consideration of reasonable alternatives, was account taken of the potential housing numbers likely to be affected, as well as the proportion of each site potentially affected by various flood depths?

### **Sites in minor service centres**

1. Gedney Hill: with reference to ED083 and ED122, would the proposed Appendix 5 of the Plan address the concerns of the Environment Agency and ensure that one of the two potential solutions would be required to be followed in respect of the development of the proposed allocations?
2. Gedney Hill: Geh015 and Geh003 - should proposed Appendix 5 of the Plan identify the need for Geh015 to be developed in conjunction with Geh003, due to the potential visual impact of the development, as well as sewerage issues?
3. Gosberton: Gos023 and Gos003 – does the response to ED120 Q27 indicate that there is no requirement for the sites to be developed jointly?
4. Surfleet: Sur006 – the response to ED120 Q41 indicates that, notwithstanding the comments made by Historic England, the JC consider it is not necessary to identify potential constraints to the development of the proposed allocation site within the proposed Appendix 5 of the Plan. Is the JC confident that any potential development of the site would not impact on views from the listed church?
5. Sutton St James: Suj007 and Suj012 – the potential for development to affect the setting of nearby heritage assets has been identified in proposed Appendix 5 of the Plan in relation to Suj007 but not Suj012. Why is this?
6. Weston: Wsn022 – the potential for development of this site to have an adverse effect on the setting of nearby listed buildings is not identified in proposed Appendix 5 of the Plan. Why is this?

### **JC list of identified additional and reserve sites**

1. With reference to ED117, have all the proposed additional and reserve sites been subject to Sustainability Appraisal and a Site Allocations Flood Risk Sequential Test?
2. Have the documents been updated to reflect this?

3. Are the proposed additional and reserve sites included within the proposed Appendix 1 to the SA (ED125)?
  4. Bicker: Bic004 – given the indication in ED120 that the site has the worst SA score, are the reasons for selecting this site in preference to reasonable alternatives clear and robust?
  5. Gosberton: Gos011 – how has the need for the additional land proposed for the extension to the cemetery and playing field been identified? Would the provision of this land be necessary in planning terms?
  6. Surfleet: Sur018 – given the concerns about access identified in the response to ED117 Q24, is it still considered appropriate to propose the site as a reserve site?
-