

Post Title: 11: Bicker

Response Number	228	Respondent Number:	2057	Comment Author:	Mr & Mrs R Collison	Client		Web Link		
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:			
Policy Number:		Map Number:		Regarding the proposed housing site (Bic 015) we must make clear the fact that the driveway leading to this field is the ONLY ACCESS for the owner of the land to bring in his large agricultural equipment. The size of today's tractors, combine harvesters, potato harvesters etc must be taken into consideration when planning the siting of the houses on this small estate because this would mean very large vehicles using the same road as the residents. Also has the following point been taken into account? There is a cess pit sited just to the rear right of the plot of land marked Bic 015. In the past, when the question of housing arose this was considered a stumbling point due to the pollution aspect and the cost of removing the pit.	It is not considered that the need to maintain vehicular access to agricultural land behind Bic015 makes the site unsuitable for development. Focus Consultants (on behalf of the site's owners) indicate that "the proposed development shall be accessed and egressed via a road constructed to an adoptable specification. This road shall run through the proposed development to the rear of the site where an access will be maintained to the remainder of the arable field beyond. The nature of specification and layout of the road will be more than sufficient to take agricultural traffic, with the frequency of use being very low. It is our client's intention that eventually the field to the rear will become grazing for livestock and therefore, omitting the need for large agricultural vehicles"		No change to the Local Plan is required.			
Site Allocation Number:	Bic015	Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is								Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>							
Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>							
		Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>							
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:										
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:										
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>									
Why wish to participate										

Post Title: 11: Bicker

Response Number: 310 Respondent Number: 1829 Comment Author: Grace Machin Planning & Property Client: Mrs J Hemmant Web Link:

Paragraph Number: Table/Figure: Comment Content: Officer Comment: Officer Recommendation:

Policy Number: Map Number: 11 With the above in mind, we currently do not believe that the South East Lincolnshire Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan can be considered sound, on the basis that the proposed residential allocations for Bicker fail each of the tests of soundness, as set out within Paragraph 82 of the NPPF. In order to become sound, we submit that additional land should be allocated for residential development within Bicker, which is achievable, suitable and deliverable in the short term, thereby meeting the objectively assessed housing needs of this settlement. Specifically, unless the Council identifies suitable sites within or adjoining Bicker, sufficient to accommodate the full quantum of housing need for this settlement, then it will be failing to provide a Local Plan which is positively prepared, effective or consistent with national policy most particularly Paragraph 14 of the NPPF and the overarching need to boost significantly the supply of housing.

Site Allocation Number: Bic004

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Consistent with national policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY We have been instructed to make the following representations in respect of the South East Lincolnshire Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan, which is currently being consulted upon, prior to submission for Examination. These representations have been prepared having regard to the documents contained within the supporting Evidence Library and have assessed the compliance of the Draft Local Plan against paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)(NPPF). Paragraph 182 states that for a plan to be "sound" it should be: * Positively prepared * Justified * Effective * Consistent with national policy These representations largely mirror those which were submitted in response to the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan: Preferred Sites for Development Consultation, August 2016 and my clients fundamental position in respect of which sites represent the most suitable for residential allocation has not changed since the previous round of consultation. On this basis, we remain of the view that my client's landholding, comprising Q productive agricultural land to the east of Donington Road, Bicker (previously identified as Site Reference BIC004) represents a suitable and deliverable Site, which should be allocated for residential development, thereby assisting to meet housing need within Boston Borough, within a sustainable and accessible location. In order to

SITE DESCRIPTION - It is agreed that site Bic004 is suitable, available and achievable, and that it has many of the other positive attributes described by the objector. This is reflected in the fact that it was put forward as a 'Potential Housing Site' in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Public Consultation (including site options for development) January 2016. Thus, it is not disputed that site Bic004 would, in absolute terms, make an acceptable housing site. However, in comparative terms, site Bic004 was not considered to be one of the more suitable sites in Bicker put forward as options in the January 2016 Draft for Public Consultation. Specifically, site Bic004 scores relatively poorly in the Sustainability Appraisal, and the visual impacts of its development are considered to be greater than for other options.

COMPARABLE SITE ANALYSIS - Although the objector is correct that there are issues to be overcome before the three Housing Allocations in Bicker can be delivered, it is not accepted that these issues are sufficiently severe to prevent or significantly delay their development.

HOUSING NUMBERS - The objector is incorrect in their assertion that the Plan's housing provisions for Bicker result in an 11 dwelling shortfall. The trajectory at the end of the 'Housing Paper – Bicker (January 2017)' identifies that the three Housing Allocations together with three other developable SHLAA sites are assumed to deliver 46 dwellings (4 short of the 'target'). However, the Plan's assumptions on site capacities are conservative (assuming 20/hectare) and, in practice, it is likely that the Plan's provisions for Bicker will deliver at least 50 dwellings, given that densities are likely to exceed this assumption. Even if completions in Bicker do not meet 50, it is not agreed that a potential under-provision of 4 dwellings would compromise the Local Plan's strategy, nor conflict with national planning policy – the Plan's overall housing provisions comfortably meet the objectively assessed housing needs.

No change to the Local Plan is required.

Post Title: 11: Bicker

fully meet the current and future housing needs for Bicker, (and the wider Borough of Boston), we believe that Site Reference BIC004 should be allocated for residential purposes in addition to the Sites already identified, in order to ensure the full delivery of housing requirements for this settlement.

SITE DESCRIPTION The Site comprises an area of grassland, located to the east of the Minor Service Centre of Bicker, and situated between Donington Road and the A52 further to the east. The landholding is not currently in active agricultural use and is a discrete parcel of land, which is visually and physically well related to the settlement of Bicker. The Site is accessible to the range of facilities and services within the village, including the primary school, post office and shop, public house, village hall, churches and Bicker Bowls Club. In addition, the Site is within ready walking distance of bus stops located on Donington Road itself (within 300 metres) and at the junction of Donington Road with the A52. These bus services provide regular access to the larger towns within the Borough, including Boston and Spalding and across the rural area.

