



AGENDA

CABINET

MONDAY, 9 OCTOBER 2006

11.00 AM

**COUNCIL CHAMBER, COUNCIL OFFICES, ST PETERS HILL,
GRANTHAM**

Duncan Kerr, Chief Executive

CABINET MEMBERS:	Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal (Leader/ Portfolio: Strategic Partnerships & Community Safety), Councillor Ray Auger (Portfolio: Healthy Environment), Councillor Teri Bryant (Portfolio: Resources & Assets), Councillor Paul Carpenter (Deputy Leader & Portfolio: Access and Engagement), Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright (Portfolio: Organisational Development & Housing) and Councillor John Smith (Portfolio: Economic Development)
-----------------------------	---

Cabinet Support Officer:	Jo Toomey 01476 406152 e-mail: j.toomey@southkesteven.gov.uk
-----------------------------	--

Members of the public are entitled to attend the meeting of the Cabinet at which key decisions will be taken on the issues listed on the following page. Key decisions are marked *.

- 1. APOLOGIES**
- 2. MINUTES**
- 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (IF ANY)**

CATEGORY A PRIORITY ISSUES:

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

It is anticipated that, in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the public may be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business because of the likelihood that otherwise exempt information, as described in paragraph 3 of the Act (as amended) would be disclosed to the public.

4. BOURNE, SOUTH ROAD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Report number PLA618 by the Economic Development Portfolio Holder.

(To follow)

5. *CAPITAL PROGRAMME

Report by the Corporate Head of Finance and Resources.

(To follow)

CATEGORY M ISSUES:

6. LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK: UPDATE ON PROGRESS AND REVISION TO LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

Report number PLA615 by the Economic Development Portfolio Holder.

(Enclosure)

CHANGE MANAGEMENT ACTION PLAN ISSUES:

7. CORPORATE PLAN AND THE COUNCIL'S VISION

Report by the Strategic Director.

(To follow)

8. MATTERS REFERRED TO CABINET BY THE COUNCIL OR THE DEVELOPMENT & SCRUTINY PANELS

9. ITEMS RAISED BY CABINET MEMBERS INCLUDING REPORTS ON KEY AND NON KEY DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED POWERS.

10. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON MATTERS WITHIN THE FORWARD PLAN (IF ANY)

11. REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED FROM NON CABINET MEMBERS

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN, BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, DECIDES IS URGENT



MEETING OF THE CABINET **4 September 2006 - 11:00 –12:25**

PRESENT:

Councillor Terl Bryant
Councillor Paul Carpenter
Councillor Mrs Frances Cartwright
Councillor John Smith

Councillor Mrs. Linda Neal – Leader / Chairman

Chief Executive
Strategic Director (x2)
Corporate Head of Finance and Resources
Assets and Facilities Manager
Legal Services Manager
Member Services Manager
Interim Manager Planning/Building Control
Public Relations Manager
Economic Development Team Leader
Grantham Town Centre Manager
Cabinet Support Officer
Environmental Health Practitioner (Licensing)
Public Relations Officer

Non-Cabinet Councillors: Wheat, Mrs. Wheat

CO44. APOLOGIES

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Auger.

CO45. MINUTES

The minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 7th August 2006 were approved as a correct record with the following amendments:

CO36, consideration 1, should be amended to read "*Exempt report number PLA607 by the Leader, the Economic Development Portfolio Holder having declared a personal interest.*"

CO37, consideration 9, should be amended to read *"Access to Mapinfo would be available for Members of the Council."*

CO37, consideration 11, should be amended to read *"The District Council would ensure that contractors were made aware of monitoring documents concerning development on properties where asbestos had been identified."*

CO38, consideration 5, should be amended to read: *"The strategy would need to reflect both potential outcomes of the ballot of tenants on Large Scale Voluntary Transfer, due to take place in autumn 2006."*

CO46. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made.

