

HAMBLETON LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT EXAMINATION

Preliminary Questions by the Inspectors

This note flags up certain matters on which we are seeking clarification before the examination proceeds much further, in order to assist our assessment of the soundness of the submitted Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD).

It would greatly assist the efficiency of the examination for the Council to prepare a full written response addressing these questions, to be tabled no later than 23 February 2010. If this response refers to evidence that is not before the examination, such evidence should also be tabled. Should preparation of the response prompt the Council to suggest minor changes to clarify and strengthen the submitted DPD, the precise changes proposed should be set out in a separate schedule.

1 Consultation with statutory bodies

a) Have Natural England and other statutory consultees had opportunity to comment on the Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report and if so, what were their views on its findings?

b) Have the views of the Regional Assembly been requested on the general conformity of the Allocations DPD with the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS), and if so, what was the response?

2 Gypsies and Travellers

The Development Policies DPD indicates that allocations will be made for sites to meet the needs of gypsies and travellers. No such allocations are included in the submitted DPD. What is the process and timetable for identifying and allocating such sites? How does this process fit with preparation of the Allocations DPD?

3 Post-publication Changes

We note that there have been two rounds of formal consultation on the proposed submission Allocations DPD (January 2009). Were any changes made to the document between these two rounds of consultation?

Attached to the Regulation 30(e) Statement is a schedule of minor editing changes from proposed submission DPD January 2009. Have these changes been incorporated in the Submission DPD December 2009?

Have any other changes been made between the proposed submission and the DPD submitted in December 2009?

Have any changes made been publicised and consulted upon, and if so what was the response?

4 Timeframe for Allocations DPD

While the adopted Core Strategy (CS) looks ahead until 2021, this DPD allocates housing land for the period to 2026, in line with the timeframe of

the adopted RSS, and adjusts phasing accordingly. In spatial planning terms, what is the justification for this approach? Is there a sufficiently robust strategic spatial planning framework to support allocations beyond 2021? What are the implications for the future review/roll forward of the CS? Is the Allocations DPD spatially coherent for the period 2021 to 2026, given that it does not identify land for employment or other uses beyond 2021?

5 Monitoring and Managing Delivery

a) The monitoring indicators included in the Allocations DPD appear to relate to the Local Development Framework as a whole. How will delivery of the allocated sites be monitored?

b) How will delivery of allocated sites be managed to ensure that targets are met? What management mechanisms will be employed? What type of corrective action is envisaged, should there be significant shortfall (or overshoot) in delivery within a particular sub area or across the district as a whole?

c) Have the main risks to delivery been identified? How will such contingencies be handled?

d) How will the likely significant effects arising from the sustainability appraisal be monitored?

6 Infrastructure

a) Annex 4 to the Allocations DPD sets out a strategic infrastructure plan. Much of this necessary infrastructure is to be provided by means of developer contributions. In addition, there are remediation costs, flood risk mitigation measures and other constraints to be overcome with certain sites. For housing sites there is also an expectation that a specified level of affordable housing will be provided. Has there been any assessment of whether, given the cumulative effect of these costs and contributions, the identified sites are likely to be viable and thus likely to come forward for delivery? Is it likely that the anticipated amount and distribution of affordable housing will be achieved?

b) Where there is an element of public funding for provision of necessary infrastructure, has this been identified in relevant programmes, and are the essential partners committed to delivery within the required timescale?

7 Site Selection Process

The supporting documents for the submission DPD contain a large amount of information on the various sites, particularly for housing development, which have been considered during its preparation. Moreover the site selection criteria and process are set out in Annex 3 to the DPD. It would, however, be helpful to the examination for a background paper to be produced which clarifies, perhaps in tabular form, the basis on which the particular sites allocated in the submission DPD have been selected. In particular this should address:

1. How far does each site satisfy the criteria of settlement character, accessibility, local issues and feasibility and to what extent, therefore, is it judged to be appropriate and sustainable?
2. How does each site meet other objectives, for example are they greenfield or previously developed land?
3. Do any of the selection criteria carry more weight?
4. How have the findings of the sustainability appraisal and consultation outcomes been taken into account in the selection of each site?
5. Where other considerations have come into play, for example the advantages of a package of sites, how have these have been balanced against the other criteria?

It will be particularly important to explain this selection process for those sites which were previously rejected, and have been found suitable for allocation in preference to other suggested sites.

8 Alternative and Additional Sites

Please clarify whether any alternative sites to those included as allocations in the submission DPD have been proposed in representations, either as replacements for, or as additions to, the allocated sites. It would be helpful to give a unique reference number to each of these suggested alternative/additional sites, clearly linked to the relevant representation(s) and to plans showing the exact location and site boundary. In addition, please clarify whether each of these alternative/additional sites has been subject to sustainability appraisal and community involvement as part of preparation of the Allocations DPD, and if so, where in the evidence base the outcomes of these processes are documented.

9 Motorway Service Area (MSA) - (Allocation BC5)

We note that at least two proposals for an MSA along this length of the A1/A1(M), one of which appears to be for this allocated site, are to be considered at a public inquiry due to open on 25 May 2010. Having regard to the issues identified by the Inspector for that inquiry, including the availability of alternative sites which would meet any need which may be demonstrated for an MSA serving this length of the A1/A1(M), what in the Council's view are the implications for the soundness of the DPD of including this particular allocation?

Karen McCabe

Siân Worden

Examining Inspectors

8 Feb 10

**HAMBLETON LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
ALLOCATIONS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT EXAMINATION**

Supplementary Question by the Inspectors

Having read the summary representations and note the objections to particular allocations and the suggestions that alternative/additional allocations are included in the DPD. However, the Inspectors have not noted any representations about the development limits as drawn on the Proposals Map (except, by implication, in representations about particular allocations). Please can the Council confirm whether or not any representations have been received about development limit boundaries? If there are any such representations, then for each it would be helpful to be provided with a plan showing that part of the development limit in dispute.

Karen McCabe

Siân Worden

Examining Inspectors
16 Feb 10