

Appendix 15: Reasons for Selecting and Rejecting Gypsy, Traveller and travelling Show People Sites.

Site ref.	Site name	Site Area(Ha)	Site Capacity (Pitches/Plots)	Allocated ?	Key Considerations	The Balance of Factors and Overall Conclusions
SITES FOR GYPSIES, TRAVELLERS AND TRAVELLING SHOWPEOPLE						
Travelling Showpeople						
N/A	Land at The Stables, Baulkins Drove, Sutton St James	0.23	1	Yes	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, scoring positively against 4, and negatively against 5 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Education; and Flood Risk). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 1 additional Travelling Showperson's plot identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site is available for immediate development; the site is within Flood Zone 3a, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, public house, place of worship, community hall, children's play area, and playing field) are available in Sutton St James (within 1 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – it is surrounded by a tall evergreen hedge and is well assimilated into its immediate environs and the wider landscape; the site's development will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of the occupants of the several nearby residential properties or adjoining land users; and the Highway Authority indicates that the site's development would not have any materially harmful impact upon the capacity or safety of Baulkins Drove. 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Travelling Showpeople. This site is the only option which has been put forward for consideration as a Proposed Residential Travelling Showperson's Site, and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it is available for immediate development; it is the sequentially preferable option in terms of flood risk (it is the only option and (although it is located within Flood Zone 3a) the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); it offers excellent accessibility to services and facilities; its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable; its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable; and it will not prejudice highway safety. <p>Consequently, the site has been allocated as a Proposed Residential Travelling Showperson's Site.</p>
Gypsies and Travellers						
Don011	Land to the north of Northorpe Road, Donington	0.48	2/3	No	<p>The site performs very poorly against the SA objectives, scoring positively against 2, and negatively against 5 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet most of the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); it has not been possible to contact the site's owner, and its availability for development is therefore uncertain; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); this site offers good accessibility to services and facilities; its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • an excellent range of facilities (post office, general store, cashpoint, bank/building society, primary school, secondary school public house, place of worship, community hall, library, children’s play area, and playing field) are available in Donington (within 1.6 km); • the site’s development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is currently visually exposed to the north and south and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; • the site’s development will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of neighbours, although there are existing residential properties to the site’s south, west and east (with the closest within 5m); and • the Highway Authority indicates that “the site is a little way out of the settlement of Northorpe and on a fairly narrow road that has no footways. However, this road is very lightly trafficked, save perhaps for agricultural vehicles, so the suggested 2 or 3 pitches would not be expected to have any major impact upon the capacity of the road and it would be reasonably safe to walk along the carriageway between the site and the end of the footway network in Northorpe.” 	<p>(subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its impacts on neighbours’ amenities will be acceptable; and • it will not prejudice highway safety. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it has not been possible to contact the site’s owner, and its availability for development is therefore uncertain. If it were to be allocated, there would be no certainty that it would be released for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site; and • the site performs very poorly against the SA objectives. <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Don013	Land to the south-east of Caythorpe Road, Donington	0.80	4	No	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, scoring positively against 2, and negatively against 3 (objectives relating to: Transport; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); • it has not been possible to contact the site’s owner, and its availability for development is therefore uncertain; • the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as ‘no hazard’, and flood depth as ‘no depth’; • an excellent range of facilities (post office, general store, cashpoint, bank/building society, primary school, secondary school public house, place of worship, community hall, library, children’s play area, and playing field) are available in Donington (within 1 km); • the site’s development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is currently visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); • this site offers excellent accessibility to services and facilities; • its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); • its impacts on neighbours’ amenities will be acceptable; • it will not prejudice highway safety; and • it performs moderately against the SA objectives. <p>However, it has not been possible to contact the site’s owner, and its availability for development is therefore uncertain. If it were to be allocated, there would be no</p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site's development will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of neighbours – the site is surrounded on all sides by agricultural land, and there are no immediately-adjointing residential properties; and the Highway Authority indicates that “if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. This is a single track road but the site is within a conveniently short distance of a two-way road. The frontage is very open and there would be adequate visibility of any other vehicles coming along the road. There is no footway at the frontage but the site is within a conveniently short distance of the village footway network.” 	<p>certainty that it would be released for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site. Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Don019	Land to the east of Quadring Road, Donington	0.53	2/3	No	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, scoring positively against 2, and negatively against 3 (objectives relating to: Transport; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet most of the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site's owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; an excellent range of facilities (post office, general store, cashpoint, bank/building society, primary school, secondary school public house, place of worship, community hall, library, children's play area, and playing field) are available in Donington (within 1.4 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is currently visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; the site's development will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of neighbours, although there are existing residential properties to the site's south and west (the closest within 15m); and the Highway Authority indicates that “the site is a little way out of the village but it is served by an A class road that has footways linking back to the village that could provide safe pedestrian access. The numbers of turning movements off and onto Quadring Road associated with the proposed two or three pitches would not be great but, if this were to be seen as an issue, it might be possible to form an access into the site a little way along Washdyke 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); this site offers good accessibility to services and facilities; its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable; it will not prejudice highway safety; and it performs moderately against the SA objectives. <p>However, the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site. Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>

