

## Wyre Local Plan Examination

### Matters, Issues and Questions

#### Statements in Response to Matter 8 Allocations Inskip (SA/13)

**Issues 2.1 Would any of the following issues in isolation or cumulatively lead to a conclusion that the allocations would not comprise sustainable development:**

**Statement: Yes**

**2.1 (i) The scale of the allocations relative to the size of the Village.**

Inskip is a small rural village, one of the smaller settlements in the Borough. Out of 25 settlements listed in Wyre, Inskip is joint 18<sup>th</sup> in population according to the 2011 census. In relation to its population, under the plan for the Inskip Extension the village would have imposed upon it the third highest housing development (33.6%) out of 25 villages. (See below, Appendix 1 – Wyre Settlements Housing Allocation Percentages).

In the last two years, Inskip has already seen an allocation of 27 properties, then a further 55 with outline planning approval (October 2016) together increasing the village core settlement by a significant 35%. The Local Plan then proposes a further 200 properties on prime agricultural land in a single field north of the existing village boundary, taking the increase to a **staggering 120%** (See below, Appendix 3 – Increases in Dwelling Numbers at Inskip ) of the 2016 level, with no such local demand or commensurate employment opportunities either in existence or anticipated.

According to the **Office for National Statistics**, the projected population growths to 2039 are as follows:

**England Average 16.5%**

**North West 8.2%**

**Wyre 6.53%**

(See below, Appendix 2 – Population Projections England, the Regions and Wyre)

A housing increase of **120%** is 'off the scale' in being beyond requirements!

WBC in their "Statement of Consultation" agree that Inskip is more than doubling its size but does not take into account Inskip Residents' views

This inappropriate scale of housing development imposed by WBC is in no way organic but represents 'a large-scale add-on extension to the village onto best local quality greenfield agricultural land north of the current settlement boundary.

The National Planning Policy Framework states in its introduction that it "sets out the Governments requirements for the Planning system only to the extent that it is **Relevant, Proportionate and necessary**".

The majority of residents in Inskip (74%) would contest the "Relevance, Proportion and Necessity" for this unacceptable and inappropriate scale of the proposed extension to the Village. This is based upon the returns from an autumn 2017 survey of the core village (available in paper form for inspection at the Inspector's Hearing).

Given that we have already, despite much objection, been obliged to accept the WBC decision to grant Planning permission for 82 new homes within our Village within the past two years, the Village is now being unwillingly forced to defend itself against a further 200 homes put into the draft WBC Local Plan, which as indicated will double the village in size.

**"This is Disproportionate Planning"** and contrary to National Guidance. Given the amount of proposed new housing in other areas of Wyre to meet the Governments housing need programme, Inskip, a small rural village, is bearing a totally unreasonable proportion of this development requirement, when no such local demand exists and appropriate work for new home owners is not locally available.

This **"Disproportionate"** proposal for new housing will put further pressure on already overburdened Traffic facilities, Services and Utilities. The WBC Local Plan purports to have made allowances for these issues, however other statements from Inskip will contradict these claims. We are aware that discussions to revise the NPPF Guidance to cover Infrastructure, Section 106 allocations and the Community Infrastructure Levy are underway but these will not be in time for incorporation into this Local Plan.

The Governments "Department for Communities and Local Government" states in its 2017 "Planning the Right homes in the Right Places" consultation proposals, that:

"The measures in this consultation will help ensure that local authorities plan for the right homes in the right places. This means creating a system that is clear and transparent so that every community and local area understands the scale of the housing challenge they face".

Nobody likes indiscriminate, unplanned and unwelcome development. But most of us are willing to accommodate new homes if they are well-designed, built in the right places, and are planned with the co-operation of the local community. To win the support of local residents, we have to build homes people want to live in as well alongside current dwellings. The proposed 200 properties are not within the current village but on prime agricultural land next to a minor road exiting the village. They are not planned in the right place i.e. where there is local demand and they have not been planned with local community involvement.

Clearly the Government wishes to build new homes in areas were the local residents support the proposals and Inskip certainly does not agree with this extra **disproportionate** increase.

There are already problems arising from the extra homes recently permitted, (sluggish take-up, stopped construction significant overrun of planned completion (25%) so allowing further development is then affecting more of this community than it is “supposedly” benefitting. This is: **Unreasonable imposition of a Plan on an existing rural community without consultation and without due consideration for its existing way of life or for that of generations to come. It represents Unsustainable Development.**

Also Stated in the Governments “Department for Communities and Local Government” in its 2017 “Planning the Right homes in the Right Places” consultation, proposals, that:

“Communities should have certainty on what level of housing they should look to plan”

Inskip feels this has been taken out of their hands and **Imposed** by WBC officers together with their Consultants, Legal Professionals, etc., all paid for by local Wyre residents, including Inskip residents affected!

WBC have devised a Local Plan showing clear **Disproportionate** preference to the Inskip Allocation allowing **one landowner** the opportunity to gain significantly from **Disproportionate** development, in a community now vehemently against any further housing in their Village.

The proposal will swamp the character of the settlement since as stated, it is inordinately large, is massively beyond any local housing need, with no suitable employment opportunities locally. It will inevitably ‘urbanise’ what was a small rural settlement to its perpetual detriment. It fails to take any credible account of the settlement’s existing character and way of life for current residents or future generations. It cuts across National Guidance by putting housing where it is **Not** needed as a result of the flawed ‘Dispersal’ Strategy for housing placement. It will leave new residents obliged to commute large distances to work sufficient to sustain their new properties.

The Plan for the Inskip Extension Represents **Unsustainable Development** and should be rejected.