COMPARABLE SITE ANALYSIS The Site has been assessed within the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment published in April 2017 and has also been considered through the earlier Housing Papers and the Preferred Sites for Development Consultation. We believe that the Site represents the most suitable, achievable and deliverable Site identified at Bicker and as such, should be allocated for residential development for the following key reasons: - The SHLAA analysis identifies the fact that the Site is immediately available and suitable for development, with no impediments or technical constraints to its delivery. - This is in stark contrast to the other potential Sites proposed for allocation within or adjoining Bicker as follows: Site BIC005 This Site has been in employment /commercial use and its proposed use for residential development will require Site clearance and a contaminated land assessment. This could lead to potentially expensive and lengthy site de-contamination,

Post Title: 11: Bicker

which could render the development of the Site unviable. In any event the abnormal costs associated with Site clearance and decontamination could well lead to a reduction in the offer of community benefits, including affordable housing or financial contributions to community facilities and services. Site BIC015 This Site is in active agricultural use. Utilising Grade 1 Agricultural. The SHLAA assessment of this Site identifies two known constraints to its early development firstly, the need to upgrade the water supply network to accommodate the proposed development and secondly, the requirement to realign the edge of the carriageway to allow for adequate visibility onto Drury Lane. Both of these requirements may be time consuming and result in significant delays in housing delivery. In addition, the need to realign the carriageway appears to require the agreement of a third party land owner and there appears to be no guarantees that such agreement will be forthcoming. Whilst not mentioned in the Site Assessment contained within the SHLAA, it is clear that Site BIC015 would form backland development, which would extend the built form into open countryside, beyond the logical framework of the village. Such a development would appear incongruous and out of keeping with the character and form of the settlement and would appear visually intrusive. Site BIC017 This Site is also in active agricultural use. Also utilising Grade 1 Agricultural Land. The SHLAA assessment of this Site identifies the fact that an upgrade to the existing sewerage system would be required to facilitate its development. Such work may be time consuming and result in a delay to the delivery of housing numbers from this Site. With the above analysis in mind, it is clear that my client's landholding at Site Reference BIC004 offers an opportunity to deliver housing numbers in the short term, to meet an immediate and identified shortfall in delivery. A significant amount of work has been undertaken to demonstrate how the Site could be developed, including up to 23 no. Dwellings across two phases and incorporating a mix of 2, 3 and 4 bedroom homes. The Masterplan enclosed indicates the provision of on-site open space, structural landscaping and a

Post Title: 11: Bicker

suitable access point onto Donington Road. Given the identified constraints associated with the three alternative Sites identified within or adjoining Bicker, as set out above, we question whether these Sites offer the immediately deliverable land required to provide the housing numbers for the village. For this reason, we would urge the allocation of Site Reference BIC004 for residential development.

HOUSING NUMBERS The South East Lincolnshire Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan identifies through Policy 10 the need to deliver 7,550 no. Dwellings within Boston Borough across the plan period (2011-2036), which equates to an annual requirement of 300 no. Dwellings. Policy 11 provides a proposed breakdown of this overall requirement, with the dwelling numbers distributed between the settlements, based upon their hierarchy in the spatial strategy. Bicker is identified within Policy 11 as a Minor Service Centre, within which it is anticipated that 50 no. Dwellings will be provided across the plan period. The three Sites currently proposed as residential allocations within Bicker (and assessed above in paragraph 7) are considered to have the potential to deliver approximately 38 no. Dwellings in total, whilst one dwelling is already approved within the village. Clearly, this leaves a shortfall of at least 11 no. Dwellings, for which suitable, deliverable land has not been allocated. Given the requirements of the NPPF, which specifically requires Local Planning Authorities, when plan-making to positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and to ensure that Local Plans "should meet objectively assessed needs" (Paragraph 14) we consider that the Council is failing in its statutory duty, if insufficient land is allocated, thereby failing to meet the identified needs of Bicker.

CONCLUSIONS Bicker is classified as a Minor Service Centre and as a sustainable settlement identified for future growth. We support a MINIMUM allocation of 50 no dwellings for this settlement and encourage the allocation of sufficient land to deliver this full requirement

Post Title: 11: Bicker

during the plan period. My client's landholding (Site Reference BICOO4) offers the potential to deliver up to 23 no. Dwellings on non-productive agricultural land, as depicted on the enclosed Masterplan. This Site is immediately adjoining the main built up area of Bicker and is readily accessible to the range of facilities and services within this settlement, as well as to the public transport network. The indicative Masterplan assists in demonstrating how the development of this Site can be accessed via Donington Road, and how the scheme can accommodate public open space and structural landscaping. The Council's own SHLAA assessment of Site BICOO4 demonstrates that this landholding can accommodate a residential development, and is suitable, achievable and deliverable in the short term, with no technical constraints or potential delays to bringing the development forward. In contrast, the other Sites being advanced for residential allocation within or adjoining Bicker have potential issues to overcome, which could lead to delays or lack of delivery, thereby hindering the supply of housing in the short term. In order to ensure that the South East Lincolnshire Submission Draft Local Plan is considered sound at Examination, we believe that sufficient land must be allocated at Bicker to accommodate the objectively assessed housing needs of this settlement. For these reasons, we urge the Council to allocate Site Reference BICOO4 for residential development.



Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

To question why sufficient sites are not being allocated in Bicker to accommodate the objectively assessed housing needs of this settlement.