					Lane. The site would have suitable visibility for safe access.”	
N/A	Roper’s Gate, Gedney	0.71	10	No	<p>The site performs very poorly against the SA objectives, scoring positively against 3, negatively against 4 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste), and with a major negative effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site is available for immediate development; the site is within Flood Zone 3a, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as ‘danger for most’, and flood depth as ‘0.5m-1.0m’; an excellent range of facilities (post office, shops, cashpoint, bank/building society, primary school, secondary school, childcare provision, GP, dentist, public house, place of worship, community hall, library, children’s play area, and playing field) is available in Long Sutton (within 3.6 km); the site’s development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is currently visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; although the site is largely surrounded by agricultural land, there are five dwellings within 200m but (with sensitive layout and landscaping) it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that “subject to the vehicle access crossings of the frontage drain being made up to the appropriate standard, the site’s development should be possible without any materially harmful impact .” 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is available for immediate development; its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); its impacts on neighbours’ amenities will be acceptable; and it will not prejudice highway safety. <p>However, this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is not a sequentially preferable option in terms of flood risk (other options are within Flood Zones 1 or 2 and are exposed to lesser flood hazard and depth). Indeed, Planning Practice Guidance indicates that caravans which will be permanently occupied should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3; offers poor accessibility to services and facilities; and performs very poorly against the SA objectives. <p>Given the three negative factors identified above (in particular the fact that Planning Practice Guidance indicates that caravans which will be permanently occupied should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3), this site is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Gos004	Land to the south-east of Churchfleet Lane, Gosberton	0.80	4	No	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 1 further objective, and negatively against 4 (objectives relating to: Transport; Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site’s owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, GP, dentist, public house, place of worship, community hall, childrens play area, and playing field) is available in Gosberton (within 1 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is currently visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; the site's development will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of neighbours – it is surrounded on all sides by agricultural land or highway, and there are no existing dwellings closer than 80m; and the Highway Authority indicates that "if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. However, this site is too far along a single-track road with no footways to be safe for vehicular or pedestrian movements." 	<p>(subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it offers excellent accessibility to services and facilities; its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable; and it performs moderately against the SA objectives. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site; and the site's development would prejudice highway safety. <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site</p>
Mou008	Land to the south-east of Fold Lane, Moulton	0.81	4	No	<p>The site performs poorly against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 1 further objective, and negatively against 5 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); it has not been possible to contact the site's owner, and its availability for development is therefore uncertain; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, GP, public house, place of worship, community hall, and playing field) is available in Moulton (within 1.3 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is currently visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; the site's development will not have a significant adverse 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); it offers good accessibility to services and facilities; and its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it has not been possible to contact the site's owner, and its availability for development is therefore uncertain. If it were to be allocated, there would be no certainty that it would be released for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site;

					<p>effect on the amenities of neighbours – it is surrounded on all sides by agricultural land or highway, and there are no existing dwellings closer than 50m; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Highway Authority indicates that “if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. However, although the site is served from a good road where there is good visibility, the road carries quite a high volume of traffic to and from the A17 and there are no footways for safe pedestrian access.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> it performs poorly against the SA objectives; and the site’s development would prejudice highway safety. <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Mou016	Land to the south-east of Broad Lane, Moulton	0.81	4	No	<p>The site performs well against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 3 further objectives, and negatively against 3 (objectives relating to: Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site’s owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as ‘no hazard’, and flood depth as ‘no depth’; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, GP, public house, place of worship, community hall, and playing field) is available in Moulton (within 1km); the site’s development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – although the neighbouring residential curtilages and existing trees and shrubs screen the site to some extent, it is largely visually exposed. As a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; although the site is abutted on two sides by agricultural land, there are existing dwellings on the remaining two sides (one within 5m and one within 25m). Nonetheless, it is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that “if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. This site is served from a good road with good visibility and has a footway to provide safe pedestrian access.” 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); it performs well against the SA objectives; it offers excellent accessibility to services and facilities; it will not prejudice highway safety; and its impacts on neighbours’ amenities will be acceptable. <p>However, the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site. Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Mou022	Land to the south-east of Broad Lane, Moulton	0.86	4	No	<p>The site performs well against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 3 further objectives, and negatively</p>	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the</p>