CO47. DRAFT GRANTHAM MASTERPLAN

DECISION:

- 1. The Cabinet did not approve the Draft Grantham Masterplan; clarification was required on:**
 - a. Whether the document presented a real vision that would allow Grantham to become a functioning sub-regional centre if it achieves its growth potential;**
 - b. Identification of sources of public funding for specific projects would be necessary as South Kesteven District Council had been identified as a funding agent;**
 - c. The location of the civic centre of Grantham and the cultural centre of Grantham;**
 - d. The implications of the proposed change of use for East Street car park following a Council decision.**
- 2. That following clarification, the Draft Masterplan should be presented to a future Cabinet meeting, which could be a special meeting held at the Leader's discretion.**

Considerations/Reasons for Decision:

- (1) Report number PLA611 by the Economic Development Portfolio Holder on the draft Grantham Masterplan for 2006-2015, which would provide a detailed, prioritised action plan that would form the basis of an Area Action Plan (AAP) for inclusion in the Local Development Framework (LDF);
- (2) The District Council's Category A Priority to develop Grantham as a sub-regional centre;
- (3) Comments made at the joint meeting of the Economic DSP and the Resources DSP on Thursday 24th August 2006 and a meeting held for Grantham Councillors on 31st August 2006;
- (4) All design proposals produced in the Masterplan would be conceptual and should not therefore be formally adopted. Each development would need to take account of key delivery issues that would be highlighted within the development brief and

- subject to some change;
- (5) Consultation with local stakeholders on the draft Masterplan undertaken by the Grantham Town Centre Manager and the need for consultation with members of the public;
 - (6) Appointment of a champion for the project and possible supporting team, into which current provision for Town Centre Management should be integrated. The appointed champion should be evaluated on a three-yearly basis;
 - (7) In determining the strategy to encourage finance it would be necessary to confirm the level of public sector intervention required to facilitate the development;
 - (8) The Masterplan for Grantham should be affordable and deliverable;
 - (9) The decision of the Council on the disposal of East Street car park being contrary to proposals in the draft Masterplan.

At 11:23 The Leader left the meeting and the Deputy Leader assumed the Chair.

CO48. *GAMBLING ACT 2005

DECISION:

That the Cabinet recommends to Council that the draft Statement of Principles be adopted as 'The Statement of Principles' in respect of the Gambling Act 2005.

Considerations/Reasons for Decision:

- (1) Report number ENV361 by the Healthy Environment Portfolio Holder concerning the draft Statement of Principles in respect of the Council's legislative responsibility under the Gambling Act 2005;
- (2) Appendix 1 of report ENV361, detailing responses received to consultation on the Draft Statement of Principles and the Draft statement circulated as a supplementary item;
- (3) Recommendations made by the Licensing Committee on Friday 1st September;
- (4) Section 349 of the Gambling Act 2005 required the licensing authority to consult on, publish and adopt a three year Statement of Principles for the area which would need to be in place by 1st January 2007;
- (5) Peer assessments of the draft Statement of Principles by the County Licensing Group and LACORS;
- (6) Discussions of the Economic Development and Scrutiny Panel;
- (7) That consideration should be given to the legality of making CRB checks mandatory for all people who work within gambling establishments.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, it was resolved that the public be excluded because of the

likelihood in view of the nature of business to be transacted that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraph 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended. With the press and public excluded, the following item was considered.

CO49. DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICES - ACTION PLAN

DECISION:

1. That the action taken to deal with the short to medium term management and performance issues in the Development Control Service, as set out in appendix 1 of report PLA612, is noted;
2. That an independent verification is carried out of development control performance statistics against the Audit Commission Key Performance Indicators lines of enquiry; and that a detailed check is carried out on those applications that are determined close to the 8/13 week date, and a sample system check of up to 2% of applications, depending on AC guidelines;
3. That the positions of Trainee Planning Officer and Development Control Officer are advertised as soon as possible;
4. That a post APAS system administrator (on an initial six month basis) be established, to be advertised for immediate filling;
5. That the post of temporary practice manager (on an initial six month basis) is advertised internally for immediate filling;
6. That these two appointments are reviewed after 3 months to evaluate possible further temporary arrangements or a permanent solution, with a report submitted to Cabinet to recommend the appropriate course of action;
7. That a report be submitted to the Cabinet setting out the measures to be in a Service Improvement Plan for Development Control based on the IDeA Peer Review Report, and the management and implementation team arrangements for carrying it out;
8. Endorse the proposals for the utilisation of Planning Delivery Grants as set out in the "Summary of Planning Delivery Grant Award, spend and commitments" contained at appendix 2 of report PLA612;
9. That regular update reports should be submitted to Cabinet on the use of the Planning Delivery Grant.

Considerations/Reasons for Decision:

- (1) Report number PLA612 by the Economic Development Portfolio Holder addressing several key issues for the short and longer term operation and management of the Council's Development Control Service and exempt appendix;

- (2) Appendix 2 of report PLA612 including a summary of the Planning Delivery Grant award, spend and commitments, with further proposals for the utilisation of the 2006/07 award.