Post Title: 11: Bicker

Response Number	359	Respondent Number:	2763	Comment Author:	Mr and Mrs Dawson	Client		Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	-------------------	--------	--	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:		Map Number:	11
Site Allocation Number:	Bic014		

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

Positively Prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>
Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:	
--	--

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:	
--	--

Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	--------------------------

Why wish to participate	
-------------------------	--

I am writing to let you know that we will definitely be applying for Planning Consent for a housing development on the above site Number 014 in Bicker. We know that Bicker has been marked to have around 50 new homes. We realise that the current project for the next few years is moving forward and we want you to be aware of our intentions, which we feel should be factored in when making decisions on other sites. Our site has some issues that were highlighted in the first round of potential development sites. We have addressed the issues below. 1. Provisions for a footpath:- There is potential to join the existing footpath; which runs along Gauntlet Road to the Village Shop and Post Office, if the path was extended along the allotments frontage it would join up with the frontage of our site. There is plenty of room to have a footpath If soil was removed from the frontage of our site, creating a footpath level to the road with the possibility of being set back. 2. The need for road markings for the entrance to the site:- our frontage along Gauntlet Road is long and wide, an entrance could be set back and/or be wide. There is a possibility of the entrance to the site being further along Gauntlet Road as we own much of the frontage. We hope that these issues will be resolved, we are seeking advise from a Planning Consultant who will be in touch with the appropriate department. If planning was granted we would like the site to have a mix of styles of homes e.g bungalows, family houses and terraces in a traditional style with adequate space for a community green area. There is an existing green lane running along the west and south boundary, which opens on to the Gauntlet road, which is part of our site. This green lane could be left and could be used by the new residents for leisure pursuits e.g dog walking. We are keen to develop the site as an attractive village type setting echoing our pretty village we have here in Bicker.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (April 2017) (SHLAA) classifies site Bic014 as 'developable', and it was identified as a 'Potential Housing Site' in the January 2016 Draft for Public Consultation of the Local Plan. However, the site was not considered to be one of the more suitable Potential Housing Sites in Bicker, because: the Sustainability Appraisal gave it the second-worst score of the Potential Housing Sites in Bicker; although it was considered likely that the impacts of the site's development on the Conservation Area would be acceptable, this was an issue which did not affect alternative sites elsewhere in the village; and although it appeared that a satisfactory vehicular access could be provided, arrangements for other sites elsewhere in the village would be more straightforward. Consequently site Bic014 was not taken forward as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the July 2016 Public Consultation on Preferred Sites for Development. Nonetheless, southern parts of the site were shown as being within Bicker's Settlement Boundary. This objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate.

No change to the Local Plan is required.

Post Title: 11: Bicker

Response Number	378	Respondent Number:	2817	Comment Author:	Dr K Vijayan	Client		Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content		Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:	
Policy Number:	11	Map Number:		<p>I live in Bicker and the area you picked BIC 029,BIC 023,BIC 002,BIC 028 and 030 are open spaces currently and we used to have the Steam Thrash in September every year here.This open space is the characteristic of the village and gives the open nature of the village and if you consider this as the development site it will spoil the natural beauty of the village.This will also add to the conjestion when you join A52 since these sites are nearer to A52.Already there are Heavy Duty Vehicles turing from the monument road to Gedneys food Processing centre and some times it causes severe traffic congestion. I would strongly object to any development at the above sites.</p>	<p>The Local Plan shows four of the five areas of land referred to by the objector (Bic002, Bic028, Bic029 and Bic030), as being in the countryside, outside of Bicker's Settlement Boundary. These areas of land are not allocated for development. Only site Bic023 is shown as being within Bicker's Settlement Boundary and, although it is too small in scale to be allocated for development, it is anticipated that it will be developed for housing. This site is entirely surrounded by existing dwellings, and it is not accepted that its development will have the harmful impacts envisaged by the objector.</p>	<p>No change to the Local Plan is required.</p>			
Site Allocation Number:									
<p>Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is</p> <p>Legally Compliant <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Soun <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		<p>Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:</p> <p>Positively Prepared <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Justified <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Effective <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Consistent with national policv <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>							
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 12: Butterwick

Response Number	461	Respondent Number:	988	Comment Author:	Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd	Client	Broadgate Homes Ltd & Broadgate Builders (Spa	Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:		
Policy Number:		Map Number:	12	This small site lies within the settlement boundary and whilst Butterwick is a lower order settlement Policy 11 directs some 70 dwellings to it. The site is allocated under plan ref But020 and is well related to the heart of the village. Site ref But020 is therefore supported and it is relevant that this is the least peripheral of the allocations at the settlement, with allocation BU002 and BUT 0004 lying north of the Broadgate site.	The support is noted and welcomed.		No change to the Local Plan is required.		
Site Allocation Number:	But020								
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:							
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Sound	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>						
		Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 13: Cowbit

Response Number	427	Respondent Number:	2060	Comment Author:	Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd	Client	Mr P Smith	Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	--------------------------------	--------	------------	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:		Map Number:	13			
Site Allocation Number:	Cow006					

<p>Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is</p> <p>Legally Compliant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Sound <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:</p> <p>Positively Prepared <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Justified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Effective <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Consistent with national policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
---	--

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

The assessment of sites in Cowbit should be reviewed, taking into account the updated information regarding access, flood risk, impact on the landscape. Assessment of access to Services should take into account the actual distances from individual sites, rather than whether the site lies within or outside the settlement boundary.

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

We consider that it is necessary to participate in the oral part of the Examination in Public to ensure that the debate is fully informed, especially with regard to the assessment of alternative allocations.