					<p>against 3 (objectives relating to: Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the landowners have indicated that, unless the site would be purchased for more than £1,000,000, they would strongly object to it being allocated as a Gypsy/Traveller site due to the potential devaluation of their other property assets in the locality; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, GP, public house, place of worship, community hall, and playing field) is available in Moulton (within 1km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – there are trees on the site's highway frontage, and an existing bungalow to the north, but the site is largely visually exposed. As a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; although the site is surrounded on most sides by agricultural land, there is one adjoining dwellings within 5m. Nonetheless, it is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that "if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. This site is served from a good road with good visibility and has a footway to provide safe pedestrian access." 	<p>most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); it performs well against the SA objectives; it offers excellent accessibility to services and facilities; it will not prejudice highway safety; and its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable. <p>However, the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site. Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Mou021	Land to the east of Fen Gate, Moulton Chapel	0.41	2	No	<p>The site performs very poorly against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 1 further objective, and negatively against 6 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet some of the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site's owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary

					<p>flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth';</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, public house, place of worship, community hall, children's play area, and playing field) is available in Moulton Chapel (within 1.8 km); • the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is currently visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; • although the site is largely surrounded by agricultural land or buildings, there is one existing residential property to the site's west, within 35m. Nonetheless, it is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and • the Highway Authority indicates that "the site is served from a suitable road to provide safe vehicular access, but there are no footways to provide safe pedestrian access." 	<p>treatment/landscaping);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it offers moderate accessibility to services and facilities; and • its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site; • the site performs very poorly against the SA objectives; and • the site's development would prejudice highway safety. <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Mou024	Land to the east of Fen Gate, Moulton Chapel	0.27	1/2	No	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 2 further objectives, and negatively against 5 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Education; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site would meet part of the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); • the site's owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; • the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; • a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, public house, place of worship, community hall, children's play area, and playing field) is available in Moulton Chapel (within 1.7 km); • the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – although there are existing trees on the site's southern boundary, it is largely visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; • the site is surrounded by agricultural land to the east and south, with residential properties to the north and west (the closest within 15m) and agricultural buildings to the north. 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); • the site performs moderately against the SA objectives; • its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); • it offers moderate accessibility to services and facilities; and • its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site; and • the site's development would prejudice highway safety. <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>

					<p>Nonetheless, it is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Highway Authority indicates that “the site is served from a suitable road to provide safe vehicular access, but there are no footways to provide safe pedestrian access.” 	
Mou019	Land to the east of Eaugate Road, Moulton Chapel	0.89	4	No	<p>The site performs very poorly against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 1 further objective, and negatively against 6 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site’s owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as ‘no hazard’, and flood depth as ‘no depth’; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, public house, place of worship, community hall, children’s play area, and playing field) is available in Moulton Chapel (within 1.5 km); the site’s development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – although there are mature trees to its south, the site is largely visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; the site is abutted to the north and east by arable land and to the south by pasture land containing mature trees. On the opposite side of Eaugate Road, there are dwellings (the closest within 35m). Nonetheless, it is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that “if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. This site is served from a good road with good visibility and pedestrian access.” 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); the site’s development would not prejudice highway safety. it offers good accessibility to services and facilities; and its impacts on neighbours’ amenities will be acceptable. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site; and the site performs very poorly against the SA objectives. <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Mou039	Land to the north of East Cob Gate, Moulton	0.30	1/2	No	<p>The site performs well against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 3 further objectives, and negatively against 3 (objectives relating to: Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p>	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet part of the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site's owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, public house, place of worship, community hall, and playing field) is available in Moulton (within 1 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – it is currently visually exposed to the north and south and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; there are existing residential properties to the site's south and west, with the closest within 8m. Nonetheless, it is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that "the site is a little way out of the village but it is adjacent to some existing local authority provided houses, East Cobgate is a suitable road to provide vehicular access. The visibility here is good. There is also a footway linking the site with the village to provide safe pedestrian access." 	<p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); the site's development would not prejudice highway safety; the site performs well against the SA objectives; it offers excellent accessibility to services and facilities; and its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable. <p>However, the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site. Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Mou043	Land to the north of Roman Bank, Moulton Chapel	0.82	4	No	<p>The site performs very poorly against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 1 further objective, and negatively against 6 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site's owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, public house, place of worship, community hall, children's play area, and playing field) is available in Moulton Chapel (within 1.5 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – it is currently visually 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); the site's development would not prejudice highway safety; it offers good accessibility to services and facilities; and its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable.