Other options considered and assessed:

1. None appropriate given the urgent timescale for the turn round of Development Control Services performance and the previous agreement of Operational Management Team to the filling of the two new Development Control Services posts.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, as amended, it was resolved that the public be excluded because of the likelihood in view of the nature of business to be transacted that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended. With the press and public excluded, the following item was considered.

CO50. CATTLE MARKET, STAMFORD

DECISION:

1. **That the Cabinet agree to the early surrender of the existing lease subject to the tenant removing all existing fixtures and fittings and clearing the site to the satisfaction of the Council and in accordance with the terms of the lease;**
2. **That the Capital and Asset Management Group investigate all options for the current and future use of the site on early surrender of the lease.**

Considerations/Reasons for Decision:

- (1) Exempt report number DLS81 by the Economic Development Portfolio Holder on Cattle Market, Stamford;
- (2) To ensure best value, the current and future use of the site at Cattle Market, Stamford should be considered in conjunction with other potential development sites in the area.

Other options considered and assessed:

1. To refuse to accept early surrender of the lease until the Council had determined an alternate future use for the site.

EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972,

as amended, it was resolved that the public be excluded because of the likelihood in view of the nature of business to be transacted that if members of the public were present there would be disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in paragraphs 3 Schedule 12A of the Act, as amended. With the press and public excluded, the following item was considered.

CO51. *WAKE HOUSE, BOURNE

DECISION:

To defer the item on Wake House, Bourne until a future meeting of the Cabinet to allow further consultation between all parties.

Considerations/Reasons for Decision:

- (1) Exempt report number AFM019 by the Economic Development Portfolio Holder on the disposal of Wake House, Bourne;
- (2) Cabinet decision on Wake House made on 7th November 2005.

DATE DECISIONS EFFECTIVE:

Minute CO48 being a Policy Framework Proposal, stands referred to the Council meeting on 26th October 2006. All other decisions as made on 4th September 2006 can be implemented on 13th September 2006, unless subject to call-in by the Chairman of the relevant Development and Scrutiny Panel or five members of the Council.

**South Kesteven District Council, Council Offices, St. Peter's Hill,
Grantham, Lincolnshire NG31 6PZ**

**Contact: Cabinet Support Officer Tel: 01476 406152
e-mail: j.toomey@southkesteven.gov.uk**

REPORT TO CABINET

REPORT OF: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO HOLDER

REPORT NO.: PLA615

DATE: 9 OCTOBER 2006

TITLE:	LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – UPDATE ON PROGRESS & REVISION TO LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME
FORWARD PLAN ITEM:	YES
DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:	17 AUGUST 2005
KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:	KEY DECISION

COUNCIL AIMS/PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:	Councillor John Smith Economic Development	
CORPORATE PRIORITY:	Town Centre Regeneration (A) Affordable Housing (A) Planning and Conservation (M)	
CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:	Minor	
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:	All LDF documents are made available on the Council's web site when published, and are made available for public inspection at the District Council's offices and the local libraries in the district	
INITIAL EQUALITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	Carried out and appended to report? No	Full impact assessment required?

BACKGROUND PAPERS:	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 PPS12: Local Development Frameworks Lincolnshire Structure Plan (Revised Deposit Draft) RSS8: Regional Spatial Strategy for the East Midlands to 2021 Letter from GOEM 11 th April 2005 Letter from PINs 13 th April 2005 Letter from DCLG 11 th August 2006 Cabinet reports and minutes dated 24 th November 2004, 7 th February 2005, 4 th April 2005, 9 th May 2005, 6 th June 2005, 5 th September 2005, 10 th October 2005, 6 th January 2006 and 3 rd April 2006
---------------------------	---