### Appendices

Appendix 1 - Wyre  
Settlement Housing  
Allocations Percentages



Allocation  
Appendix 1 JF 17041

Appendix 2 – Population  
Projections England, the  
Regions and Wyre



Allocation  
Appendix 2 JF 17041

Appendix 3 – Increases in  
Dwelling Numbers at Inskip



Allocation  
Appendix 3 JF 22041

JFROST ID No 0923

APPENDIX ONE  
STATEMENT IN RESPONSE TO  
MATTER 8 ALLOCATIONS  
INSKIP SA/13

Wyre Settlements Housing Allocation Percentages

	<u>Total Number</u>	<u>Population 2011</u>	Increased housing development in relation to population %
Thornton	1582	18,941	8.4
Poulton Le Fylde	1421	17,430	8.1
Garstang	841	6,779	12.4
Fleetwood	695	25,359	2.7
Gt Eccleston	617	1,257	49.1
Catterall	567	2,336	24.3
Forton	511	1,213	42.1
Cleveleys	405	12,216	3.3
Hambleton	286	2,247	12.7
<b>Inskip</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>840</b>	<b>33.6</b>
Bowgreave	246		*
Stalmine	216		
Knott End/ Preesall	174	1,087	19.9
Barton	163	4,417	3.9
Pilling	124	1,154	14.1
Hollins Lane	113	714	17.4
Bilsborrow	23	632	3.6
St Michaels	23	629	3.7
Preesall Hill	11	5,694	0.2
Cabus	9	1,522	0.6
Scorton	4	1,012	0.4
Normoss	2	1,055	0.2
Calder Vale	0	2,148	0
Churchtown/Kirkland	0	840	0
Dolphinholme (Lower)	0	311	0
Others	300		
			3.5

\* Unable to obtain population numbers.

Elswick

1,079

Table 1. Population Projections: England and the Regions

Area	2014	2019	2024	2039	% change, number of years from 2014		
					5	10	25
North West	7,132,991	7,275,838	7,409,124	7,719,677	2.0	3.9	8.2
North East	2,618,710	2,861,050	2,700,631	2,795,865	1.6	3.1	6.8
Yorkshire and The Humber	5,360,027	5,491,391	5,608,923	5,908,106	2.5	4.6	10.2
East Midlands	4,637,413	4,798,049	4,950,206	5,338,728	3.5	6.7	15.1
West Midlands	5,713,284	5,887,867	6,052,439	6,486,090	3.1	5.9	13.5
East	6,018,383	6,288,617	6,554,334	7,237,577	4.5	8.9	20.3
London	8,538,689	9,196,512	9,707,963	10,975,551	7.7	13.7	28.5
South East	8,873,818	9,242,890	9,596,169	10,508,430	4.2	8.1	18.4
South West	5,423,303	5,624,109	5,816,497	6,311,495	3.7	7.3	16.4
England	54,316,618	56,466,323	58,396,286	63,281,519	4.0	7.5	16.5

Source Office for National Statistics

England average 16.5%

The Lancashire perspective

Table 2 has figures for both the Lancashire-12 and Lancashire-14 areas. The latter includes Blackburn with Darwen and Blackpool unitary authorities whilst the former excludes these two areas. For Lancashire-14, a 4.4% increase is projected over the 25-year period, resulting in an expected population total of 1.537 million by 2039. For Lancashire-12, the percentage increase is projected to be higher at 5.8%, with the number expected to reach 1.253 million. The estimated increases for both areas are lower than the average for the North West as a whole, and well below the expected increase for England.

Table 2. Population projections, Lancashire local authorities

Area	2014	2019	2024	2039	% change, number of years from 2014			Rank out of 326 authorities <sup>1</sup>
					5	10	25	
Burnley	87,291	87,329	87,443	87,263	0.04	0.17	-0.03	11
Chorley	111,607	117,211	122,311	131,885	5.02	9.59	18.17	214
Fylde	77,042	78,666	80,515	84,194	2.11	4.51	9.28	81
Hyndburn	80,208	79,665	79,361	78,273	-0.68	-1.06	-2.41	5
Lancaster	141,277	144,945	147,505	154,455	2.60	4.41	9.33	84
Pendle	89,840	90,623	91,257	91,700	0.87	1.58	2.07	15
Ribble Valley	58,091	58,865	59,794	61,331	1.11	1.49	3.66	26
Rosendale	69,168	70,705	72,257	74,907	1.33	2.93	5.58	41
South Ribble	109,077	109,854	110,958	112,687	0.71	1.72	3.31	22
West Lancashire	111,940	112,944	113,855	116,381	0.90	1.71	3.97	31
Wyre	108,742	110,258	112,154	115,838	1.39	3.14	6.53	52
Lancashire-12	1,184,735	1,203,070	1,219,958	1,254,503	1.55	2.97	5.89	
Blackburn with Darwen	146,743	146,162	145,675	144,045	-0.40	-0.73	-1.84	6
Blackpool	140,501	139,300	138,885	139,847	-0.86	-1.15	-0.47	8
Lancashire-14	1,471,979	1,488,531	1,504,518	1,538,395	1.12	2.21	4.51	

Source Office for National Statistics

<sup>1</sup> Where the authority ranked 326 had the highest projected rate of population increase. A small number of authorities occupying the lowest ranks are expected to record decrease in their population totals.

Effect of the increases in dwellings (approved and proposed) over the last 2 years

Appendix 3

Initial No of Core Dwellings as per Parish Council	1st Extension Dwellings	Total Dwellings	% increase over base	2nd Extension Dwellings	Total Dwellings	% Increase	Cumulative% increase over base	Proposed Extension	Total Dwellings	% Increase	Cumulative% increase over base
236	27	263	11.4%	55	318	20.9%	34.7%	200	518	62.9%	119.7%