We have proposed the site (COW6) at every available opportunity, and have provided landscape appraisals and other technical reports demonstrating the suitability of this site. This site is also the subject of a planning application for up to 17 dwellings (H01-0035-17). A number of consultees, including the Environment Agency and the County Highways department, have either supported the application, or not objected to it. Despite this positive assessment by statutory Consultees, the Local Plan process fails to allocate this site in favour of two sites subject to significant representations from the Environment Agency. The significant factor being the fact that those sites are within the settlement curtilage, whereas COW6 is not. A further site (COW 8) is also included in the development trajectory because it is in the settlement Curtilage, despite a number of significant concerns on the grounds of Contamination and access. The Council's analysis indicates that COW6 has fewer objections regarding access and flooding purely because the other sites lie within the drawn settlement Curtilage and are, therefore, deemed by the Council to be in a more sustainable location. This analysis ignores the fact that COW6 is closer to key services in the settlement (such as the primary school) than the sites within the settlement Curtilage. The analysis also ignores the reality of the built pattern of Cowbit, and the fact that development stretches along the B1357 to the west of the bypass. Although lying outside the settlement Curtilage, COW6 is in reality well related to the existing built environment, as well as being contained by the A16 to the east, and existing development to the north and West. The Plan is unsound because it is not properly justified with regard to the chosen allocation sites in Cowbit. It will not be effective because the allocated sites have significant risks attached and may not be delivered. Even if they are delivered, they may well come forward at a lower overall capacity, reducing the chances that the Plan's growth targets will be delivered. This is inconsistent with national policy because development sites with significant flood risk and hazard levels are preferred over COW6, which has such a low risk of flooding that the current application has not been subject to objections from the Environment Agency. The risk to the allocations is illustrated by the fact that although a developer has supported sites COW004 and 009 as part of the single scheme, no application has, as yet, been forthcoming.

The reasoning for not allocating this site and the discussion on other sites is contained in the Cowbit Housing Paper January 2017.

A full planning application for 80 dwellings has been submitted on the proposed housing allocations: Cow004 and Cow009, referenced H01-0501-17. This is more than the 54 dwellings estimated in the housing paper at 20dph. The submitted layout shows its vehicular access from the site to the north, that is currently being developed by the applicant, and also indicates accesses onto the playing field, which provide a shorter route to the school via Parkin Road and St Marys Gardens than around Backgate and Stonegate.

Therefore, the plan is not unsound as the proposed allocations are coming forward and it is effective owing to the numbers being greater than envisaged. If the 80 dwelling proposal is granted, with the completions and commitment figures from the January Housing paper, the 120 target for Cowbit would be achieved, with a total of 145, suggesting this site is unnecessary.

The planning applications are both likely to have been determined before the examination takes place and their consideration at the examination will be influenced by those decisions. An update on the completions and commitments will be available at that time.

Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.

Post Title: 13: Cowbit

Response Number	508	Respondent Number:	2342	Comment Author:	Ashley King Developments	Client		Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	--------------------------	--------	--	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:		Map Number:	13	As we have commented in our representation on the Spatial Strategy (Policy 2), we support the draft Local Plan's identification of Cowbit as a Minor Service Centre. We note that Cowbit is less constrained by flood risk than many other similarly sized and larger settlements, and that it has also been shown to be a sustainable location for new development. Cowbit has some good local facilities, such as a local primary school and community hall, which serve its existing population, and also a good bus service due to its proximity to Spalding. These services and facilities can only be maintained in future through the provision of new housing, which will create continued demand. In this context, we support the draft Local Plan's provision of at least 120 new dwellings in Cowbit. Within Cowbit, sites COW004 and COW009 are the most obvious locations for new development. They are located entirely within Flood Zone 1, and they lie within the centre of the village, in what is clearly the most suitable location for new development. The sites are farmed land within the existing built up area of the village. Their development would not be likely to lead to any unacceptable adverse impacts. Planning permission (H01-0776-14) has already been granted for a development of 37 dwellings on the land immediately to the north of sites Cow004 and Cow009 (on site Cow001). Similar principles are expected to inform the development of these sites, to the south, including the following: A suitable highway access can be Constructed for the sites, directly on to Backgate. This access can be delivered within land controlled by Ashley King Developments and on highway land, and it would provide sufficient capacity to serve the two sites. The sites would also be served by Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), such as open balancing ponds. Rain water would be attenuated within the site and then released to the adjacent field drain at a similar rate to the existing greenfield runoff rate. We understand that the site can accommodate a layout of around 60 dwellings whilst complying with all of the Councils' policies, and providing an area of public open space, generous private garden areas, and a high quality public realm. As such, the proposed allocation for 54 dwellings indicated in Table 3 is Conservative, and we	The support is noted and welcomed.	No change to the Local Plan is required.
Site Allocation Number:						

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

Legally Compliant
 Sound
 Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

Positively Prepared
 Justified
 Effective
 Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

Because we represent the land owner and developer, and would wish to take part in any discussion of the site at the Examination.

Post Title: 13: Cowbit

believe it should be regarded as a likely minimum figure.

This site is entirely developable and deliverable, and is backed by Ashwood Homes, who intend to construct the above mentioned residential development. We also note that the Councils have already concluded, through their SHLAA 2017 update, that the sites are both available, achievable and suitable for development, and that:

The sites' development would not have any unacceptable adverse impacts on natural, built or heritage assets, or the character and appearance of the area.

The sites are in a sustainable location, accessible to existing services and facilities.

Given the suitability of these sites, the lack of constraints to their delivery, the fact that a house builder is prepared to deliver housing on them in the near future, and their location at the heart of the village, we believe that they should be identified on the Local Plan Proposals Map as Housing Commitments.