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Public consultation on the Issues and Options for Future Development in South Kesteven took place in late 2005. The Issues and Options paper was the first formal stage when the community was invited to become involved in the preparation of policies and identification of land for development for the emerging Local Development Framework (LDF). A total of 259 responses were received, and helped shape the development of preferred options for addressing key issues facing the district for the next two decades.
- 1.2 Two preferred options reports were published for public consultation on 26 June for six weeks until 7 August, the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic Development Plan Document. Approximately 250 copies of both documents were sent out to statutory consultees, a further 550 letters were posted out to parties registered on our database to inform them of the consultation exercise, documents were made available at libraries in the district and were available on request, all documentation was available on the internet, and three workshops were held for the public and agents to which a total of 60 people attended. Over 220 responses have been received during the consultation period, and the council is currently in the process of registering and inputting those responses onto a database.
- 1.3 Following completion of the preferred options consultation, the council was intending to move directly to the production and publication of the submission drafts of both the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic Development Plan Document in November 2006. In the period leading up to publication of the submission versions officers were due to meet with objectors to the preferred options to negotiate whether their issues could be addressed. However, recent events have caused this timetable to be reconsidered.
- 1.4 LDFs are a new form of planning policy documentation, brought in by the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act to replace Local Plans. The first examinations nationally of the soundness of LDF Core Strategies took place this summer, and the first two to be tested were both found to be unsound by the Planning Inspectorate. This means that these two local authorities will have to withdraw the documents and start again, effectively wasting two years of work and creating inevitable knock-on delays to all other LDF documents. Following these experiences the Department for Communities and Local

Government (DCLG) issued a letter dated 11 August 2006 (see Appendix 2) to all local authorities setting out in detail their expectations for production of LDF documents. Having assessed the Inspectors' reports and considered the letter from DCLG there are concerns that the work undertaken at the preferred options stage for the LDF for South Kesteven could also be found to be unsound at the examination, resulting in abortive work.

- 1.5 In their response to the preferred options consultation Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM) indicated that they shared the same concerns, as did the Planning Inspectorate. The council met with GOEM on 16th August to discuss their concerns and agree a way forward. The key issue of concern was based on the manner of consultation regarding the preferred options. GOEM did not feel the documents reflected the spirit of Government guidance set out in PPS12, which required a full consideration of all options, including those rejected. GOEM concluded that our documents focused too strongly on simply justifying the preferred option and did not offer a fair choice of options to consultees. They recommend that the council extend or redo consultation on preferred options.
- 1.6 Whilst the approach set out by GOEM in para. 1.5 will result in initial delays to the preparation of the LDF, it seems that this will be the most effective way to get the core LDF documents in place. The clear message from GOEM was that if we progress at the timescale indicated in para. 1.3 then we are at great risk of having our documents ruled unsound at examination or the Secretary of State issuing Directions preventing us even progressing to the examination.
- 1.7 The council were also in the process of revising their Local Development Scheme (LDS), which is the project plan and timetable for producing the LDF, to reflect earlier slippage in the timetable for producing LDF documents. Ensuring the authority meets targets in the adopted LDS is a criterion upon which Planning Delivery Grant is allocated. The council received notification in a letter from Government Office for the East Midlands dated 10 July 2006 approving the document for adoption by the council. We have not pursued adopting that version, as the LDS timetable is likely to change further based on the issues flagged up above.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That Members:

- a) **Note the work completed to date on producing the core documents of the LDF;**
- b) **Endorse the extension of the preferred options consultations for the Core Strategy and the Housing & Economic Development Plan Document; and**
- c) **Agree to the revised LDF timetable appended to this report (Appendix 1) as the basis for the revision of the Local Development Scheme.**

