

**Email 060517 from Programme Officer to Council**

**From:** Tony Blackburn

**Sent:** 06 May 2017 11:08

**To:** Julie Glaister <julie.glaister@fylde.gov.uk>

**Cc:** Eddie Graves <eddie.graves@fylde.gov.uk>; PlanningPolicy <PlanningPolicy@fylde.gov.uk>; Mark Evans <mark.evans@fylde.gov.uk>

**Subject:** RE: Response to Inspector's Letter of 11th April

Julie

I've delayed the uploading of your recent response to the Inspector and most likely will do this alongside your further information due by the 10<sup>th</sup> next week.

In the meantime, the Inspector would welcome some further feedback – by the same date ideally - as detailed below:

*In relation to the draft schedule of modifications it would be most helpful if proposed main and additional (minor) modifications are kept separate please.*

*Some of the matters and Council's proposed modifications will be discussed as part of the upcoming stage 2 hearing sessions. However in the interim and to assist progress in the examination I have a few further queries in relation to the proposed modifications to Policy DLF1 which are:*

- *The first sentence refers to both housing and employment yet the distributions refer to housing. Is this a policy for the distribution of housing development only or should employment land locations be referred to as well including within the new table? Or should reference just be made to appropriate policies e.g. Policy EC1?*
- *The policy includes reference to Strategic Locations and Strategic Locations for Development; strategic sites and strategic development sites; Non-Strategic Locations and Non-Strategic Locations for Development. Consistency of the use of terms within the policy and the plan as a whole would be welcomed to ensure clarity and effectiveness in interpretation of policy.*
- *There is duplication of wording within the policy which affects the effectiveness of the policy. Is there a specific reason for having separate sections on the Locations for Development and then the Broad Distribution of Development? These elements could be easily combined. For instance the table sets out how housing development over the plan period will be distributed in the four Strategic Locations for Development (SLDs) and could be merged with the list of these areas earlier in the policy. Other elements could also be merged with the SLD and Non-Strategic Locations sections including the text under Development Sites. As an example, following the final sentence under the Strategic Locations for Development title, the definition of strategic sites could be added though this should refer to committed/allocated sites in Policies SL1-SL4 for SLDs. Though policies SL1-SL5 have yet to be discussed within the hearings, it would be*

*useful at this stage if the Council could clarify whether these policies are allocating all sites listed including committed sites?*

- *The second column of the table states that housing will be 'provided on allocated sites' – is this necessary here? The policy is setting out the distribution of development, not allocating sites. This is done later in the plan under Policies SL1-SL4 for SLDs. Also is the third column in the table necessary? The policy already defines the distribution of housing development by the minimum housing numbers. Does the Council propose to rely on the % distribution in the SLDs instead of this or in conjunction? The heading of this column refers to total housing supply and allocated sites – is this appropriate? Is it not just showing the approximate distribution of housing development within those locations?*
- *Does the section on existing land uses relate effectively to the policy or is it more of a development management matter?*

Thank you.

Tony

**Tony Blackburn**  
**Programme Officer**  
**Extension: 01254 260286**