Post Title: 14: Deeping St Nicholas

Response Number	253	Respondent Number:	1677	Comment Author:	Deeping St Nicholas PC	Client		Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:		
Policy Number:		Map Number:	14	The Parish Council is disappointed that Caultons Field was granted Outline Planning for 66 houses, but understand the dilemma for SHDC. The Parish Council objected and did not ask for any contribution from the landowner towards projects in the Village, for which we were very disappointed and will try to obtain concessions if it is developed. The Parish Council welcomes the Home Farm development for 135 houses with the potential it offers to provide facilities for the village. We consider this will fulfil our allocation for housing as outlined in the Local Plan, but will welcome infill housing on an ongoing basis. Outline Planning may be acceptable for other adjacent sites, which could provide future housing stock. We will be looking for major contributions from any large developments, to build on our aim of creating a more unified village and a 'village hub' aspect for facilities.		The comments are noted. The Home Farm application will be considered separately to the Local Plan and is larger than the Local Plan indicates. Policy 11 supports further infill development within the settlement boundary and policy 16 supports Rural Exceptions sites outside the Settlement Boundary.		No change to the Local Plan is required.	
Site Allocation Number:									
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is Legally Compliant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sound <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not: Positively Prepared <input type="checkbox"/> Justified <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent with national policy <input type="checkbox"/>							
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 14: Deeping St Nicholas

Response Number	342	Respondent Number:	1829	Comment Author:	Grace Machin Planning & Property	Client	Mr D Dennis	Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	----------------------------------	--------	-------------	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:		Map Number:	14	INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY 1. We have been instructed to make the following representations in respect of the South East Lincolnshire Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan, which is currently being consulted upon, prior to submission for Examination. These representations have been prepared having regard to the documents contained within the supporting Evidence Library and have assessed the compliance of the Draft Local Plan against paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)(NPPF). Paragraph 182 states that for a plan to be sound" it should be: - Positively prepared - Justified - Effective - Consistent with national policy 2. These representations seek to promote my client's landholdings, comprising a small parcel of land at Porter's Farm, to the north of the A1175 (Site A) and a further parcel of land to the south-west of New Road, Deeping St Nicholas (Site 8), for residential development. This document sets out a brief rationale as to why these Sites represent suitable and deliverable land, which should be allocated for small scale residential developments, thereby assisting to meet the housing needs of South Holland District, within a sustainable and accessible location. 3. In order to fully meet the current and future housing needs for Deeping St Nicholas, (and the wider District of South Holland), we believe that the two Sites identified on the attached Plan should be allocated for residential purposes in addition to the Site already identified for residential allocation, in order to ensure the full delivery of housing requirements for this settlement. SITE DESCRIPTIONS Site - Porters Farm 4. Site A, shown on the attached plan, comprises an area of grassland belonging to Porter's Farm, which is situated at the heart of Deeping St Nicholas, to the north of the A1175 Littleworth Drove, which bisects the settlement. Located to the north of the Minor Service Centre of Deeping St Nicholas, the Site lies in close proximity to existing and planned residential development further to the north-east, and has excellent accessibility to the facilities and services found within this settlement, most particularly the primary school, which is within walking distance of this Site. The landholding is not currently in active agricultural use and is a discrete parcel of land, which is visually and physically well related to the settlement of Deeping St	In paragraph 13 it is quoted that there is a shortfall of 14 dwellings. This is not correct. As of the 1 January 2017 completions and commitments produced a small shortfall of 5. Since then a planning application for 135 dwellings has been submitted on Home Farm, which is partly within the settlement Boundary, but also extends beyond it onto agricultural land. Home Farm has no flood hazard and no depth. A further application has been submitted behind properties on Campains Lane. This is also outside but adjacent to the Settlement Boundary with a flood hazard of danger for most and a flood depth of upto 1-2m. Both these applications are likely to be determined before the Local Plan examination. In relation to the two submitted sites: Site A has a flood risk of no hazard and no depth. Lincolnshire County Council have commented regarding access as follows: Access to the 'Porter's Farm' site would appear to rely upon the use of an un-adopted, un-made agricultural road that is not shown within the outline of the location plan. This roadway serves a substantial area of agricultural land as well as a commercial use on the area immediately adjacent to the Spalding to Peterborough railway line. The width of this roadway would suggest that it is used by large agricultural and commercial vehicles that may not be compatible with a private residential development. When we have previously looked at the junction of this roadway with Littleworth Drove, it was considered that the close proximity of the hedge to the back of the roadside footway quite significantly obstructed visibility to the right for drivers emerging from the access. The access is also very close to the railway level crossing and it is therefore suggested that the rail operator should be contacted for an opinion on the proposed allocation. Network Rail have commented regarding the access as follows: We object to this site, due the extremely close nature of the entrance to the level crossing. As you can see in the photo the road leads out onto the main road A1175 right next to Littleworth crossing and is almost on the	Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.
Site Allocation Number:						

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:	
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Soun	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Consistent with national policy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

15. With the above in mind, we currently do not believe that the South East Lincolnshire Publication Pre-Submission Draft Local Plan can be considered sound, on the basis that the proposed residential allocations for Deeping St Nicholas fail each of the tests of soundness, as set out within Paragraph 82 of the NPPF. 16. In order to become sound, we submit that additional land should be allocated for residential development within or adjoining Deeping St Nicholas, which is achievable, suitable and deliverable in the short term, thereby meeting the objectively assessed housing needs of this settlement. 17. Specifically, unless the Council identifies suitable sites within or adjoining Deeping St Nicholas, sufficient to accommodate the full quantum of housing need for this settlement, then it will be failing to provide a Local Plan which is positively prepared, effective or consistent with national policy - most particularly Paragraph 14 of the NPPF and the overarching need to boost significantly the supply of housing. 18. With this in mind, it is our belief that our client's landholdings at Sites A or B offer the potential to deliver this shortfall in housing numbers throughout the plan period, but without providing a significantly greater number of dwellings than is required for the settlement (as would occur through the allocation of Site References DSN005 and 011).

