

# **Fylde Local Plan Examination**

## **Stage 2 Hearings**

**Matter 5 Housing - Site Allocations and Delivery**  
**Policy SL5**

**Matter 6 General Development**  
**Policy GD1**

**Hearing Statement on behalf of Mr & Mrs McSorley**

**Representor No. 39**

June 2017

## 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement is submitted on behalf of Mr & Mrs McSorley in connection with the proposed allocation of land for housing development at Site HS52 - Cobweb Barn, Oak Lane, Newton.
- 1.2 It responds to relevant questions set out in Matters 5 and 6 of the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions for the Stage 2 Hearings dated the 15<sup>th</sup> May 2017, and should be read in conjunction with the preceding representations submitted to the Publication version of the Local Plan on behalf of Mr & Mrs McSorley in September 2016.

## 2 Matter 5: Housing - Site Allocations and Delivery

*Issue Does the Plan set out a positively prepared strategy for the supply and delivery of housing that is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?*

### **Site Allocations - Policies SL1 - SL5**

*Q7 Are the proposed housing site allocations in Policies SL1 - SL5 justified and deliverable? Are the delivery rates for the sites reasonable and achievable?*

- 2.1 Mr and Mrs McSorley made representations in support of the proposed housing allocation identified as Site HS52 Cobweb Barn, Oak Lane, Newton, and seeking its enlargement by including the rectangular area of land they own immediately south of the proposed allocation. They consider the additional area of their land should be included in the Local Plan as an extension to the proposed housing allocation to form a larger and more beneficial opportunity for sustainable new housing development to take place within Newton.
- 2.2 As a Tier 1 Larger Rural Settlement, Newton is a sustainable location for growth and has the physical and social infrastructure to support modest additional housing, as well as being an attractive residential area for both working families and retired and older people. There is acknowledged market interest in Newton and Mr and Mrs McSorley are committed to making their land available.
- 2.3 Mr and Mrs McSorley's land comprises two small paddocks, a stable and a riding arena and presumably, the Council assumed it was not available for development when drafting the proposed site allocation boundary, notwithstanding the fact the paddock and stable was included within SHLAA Site Ref. NE06. The land is available however, unused and surplus to Mr and Mrs McSorley's requirements, and they would not propose to erect replacement stable facilities elsewhere.

- 2.4 Development of the proposed housing allocation in isolation would therefore sterilise the additional surplus land as it would become contained between existing and future housing and its subsequent development or beneficial re-use would be constrained. It would also no longer serve any visual or landscape benefit as open countryside on the edge of the settlement.
- 2.5 Incorporating this land into the proposed Site HS52 housing allocation is therefore the only logical solution for the land and for the proper planning of the village. The site is available, suitable and achievable and provides an enhanced opportunity to provide new housing in Newton. The opportunity to secure an enlarged housing allocation should not be overlooked and will form a logical rounding-off of development within this part of Newton, enclosed by the road network and existing development.
- 2.6 The proposed minor modification MNR011 of the Schedule of Minor Modifications of December 2016, indicates a correction is to be made to the boundary of the housing allocation Site HS52 - Cobweb Barn, Oak Lane, Newton, with a higher yield of 54 dwellings increased from 29. This indicates the Council may have supported Mr and Mrs McSorley's representations to enlarge the proposed allocation, however in the absence of a revised Policies Map it is unclear. It is requested that clarification is provided at, or ideally before, the Hearing on this matter, in the hope that the objection raised by Mr and Mrs McSorley has been favourably resolved.

### **3 Matter 6: General Development**

*Issue Does the Plan provide a robust framework for the management and delivery of development across the Borough that is justified, effective and consistent with national policy?*

#### **Policy GD1 - Settlement boundaries**

*Q26 Policy GD1 refers to development being focussed on previously developed land within and immediately abutting the existing settlements. Does this relate to allocated sites and if so are settlement boundaries drawn around them? Are the boundaries around each settlement justified?*

- 3.1 The proposed settlement boundary for Newton is not justified as it appears on the draft Policies Map to the north of Mr and Mrs McSorley's property and neighbouring houses, and to the south of the proposed Site HS52 housing allocation in Policy HS5.
- 3.2 The land excluded from the settlement boundary as currently drawn, includes theirs and their neighbours' rear gardens, which is previously-developed private land and not countryside, and ancillary domestic paddocks, stable and arena. The land to the east also excluded from the settlement boundary, includes further domestic garden and the residual area of underused

farm buildings - the northern part of which is incorporated into the proposed housing allocation Site HS52.

- 3.3 Development of the draft housing allocation HS52 as currently proposed, would therefore annex the land to the south and create an unnecessary and unjustified narrow finger of 'quasi' countryside extending into the settlement area. This would not serve any useful purpose as countryside and its protection serves no beneficial landscape, visual, biodiversity, heritage or other planning purpose in the public interest.
- 3.4 Incorporating this land into the new settlement boundary for Newton is therefore the only logical solution for the land and for the proper planning of the village.

*Q30 In relation to greenfield land within settlement boundaries paragraph 8.3 lists other matters that will be taken into consideration when considering development proposals. Should these matters be included in the policy? Would this be justified?*

- 3.5 The proposed text of Policy GD1 is clear on the considerations that will be taken into account in considering development proposals on greenfield land within settlement boundaries. There is no need to include the criteria listed in paragraph 8.3 of the supporting text.