3. DETAILS OF REPORT

- 3.1 Two LDF preferred options reports were published by the council for public consultation on 26 June for six weeks, the Core Strategy and the Housing and Economic Development Plan Document. Over 220 responses were received from the public, developers, charities, public bodies, and other stakeholders during the consultation period. The response received from the Government Office for the East Midlands suggested that they, and the Planning Inspectorate, had concerns regarding the manner in which the options were presented for public consultation. This concern emanated from the recent experience of the first examinations nationally into LDF Core Strategies at Lichfield and Stafford. The Department for Communities and Local Government issued a letter dated 11 August 2006 to all local authorities highlighting the problems of the first two LDF examinations and setting out their expectations for the production of all other LFDs in the country.
- 3.2 The council met with GOEM on 16th August to discuss their concerns and agree a way forward. The key issue of concern for them was based on the manner of consultation regarding the preferred options. GOEM did not feel the documents reflected the spirit of Government guidance set out in PPS12, which requires a full consideration of all options, including those rejected. GOEM concluded that our documents focused too strongly on simply justifying the preferred option and did not offer a fair choice of options to consultees for them to choose from. They recommend that the council extend or redo consultation on preferred options to ensure that our documents are not ruled unsound at examination, or that the Secretary of State issues Directions preventing us even progressing to the examination.
- 3.3 One key advantage of extending the consultation on preferred options is that it will allow us to align the LDF with the emerging Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Currently the LDF has been developed based on planning policy set out in the Lincolnshire Structure Plan Review. However, the council has always been aware that the lifespan of the Structure Plan is very limited, as it will be phased out and replaced by guidance in the RSS. The council therefore asked GOEM whether during the process of producing the LDF we could change our approach to reflect new information emerging through the RSS. Their response was not encouraging, as they argued that the consultation stages of the LDF (i.e. the preferred options) are based on giving people options to choose from, and changing the approach in the latter stages of producing an LDF document (i.e. the submission draft) would effectively render the consultation process invalid.
- 3.4 The key issue for aligning the LDF for South Kesteven with the RSS centres on housing figures and length of plan period. As noted in para. 3.3 we are currently working to the Structure Plan policy, which allocates 9,200 dwellings to be built in the district for the period 2001 to 2021 at a built rate of 460 houses per annum. However, the emerging RSS will have a plan period to 2026, and it is expected that when the consultation draft is published at the end of this month our housing target will be 15,750 dwellings, at a build rate of 630 per annum – a significant increase. By extending or repeating the preferred options stage of our Core Strategy and Site Allocations documents, GOEM has indicated that we will be allowed to incorporate these emerging

figures. This will enable us to take a slightly less restrictive approach to housing allocations than was set out in the June 2006 preferred options reports. Therefore, for the sake of extending the timetable for producing the LDF by six months now, it will mean that we will be able to produce a Core Strategy and other LDF documents with a reasonable lifespan, rather than one that will be out of date and need reviewing the instant it is adopted.

- 3.5 Of the 220 responses received to the June 2006 preferred options consultation, it is estimated that 25-30% of objections (primarily from housebuilders) were centred on the housing figures issue set out in paras. 3.3. and 3.4. By extending consultation on preferred options and reflecting the housing figures and plan period set out in the emerging RSS we will therefore address those objections and should significantly reduce the amount of time it takes later in the process negotiating with those objectors, and should also significantly simplify the examination process. It is acknowledged that RSS8 will only be at the draft stage when it emerges at the end of this month and therefore there is a risk that key issues such as housing figures may change by the time of adoption of the RSS, however, the figures have been subject to extensive consultation through the "Options for Change" consultation earlier this year so already have a certain degree of weight.
- 3.6 The experience of Lichfield District Council highlighted another important point in regard to delivering the LDF for South Kesteven; which is the danger of producing other LDF documents in tandem with the Core Strategy. As the Core Strategy for Lichfield was deemed "unsound" by the Inspector following the examination, it automatically resulted in the two other LDF documents being examined being deemed unsound. This is because a local authority must have a Core Strategy adopted to inform all other LDF documents. In this instance Lichfield DC will need to start from the beginning on not only producing their Core Strategy but also their Site Allocations and Development Control Policies. As members will be aware, we were seeking to produce our Core Strategy and Site Allocations in tandem, however, based on this lesson we propose to concentrate on the Core Strategy in the first instance and set other documents back six months to avoid abortive work (see Appendix 1).
- 3.7 In reaction to comments from GOEM regarding a need to distinguish further between preferred options contained in LDF documents. It is therefore proposed that to clarify the situation the council will produce a Core Strategy, Site Allocations document and Development Control Policies document, rather than a Core Strategy and Housing & Economic DPD, which were previously proposed. This provides a clearer differentiation and hierarchy of types of policy and accords with the recommended terminology set out in PPS12 and other Government documents.
- 3.8 There is a desire to produce an LDF as quickly as possible to replace the 1995 Local Plan to provide the Development Control process with an up to date planning policy framework upon which to base decisions. However, given the information presented in this report, it is felt that the delays and expense caused by extending the preferred options consultation for the Core Strategy this winter and for the Site Allocations next spring are outweighed by the benefit of addressing Government requirements for consultation, with the longer term aspiration of producing a submission document that can be

approved and found to be sound by the Planning Inspectorate through the examination process. It is also proposed in the three year period of the Local Development Scheme to concentrate primarily on producing the core components of the LDF (Core Strategy, Site Allocations, Development Control Policies and the Proposals Map).