Post Title: 14: Deeping St Nicholas

Participate in Examination:



Why wish to participate

Nicholas. See photographs and plan attached.

5. Access to the Site could be readily achieved via Littleworth Drove, onto which there is excellent visibility in both directions. Owing to the scale of the development envisaged on this Site, it is considered that highway capacity will not be a significant consideration or concern. It is considered that this Site could accommodate in the region of 14 dwellings, which, owing to the lack of technical constraints or any complexities in land ownership, could be achievable and deliverable during the first part of the plan period. Site - New Road

6. Site B, also shown on the attached plan, comprises an area of arable agricultural land, immediately adjoining the settlement framework of Deeping St Nicholas, at its south-eastern boundary. The Site lies adjacent to New Road and is adjoined by existing residential properties along its north-western and north-eastern boundaries. Again, the Site is well related to the existing built form of the settlement and would not extend the framework of the village into the open countryside beyond. The Site is accessible to the facilities and services found within Deeping St Nicholas and again, is within walking distance of the Primary School.

7. Access to the Site is available directly onto New Road, with good visibility splays in each direction ensuring that a safe point of access/egress can be achieved. Owing to the scale of the development envisaged on this Site, it is considered that highway capacity will not be a significant consideration or concern. It is considered that this Site could accommodate in the region of 28 no. Dwellings, which, owing to the lack of technical constraints or any complexities in land ownership, could be achievable and deliverable during the first part of the plan period.

COMPARABLE SITE ANALYSIS

8. A number of Sites within or adjoining Deeping St. Nicholas have been considered and assessed within the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment published in April 2017 and have also been considered through the earlier Housing Papers and the Preferred Sites for Development Consultation. In considering the content of the SHLAA, it is clear that three Sites have been identified as being available, achievable and suitable to accommodate residential development as follows:

Site Reference DSN005 - Land to the west of Littleworth Drove - This Site is considered suitable to accommodate approximately 56 no. Dwellings and no insurmountable constraints to its development are identified. It is not proposed as a residential allocation within the

crossing and definitely within the yellow road hatchings. Our concerns are that traffic trying to get out on to the main road also large vehicles trying to turn (there is not much room to manoeuvre), blocking back will also become an issue.

The SHLAA has given this site reference DsN017 and concluded it is Undevelopable.

Site B also has a flood risk no hazard and no depth.

Lincolnshire County Council have commented regarding access as follows:

There is a fairly substantial watercourse between the 'New Road' site and New Road that would require the construction of a bridge or culvert to provide the necessary access but New Road itself is suitable to provide vehicular access. The position of the site, on the outside of a bend, would mean that a junction here would have adequate junction visibility in both directions. A section of footway would be required to provide a pedestrian link between the subject site and the existing village footway network.

Both proposals are of such a size that Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) principles should be applied to the management of surface water run-off.

Network Rail have commented regarding access as follows:

In terms of Site (B) we would want to ensure that the exit from New road onto the A1175 is not reopened as the proximity of this to the level crossing would cause issues. We would expect that the exit would be from St Nicholas' way onto the A1175.

The SHLAA has given this site reference DsN018 and concluded it is Developable.

Post Title: 14: Deeping St Nicholas

Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan.
 Site Reference DSN007 - Lane at Caulton's Field, Littleworth Drive - This Site has extant Planning Permission for 66 no. Dwellings granted in 2016 which are all likely to be delivered during the plan period. As such, it is proposed as a residential allocation within the Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan.
 Site Reference DSN011 - Land to the west of Littleworth Drove - This Site is considered suitable to accommodate approximately 45 no. Dwellings and no insurmountable constraints to its development are identified. It is not proposed as a residential allocation within the Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan.

9. Based upon the findings of the SHLAA, only Site Reference DSNo07 has been proposed as a residential allocation within the South East Lincolnshire Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan, thereby providing a total number of 66 no. Dwellings for the settlement throughout the Plan Period.

10. With the above analysis in mind, it is clear that my client's landholdings at Sites A and B, which lie immediately adjoining the main built up area of Deeping St Nicholas, offer an opportunity to deliver small scale residential development in the short term, to meet an immediate and identified shortfall in delivery. Given the significantly larger housing which could be delivered through Site References DSN005 and 011, it is anticipated that these Sites would in fact over-deliver in respect of the identified housing needs of Deeping St Nicholas. Furthermore, owing to the larger sizes of these Sites, it is very likely that the infrastructure and preparatory works required to allow their delivery would be more significant and time consuming, thereby hindering their early commencement.

11. In contrast however, my client's landholdings offer the potential to deliver a more suitable number of dwellings for the settlement of Deeping St Nicholas throughout the plan period, whilst also being immediately available and achievable to provide the residential development required in the short term. For these reasons we would urge the allocation of Sites A and B, as identified on the attached Plan, for residential development.

HOUSING NUMBERS

12. The South East Lincolnshire Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Local Plan identifies through Policy 10 the need to deliver 11,125 no. Dwellings within South Holland District across the plan period (2011-2036), which equates to an annual requirement of 445 no. Dwellings. Policy 11 provides a proposed breakdown of this overall requirement, with the dwelling numbers

Post Title: 14: Deeping St Nicholas

distributed between the settlements, based upon their hierarchy in the spatial strategy.

13. Deeping St Nicholas is identified within Policy 11 as a Minor Service Centre, within which it is anticipated that 80 no. Dwellings will be provided across the plan period. The one Site currently proposed as a residential allocation within Deeping St Nicholas (and assessed above in paragraph 8) has the potential to deliver up to 66 no. Dwellings in total, as established through Planning Permission Reference H03-0331-16, approved in November 2016. Clearly, this leaves a shortfall of at least 14 no. Dwellings, for which suitable, deliverable land has not been allocated.

