

Objections/Comments)on regulation 19 Draft North Lincs Local plan

jack Butterfield [REDACTED]

Thu 25/11/2021 15:24

To: localplan <localplan@northlincs.gov.uk>

Dear Sirs

I write to set out to my objection on the above document, specifically in relation to Housing Option Proposal for land behind Main Street & Station Road in Sturton Nr Brigg.

Whilst I cannot comment on the legal compliance of the plan in relation to planning statutes, I do however wish to object under the 'Soundness' of the plan in relation to the same, namely it contradicts national and local policy directives as follows.

The North Lincolnshire Council Scawby Conservation Area Appraisal report (2005) expresses in its statement 'Modern development around the edges of Scawby has had a negative impact on the quality of the village' Further residential development should be therefore dissuaded.

The 5 year target is based entirely on an old and now superseded planning document (Structure Plan) dating back to 1989-2006. Today's annual housing supply targets accord with the number required by this structure plan and it is widely acknowledged that this annual figure exceeds building rates and emerging regional planning requirements and are thus inaccurate. The Office for National Statistics population projections suggest that 'the population of North Lincolnshire may decline by 6,300 people between 1996 and 2021'. The DETR has since amended the figure for North Lincolnshire, which show a broadly static population. To conclude, any shortfall, if any in the current 5 year NLCC housing supply plan should not and cannot be singularly used as the basis for this draft designation. NLCC have also in my opinion conveniently disregarded all of the previously approved housing applications made in its five-year count, a consequence of greedy developers deferring actual building to heighten demand and hence profit. At the end of the day, its 'easy' housing development in rural communities being pushed for approval, all at the expense of the quality and amenity of its villages that its seeking to protect in the first place. On this basis the designation cannot be justified on the 5-year supply plan.

In accordance with Policy PPG3 of the local plan, (and I quote policy highlighted in red;)'*The Government is committed to promoting more sustainable patterns of development. PPG3 seeks to achieve this by "concentrating most additional housing within urban areas" and by "making more efficient use of land by maximising the re-use of existing buildings". A further central aim of PPG3 is to prioritise the re-use of previously developed land within urban areas to promote urban renaissance to improve the quality of life and to minimise the level of development on Greenfield sites*'. This proposed designation is contrary to policy expressed here.

'In moving towards more sustainable patterns of development PPG3 identifies also a clear sequential approach to the identification of new housing land as follows. Firstly, re-use of previously developed sites and empty or under-used buildings within town centres and elsewhere in the urban areas which are well located and accessible to jobs, shops and services other than by private car. Secondly, extension of urban areas should be prioritized. Finally, development should focus on areas with good public transport nodes and corridors' Sturton clearly does not fall within any of these areas identified for housing development and therefore the designation here should be strongly rejected.

'The settlements identified as rural hamlets and villages are considered entirely unsuitable locations for new residential development, unless related to an agricultural or other special housing need, and

are identified as being within the open countryside' Again, policy actively dissuades residential development in these hamlets, and the designation should be rejected.

In line with PPG13, the Local Plan now seeks to ensure that future housing development is in locations that help to reduce the need to travel by private car and are well related to existing or proposed employment opportunities. The Plan also reflects government advice to allocate the maximum amount of housing to existing larger urban areas (market towns and above) where they can be easily accessible to facilities and avoid any significant incremental expansion of housing in villages and small towns where this is likely to result largely in car commuting to urban centres and where the travel needs are unlikely to be well serviced by public transport. Designation should be wholly rejected as housing development in Sturton can only attract a transient (car ownership) population as public transportation infrastructure is largely minimal as are local employment opportunities.

'For existing Housing allocations inherited from Local Plans only 32.5% are identified within the Scunthorpe and Urban Area and only 19.6% within Barton upon Humber and Brigg whilst more than 47% are identified within the small towns and villages where few jobs and facilities exist. This existing geographic distribution of housing is not in accordance with current settlement hierarchy nor is it sustainable' The sustainable argument against this designation is clearly expressed in policy and government thinking and should as such be rejected..

H1(Housing Development Hierarchy) *Future housing development will take place in accordance with the following hierarchy:*

In minimum growth settlements (such as Sturton) new housing development will be restricted to the building of single and in exceptional cases very small groups of dwellings (up to a maximum of three dwellings), on infilling plots in the main body of the settlement provided that such development would be in keeping with the size, form and character of the settlement.

Also expansion of these villages on a large scale cannot be achieved without altering their character and function. Any opportunities for housing in such settlements tends to be limited to greenfield land, open spaces, amenity areas and agricultural land, which are not considered suitable for development. The Policy clearly states a presumption against development in villages/hamlets such as Sturton.

In summary, I am of the view that existing and proposed policy both at national and local level is set out to minimise/dissuade further residential infill in rural locations such as this. It is clearly seen as unsustainable and not in line with current government trends and thinking. Furthermore, population is seen to be static/reducing in North Lincolnshire and no clear demand has been set out to justify such a designation. With regard to policy, the designation of housing supply land in Sturton should be wholly rejected as it contradicts almost all policy on housing for North Lincs.

I hope that my views and comments a properly considered as part of the Regulation 19 Proposal review.

Sincerely
Mr J Butterfield