					<p>exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is surrounded by agricultural land on all sides, with the nearest dwelling more than 50m distant. It is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that “if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. However, although this site is served from a good road with good visibility, the Highway Authority could not support its allocation because there is no footway.” 	<p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site; and the site performs very poorly against the SA objectives. <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Wha013	Land to the north of Drove Road, Shepeau Stow	0.80	4	No	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 2 further objectives, and negatively against 5 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Education; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site’s owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is located partly within Flood Zone 1 and partly within Flood Zone 2, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as ‘no hazard’, and flood depth as ‘no depth’; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, public house, place of worship, community hall, and playing field) is available in Gedney Hill (within 3 km); the site’s development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – it is currently visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; the site is surrounded by agricultural land or highway on all sides, and there are no dwellings closer than 75m. It is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that “if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. However, although this site is served from a good road with good visibility, there is no footway and narrow verges so pedestrian access would be unsafe.” 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); the site performs moderately against the SA objectives; and its impacts on neighbours’ amenities will be acceptable. <p>Although this site is not a sequentially preferable option in terms of flood risk (other options are entirely within Flood Zone 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> none of the sequentially preferable options are available for development; the SFRA identifies that this site is exposed to ‘no hazard’, and ‘no depth’; and Planning Practice Guidance indicates that caravans which will be permanently occupied may be permitted in Flood Zone 2 provided the sequential and exceptions tests have been passed. <p>However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site; it offers moderate accessibility to services and facilities; and the site’s development would prejudice highway safety. <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation</p>

N/A	Drain Bank North, Spalding	0.86	4	No	<p>The site performs very poorly against the SA objectives, scoring positively against 2, negatively against 5 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste), and with a major negative effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); although the majority of the site is available for immediate development, the intentions of the owner of part of the site are unknown; the site is within Flood Zone 3a, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'danger for some', and flood depth as '0.25m-0.5m'; a full range of facilities is available in Spalding (within 2 to 3 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is currently visually exposed and, as a consequence, its development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time; the site is surrounded by agricultural land, sports pitches and existing Gypsy/Traveller pitches. It is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that the site's development would be acceptable, provided it shared the access that has already been provided into the existing Gypsy/Traveller site. Any new access would require further highway improvement works to Darin Bank North. 	<p>as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p> <p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable (subject to appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping); it offers moderate accessibility to services and facilities; its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable; and it will not prejudice highway safety. <p>However, this site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is not a sequentially preferable option in terms of flood risk (other options are within Flood Zones 1 or 2 and are exposed to lesser flood hazard and depth). Indeed, Planning Practice Guidance indicates that caravans which will be permanently occupied should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3; is not known to be available for development in its entirety. If it were to be allocated, there would be no certainty that it would all be released for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site; and performs very poorly against the SA objectives. <p>Given the three negative factors identified above (in particular the fact that Planning Practice Guidance indicates that caravans which will be permanently occupied should not be permitted in Flood Zone 3), this site is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
Sur002	Land to the east of the B1356, Surfleet	0.85	4	No	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 2 further objectives, negatively against 5 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Education; Air, Soil and water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste), and with a major negative effect against 1 (the objective relating to Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green Infrastructure). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth);