14. Given the requirements of the NPPF, which specifically requires Local Planning Authorities, when plan-making to "positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area" and to ensure that Local Plans "should meet objectively assessed needs" (Paragraph 14) we consider that the Council is failing in its statutory duty, if insufficient land is allocated, thereby failing to meet the identified needs of Deeping St Nicholas.

CONCLUSION

19. Deeping St Nicholas is classified as a Minor Service Centre and as a sustainable settlement identified for future growth. We support the minimum allocation of 80 no. Dwellings for this settlement and encourage the allocation of sufficient land to deliver this full requirement during the plan period.

20. My client's landholding (at Sites A and 8) offer the potential to deliver small scale residential schemes on land which is immediately adjoining the main built up area of Deeping St Nicholas and is readily accessible to the range of facilities and services within this settlement, as well as to the public transport network. These Sites are suitable, achievable and deliverable in the short term, with no technical constraints or potential delays to bringing these developments forward.

22. In contrast, the other Sites which have been identified within the SHLAA as being potentially available, suitable and achievable for residential development at Deeping St Nicholas are significantly larger in size, which could lead to delays, thereby hindering the supply of housing in the short term, whilst eventually over-delivering in terms of the identified housing need for this Minor Service Centre.

23. In order to ensure that the South East Lincolnshire Submission Draft Local Plan is considered sound at Examination, we believe that sufficient land must be allocated at Deeping St Nicholas to accommodate the

Post Title: 14: Deeping St Nicholas

objectively assessed housing needs of this settlement. For these reasons, we urge the Council to allocate Sites A and B for residential development. [All photos and plans have been submitted by email]

Response Number: 433 Respondent Number: 1835 Comment Author: Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd Client: Mr J Turner Web Link:

Paragraph Number: Table/Figure: Comment Content: Officer Comment: Officer Recommendation:

Policy Number: Map Number: 14 Site Allocation Number: Dsn013

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

- Legally Compliant
- Sound
- Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

The Plan should acknowledge the benefits of site DSN019, including its locational advantages and the technical material supporting the Current planning application, the support of the Local Parish Council and the fact that the development is being actively promoted by a national house builder. The site, therefore, should be shown on Inset Map 14 as an allocation for residential development under policy LP11.

We consider that it is necessary to participate in the oral part of the Examination in Public to ensure that the debate is fully informed and that our clients knowledge of the area and concerns about the plan are shared and understood.

This site, (DSN13), which is opposite a site with extant planning permission for 66 dwellings, has been promoted through the plan period and is now subject to a planning application (H03-0161-17) for 135 dwellings and a village hall. The application is being promoted by Kier Living Ltd, a national house builder and, as such, there is certainty that the development would be developed upon receipt of planning permission. Comments regarding access and flood risk are being addressed through the application process. The reason given for not allocating the site in the Planning Authority's response to the local plan consultation in July 2016 refers to the fact that small parts of the whole site are at risk of flooding and other sites are therefore preferred, although this site would reinforce the existing pattern of development and is, unlike sites to the north of Littleworth Drove, unaffected by the railway line to the north West. Redevelopment of the site will allow for the relocation of the agricultural yard, with its large buildings and significant areas of concrete hardstanding, out of the village. The assessment of allocations has failed to weigh the benefits and challenges of the different sites, resulting in the most sustainable site not being allocated, with other sites with lesser advantages in terms of amenity and the character of the settlement finding favour, contrary to national policy.

There is an error in the January Housing Paper for Deeping St Nicholas in section 7.1 in that it refers to Dsn013. This should be Dsn007 and the sentence that follows it should be deleted.

The housing target for Deeping St Nicholas is 80 dwellings with completions and commitments at January 2017, providing 75 dwellings.

The Site Dsn013 is partly within the Settlement Boundary and is capable of providing more than the deficit within the boundary. The planning application extends beyond the Dsn013 since it adjoins Wheatfield Court to the south west.

The planning application is likely to have been determined before the examination takes place and its consideration at the examination will be influenced by that decision. An update on the completions and commitments will be available at that time.

Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.

Post Title: 15: Fishtoft

Response Number	327	Respondent Number:	2310	Comment Author:	Mr and Mrs J Thompson	Client		Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	-----------------------	--------	--	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:		Map Number:	15
Site Allocation Number:	Fis046		

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

Legally Compliant

Sound

Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

Positively Prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

Regarding South East Lincolnshire local plan 2011-2036 publication version consultation. We are very concerned with the proposal for extensive residential development ref FIS046 on the insert map number 15. This proposed development borders the south boundary of Fishtoft Manor, a grade two listed building set in a conservation area. When Fishtoft Manor was renovated due to dereliction, extremely onerous restrictions were applied. These were agreed in consultation with Mary Anderson who at the time, was conservation officer of Boston Borough Council. Mrs Anderson insisted upon every fine detail complying with her requirements to insure that the renovations were sympathetic to the grade 2 listed building. Consequently we were not even allowed to use double glazing to the sash windows. This along with many other restrictions, made the renovations very difficult. We then submitted a proposal to build 4 executive detached house in the grounds. As this was in a conservation area adjacent to the listed building, again very strict requirements were applied, particularly with regards to the density of the residential properties. There were also strict requirements on the appearance of the properties, to ensure they were sympathetic to Fishtoft Manor. We are therefore concerned with regard to this new proposed development, within 20 feet of Fishtoft Manor. We see that in policy 26 (the historic environment) option A listed buildings, that (development proposals that are considered to harm the fabric, character, appearance or setting of listed buildings will not be permitted.) This was confirmed by Heritage England after speaking to them, last week. We therefore cannot see how this proposal could be acceptable. Certainly not within a substantial distance of the boundary of Fishtoft Manor. In addition, along the proposed development boundary, is a horse chestnut tree which we believe to be in excess of 400 years old, as stated in the tree report we submitted to Boston Borough Council at the time of our original proposals. We have been informed that the roots of this tree extend approximately the same distance as the height of the tree into the proposed site. Therefore any excavation within the root area would be totally unacceptable.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (April 2017) (SHLAA) recognises the issue identified by the objectors. It states that site Fis046 "abuts the grade 2 listed Fishtoft Manor, and its development is likely to have a detrimental effect on the setting of the listed building unless it can be organised in such a way as to have a green landscaped space where it abuts the listed building's garden". The site has an area of 2.69 hectares and (at the 'standard' density used to assess site capacities in a settlement such as Fishtoft) could be expected to accommodate 54 dwellings. However, in order to reflect the need for a green landscaped space to be provided adjacent to the listed building, Table 3 of the Local Plan identifies that it is expected to deliver only 45 dwellings. This equates to approximately 0.45 hectares of the site being set aside to protect the listed building's setting. This green landscaped space would also ensure the protection of the tree described by the objectors.