- 3.9 In addition to the core components of the LDF, a need has been identified to produce a further three optional LDF documents for South Kesteven during the next three years. These are Area Action Plans (AAPs) for Grantham and Stamford, and a Supplementary Planning Document for Affordable Housing. These documents have been timetabled within the next three years to reflect the council's category "A" priorities: affordable housing and town centre regeneration. The AAPs will provide more detailed policies and allocations for areas for change and conservation in Grantham and Stamford. The Grantham Area Action Plan will build upon and translate the two masterplans (for the Town Centre and the Canal Basin) into planning policy. The Stamford AAP will require more background work, as there is no current masterplanning work in preparation. It is likely that some consultancy work will be required to develop background evidence in the next six months to feed into the preferred options consultation report for the Stamford AAP. The Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document will expand upon affordable housing policy contained in the Core Strategy, using the Housing Needs Survey (March 2006), and will be prepared at the same time as the Core Strategy.
- 3.10 In order to achieve the alteration to the timetable as set out above, the council needs to review its Local Development Scheme (LDS). Meeting the targets set out in the LDS is a criterion against which the Government allocate Planning Delivery Grant (PDG) funding to local authorities. If a local authority fails to meet the targets that it has set itself then it will reduce the amount of PDG received. The council was in the process of reviewing its LDS, to reflect earlier slippage in the LDF timetable caused by vacancies in staffing, when the problems highlighted by this report emerged. The adoption by the council of this first review has therefore been deferred in order that the timetable that is set out in the LDS can be realistic to achieve. If the timetable at Appendix 1 is approved then the council will move quickly to review the LDS based on this timetable and ensure there is the best possible chance of securing PDG.

4. OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND ASSESSED

- 4.1 The alternative approach to extending consultation on the preferred options for Core Strategy and Housing and Economic DPD would be to progress on to the next stages of these documents, i.e. the submission draft consultation, and retain the timetable for production of all LDF documents as currently set out in the Local Development Scheme (April 2005).
- 4.2 As set out in Section 3 of this report, the risks with ignoring advice from the Government Office and progressing with the production of the Core Strategy and Housing and Economic DPD as originally timetabled are significant. It is therefore felt that this option should not be pursued as the Government's view on this matter is clearly set out in the DCLG letter dated 11 August 2006.

- 4.3 In addition, progressing with the LDF based on the current timetable will result in an adopted Core Strategy and Site Allocations that do not reflect the emerging Regional Plan (RSS8). The lifespan of these LDF documents will therefore be extremely limited due to the fact that key issues such as housing figures will be out of date from the moment the document is adopted.

5. COMMENTS OF SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 5.1 The approach suggested by the Team Leader for Planning Policy appears to be the most appropriate to ensure that the Council has the best opportunity of securing Planning Delivery Grant. Although when the Service Manager prepares the service plan for this service area, a realistic assessment of the likely chances of securing PDG should be made.

6. COMMENTS OF MONITORING OFFICER

- 6.1 Any delay in production of the Local Development Framework requires extended reliance on an existing out-dated local plan. It is essential to minimise that delay. This can be best done by following the government office advice as recommended.

7. COMMENTS OF OTHER RELEVANT SERVICE MANAGER

- 7.1 N/A

8. CONCLUSION/SUMMARY

- 8.1 This report sets out the current situation regarding the production of the first Local Development Framework for South Kesteven and seeks endorsement for extension to the preferred options consultation that was undertaken in summer this year on the Core Strategy and Housing & Economic DPD to ensure that concerns raised by the Government Office are addressed. Redoing consultation on the preferred options will result in an initial delay to the LDF timetable, and therefore a need to review the council's adopted Local Development Scheme based on the timetable appended to this report.

9. CONTACT OFFICER

- 9.1 Mark Harrison
Team Leader, Planning Policy
01476 406438
m.harrison@southkesteven.gov.uk

Appendix 1:
Indicative Timetable for Local Development Framework (Sept 2006)

Core Strategy

Preferred Options Consultation (6 weeks)	-	From Nov 2006
Submission Draft Consultation (6 weeks)	-	Summer 2007
Examination	-	Winter 2007
Adoption	-	Summer 2008

Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document and Proposals Map

Preferred Options Consultation (6 weeks)	-	From Sept 2007
Submission Draft Consultation (6 weeks)	-	Spring 2008
Examination	-	Autumn 2008
Adoption	-	Spring 2009