					<p>Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site's owner indicates that the land is subject to a tenancy, and that they therefore would not be prepared to release it for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is located within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; a good range of facilities (general store, primary school, public house, place of worship, community hall, children's play area, and playing field) is available in Surfleet (within 1.3 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – it is very well screened from the highway by existing trees and shrubs; the site is abutted to the south and east by agricultural land, but there are existing dwellings to the north and west (the closest within 15 m). Nonetheless, it is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; the Highway Authority indicates that "if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. This site is served from a good road with good visibility, and a footway for safe pedestrian access."; and land immediately to the site's south is designated as a SSSI, the interest of which is vulnerable to changes to local drainage or increased recreational use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site performs moderately against the SA objectives. its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable; the site's development would not prejudice highway safety; it offers good accessibility to services and facilities; and its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable. <p>However, the site is not available for development, and it must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site.</p> <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the site's development may adversely affect an area of importance to nature conservation.</p>
Wha038	Land to the north of Cob Gate, Whaplode	0.85	4	No	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, with a major positive effect against 1 (the objective relating to Flood Risk), scoring positively against 1 further objective, and negatively against 4 (objectives relating to: Transport; Education; Air, Soil and Water Resources; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site's owner indicates that they do not wish to release their land for development as a Gypsy/Traveller site; the site is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as 'no hazard', and flood depth as 'no depth'; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, place of worship, community hall, children's play area, and playing field) is available in Whaplode (within 1.4 km); the site's development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is visually exposed on all sides but the west and, as a consequence, its 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>In its favour:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> this site is one of the most sequentially preferable options in terms of flood risk (it is within Flood Zone 1, and the SFRA identifies that it is exposed to no flood hazard or depth); the site performs moderately against the SA objectives; its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable; the site's development would not prejudice highway safety; it offers good accessibility to services and facilities; and its impacts on neighbours' amenities will be acceptable. <p>However, the site is not available for development, and it</p>

					<p>development would not immediately be assimilated into the wider landscape. However, it is considered that appropriate boundary treatment/landscaping could address this issue in time;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site is abutted to the north and east by agricultural land, and there are existing dwellings to the west and south (the closest within 10m). Nonetheless, it is considered that it could be developed without significant adverse effects on the amenities of neighbours; and the Highway Authority indicates that “if the need is to provide pitches for just four family groups, then the daily number of vehicle movements would be relatively low. This site is served from a good road with good visibility and a footway to provide pedestrian access”. 	<p>must therefore be classified as an undevelopable site</p> <p>Consequently, it is an inappropriate candidate for allocation as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
N/A	Land at Bleu Raye Farm, Mill Gate, Whaplode Fen			Yes	<p>The site performs moderately against the SA objectives, scoring positively against 4 objectives, and negatively against 5 (objectives relating to: Health and Wellbeing; Transport; Socially Inclusive Communities; Education; and Sustainable Use of Land and Waste). The following key considerations also need to be taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the site would meet the need for 4 additional Gypsy/Traveller pitches in South Holland identified in the Boston and South Holland GTAA (November 2016); the site is available for immediate development; the site is located partly within Flood Zone 1 and partly within Flood Zone 2, and the SFRA identifies flood hazard in 2115 as ‘danger for most’, and flood depth as ‘0.5m-1.0m’; a good range of facilities (post office, general store, primary school, place of worship, community hall, children’s play area, and playing field) is available in Whaplode (within 3.6 km); the site’s development will not have major adverse impacts on the surrounding landscape – the site is screened from view from the south, west and east by trees and hedging. From the north, only partial and distant views are available. It is considered that the site is capable of being assimilated into its immediate environs and the wider landscape; the site’s development will not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of neighbours - although it is predominantly surrounded by agricultural land, there are two nearby dwellings (the closest within 35m); and the Highway Authority indicates that the development of the site to accommodate four Gypsy/Traveller households should be possible without creating any materially harmful impact upon the local highway network. 	<p>Site availability, flood risk, accessibility to services and facilities, townscape/landscape impacts, impacts on neighbours, and highway safety are considered to be the most important concerns in identifying sites for Gypsies and Travellers.</p> <p>This site has two negative factors</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> it is not a sequentially preferable option in terms of flood risk (other options are entirely within Flood Zone 1), but: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> none of the sequentially preferable options are available for development; the SFRA identifies that this site is exposed to ‘no hazard’, and ‘no depth’; and Planning Practice Guidance indicates that caravans which will be permanently occupied may be permitted in Flood Zone 2 provided the sequential and exceptions tests have been passed; and it offers poor accessibility to services and facilities. <p>However,:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it scores moderately against the SA objectives; it is available for immediate development; its landscape/townscape impacts will be acceptable; its impacts on neighbours’ amenities will be acceptable; and it will not prejudice highway safety. <p>Consequently, the site has been allocated as a Proposed Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.</p>
N/A	Cranesgate North/Hurdletree Bank, Whaplode St			No	<p>Full planning permission (H23-0440-17) was granted on 22nd January 2018 for the use of this land for the siting of a caravan.</p>	<p>This site has not been allocated because full planning permission (H23-0440-17) is outstanding for its use for the siting of a caravan. It has, however, been identified as an</p>

	Catherines					Existing Residential Gypsy/Traveller Site.
--	------------	--	--	--	--	--