Development Control Policies Development Plan Document

Preferred Options Consultation (6 weeks)	-	From Sept 2007
Submission Draft Consultation (6 weeks)	-	Spring 2008
Examination	-	Autumn 2008
Adoption	-	Spring 2009

Grantham Area Action Plan

Preferred Options Consultation (6 weeks)	-	From Sept 2007
Submission Draft Consultation (6 weeks)	-	Summer 2008
Examination	-	Winter 2008
Adoption	-	Summer 2009

Stamford Area Action Plan

Preferred Options Consultation (6 weeks)	-	From Sept 2007
Submission Draft Consultation (6 weeks)	-	Summer 2008
Examination	-	Winter 2008
Adoption	-	Summer 2009

Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation on Draft	-	Summer 2007
Consultation on Council-approved	-	Spring 2008
Adoption	-	Summer 2008

To Chief Executive Officer
County Councils in England
District Councils in England
Unitary Authorities in England
London Borough Councils
Greater London Authority
Regional Planning Bodies
Council of the Isles of Scilly
The Town Clerk, The
City of London
National Park Officer, National
Park Authorities in England
The Chief Planning Officer,
The Broads Authority
Chief Planning Officers of local
planning authorities

John Stambollouian
Head of Planning Delivery and
Performance
Zone 4/H2
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London
SW1E 5DU

Direct line: 020 7944 8075
Direct fax: 020 7944 5004

Web site: www.DCLG.gov.uk

11 August 2006

Dear All

Letter to Chief Planning Officers following the first two DPD examinations

The Planning Inspectorate has reported on the first two examinations of the soundness of core strategies under the new LDF system. I regret to say that both these plans have been found unsound. This means that the authorities concerned will have to withdraw their core strategies and start again, with the inevitable knock-on delays to other related plans they are preparing. I am therefore writing to you to highlight the issues raised by these cases so that those authorities which are following on can seek to avoid encountering the same difficulties at the examination stage.

The first two core strategies to be examined were found unsound because they did not meet all the following criteria largely reflected in current guidance. Core strategies should:

- Set out broadly but clearly what kind of place the area will be in the future; what kind of changes will be needed to make this happen; and how this will be brought about.

- Be prepared through a process of options generation and appraisal. Options should be alternative strategic spatial options, effectively alternative scenarios for the future development of the area. These options should be consulted on. The preferred options report should set out the alternative options considered; and give clear reasons including sustainability appraisal findings for the selection of the preferred option or options and for the rejection of others. .
- Make serious spatial choices about what will happen and where in broad terms it will happen over the life of the strategy, underpinned by consultation and sustainability appraisal. This will then provide clear guidance to subsidiary DPDs and avoid a return to the old process of protracted arguments over site allocations.
- Avoid the repetition of national and regional policy but explain how these have been applied to the spatial decisions which have been made about the future development of the area
- Look to the long term and include sufficient flexibility to be able to deal with a variety of future circumstances.
- Be cross sectoral - developed with regard to (and ideally in conjunction with) the community strategy, in partnership with the Local Strategic Partnership and other parts of the Council and other key organisations and with wide community involvement.
- Not contain excessive detail.
- Be supported by relevant evidence
- Set clear goals, show how these will be delivered (including through other DPDs), and show how progress on delivery will be monitored.

The first two examinations were of core strategies. However many of these considerations apply to all kinds of DPDs.

We are working with Government Offices, the Planning Inspectorate and the Planning Advisory Service to ensure that the early lessons of the new system are disseminated quickly. Where Government Offices offer advice on the preparation of development plan documents, failure to heed that advice may result in the Secretary of State issuing Directions so as to avoid the waste of time and resource involved in examinations which lead to plans being judged unsound. PAS will be running another series of regional seminars to help local authorities in the autumn and they have developed a soundness self-assessment toolkit which is available on their website. The Inspectorate's Guide to Soundness of DPDs was published in December 2005 and remains crucial to successful examinations. In addition the Inspectorate will be publishing the lessons learned at the end of the first six months of examinations.

We want local authorities to get on quickly with making plans under the new system but they must ensure that the plans are able to meet the test of soundness. We know that there is a lot of good work going on around the country and we have no reason to believe that the majority of plans which are being prepared will not meet the requisite tests.

If you have any queries about any matters do speak to your Government Office LDF contacts. As part of their ongoing support, Government Office staff will be happy to discuss any of the issues in this letter.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'John Stambollouian', followed by a short horizontal line.

John Stambollouian