No change to the Local Plan is required.

Post Title: 16: Fleet Hargate

Response Number	252	Respondent Number:	2134	Comment Author:	Mr P Franks	Client		Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	<p>As one of the joint owners of the parcel of land in Fleet, designated as Fle 020. I am astonished that you have designated this land as undevelopable. I have looked at the site description that you have used to reach your conclusion, and it would appear that your assumptions regarding site access and effect on the listed building, the Laurels, are ill founded. There is no intention that an access would be suggested between the Laurels and Broadlands. There are 3 potential access points for this land;- 1 from lowgate, 1 from the B1515, and provision has been made to provide access from Old Main Road adjacent to Haven House through the land that you have designated as Fle017. This land was previously owned by my family, and there is a contractual agreement that designates the line and specification of the road over this land stating that it shall be constructed to adoption standards with visibility splays and of adequate dimensions to allow for future development.</p>			Officer Comment:	<p>Access from Lowgate would not be suitable owing to the carriageway width. Historic England commented about impact on the Conservation Area and other Historic Assets for Fle017, which is part of this site. Fle020 was put forward owing to its location, but stating noise and conservation issues need to be assessed and designed for. Access via Fle017 would reduce impact on The Laurels but there is a listed building opposite. The site is partly in the Conservation Area and the Conservation Officer is concerned development of the site is likely to have a very negative effect on the character of the Conservation Area. The site is also slightly impacted by flood Hazard and Flood depth in the SFRA. Other sites are not.</p>
Policy Number:		Map Number:	16	Officer Recommendation:	<p>No change to the Local Plan is required.</p>				
Site Allocation Number:	Fle020			<p>Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is</p> <p>Legally Compliant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Sound <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>			<p>Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:</p> <p>Positively Prepared <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Justified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Effective <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Consistent with national policy <input type="checkbox"/></p>		
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:	<p>As there will obviously be no detrimental effect to The Laurels and there is adequate access to this site, I would respectfully request that you reconsider the designation of this site.</p>								
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 16: Fleet Hargate

Response Number	371	Respondent Number:	2812	Comment Author:	Ms V Fear	Client		Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	-----------	--------	--	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:		Map Number:	16			
Site Allocation Number:						

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

Legally Compliant

Sound

Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

Positively Prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

I would like to register an objection to a section of land in Eastgate, Fleet Hargate from being included in the South Lincolnshire Local Development Plan. The land in question, I believe was known as FLE10 on previous documents, may have been taken out of the final document so I apologise for my objection if that is the case. FLE10 is a field which lies at the back of my home, Corner Cottage in Hocklesgate. I believe the plan stated access would be via Eastgate but the field actually stands in Hocklesgate. The reason for my objection is that I do not believe that Hocklesgate could cope with additional traffic. It is a single track road with very few passing places but plenty of dykes. The road is already very well used with school traffic, and during the summer months, agricultural traffic. I believe that adding further cars onto this road without serious and costly improvements would be madness and could lead to an increase of collisions on this road, which incidentally is very well used by dog walkers. There is also another small unnamed road, which runs between my home in Hocklesgate and Capricorn Cottage in Eastgate. This road is again another single track road with dykes either side and no passing places. I have met other cars on this road, including an ambulance, and it has frankly been dangerous. Again, I fear that if FLE10 was developed that this would lead to an increase of traffic on this road as many people use it as a cut through to get to the school or to travel from Fleet Hargate to the Peterborough road. If this site was developed this road would need improving to cope with the traffic created by the additional houses. I have attached pictures to this email of this road. The pictures may look deceiving as the dykes are overgrown currently, but it is quite a steep bank.

I also do not believe that Fleet is suitable for development because it is unsustainable. There is no shop within easy walking distance and the school, I understand, is over subscribed with no suitable parking. Eastgate is also home to a haulage company and a plant firm, which operate from two sites in this area.

Fle010 was not put forward as a Housing site because of the issues raised.

The County Education Department has commented that Fleet Hargate has sufficient primary school capacity available for developments proposed. The closest secondary is University Academy Holbeach which currently has no available capacity. An additional 300 spaces is required for developments proposed. The closest sixth form is University Academy Holbeach - Sixth form capacity echoes capacity in the secondary schools which they are part of (no capacity available).

No change to the Local Plan is required.

Post Title: 18: Gosberton

Response Number	462	Respondent Number:	988	Comment Author:	Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd	Client	Broadgate Homes Ltd & Broadgate Builders (Spa	Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:				Officer Recommendation:
Policy Number:		Map Number:	18	Gosberton is identified as a "Minor Service Centre" at Policy 11. The settlement because of its service function, is recognised as a sustainable location within the settlement hierarchy and is expected to contribute some 270 dwellings during the local plan period (and with the settlement of Weston) is planned to experience the most growth because of the settlement's characteristics and sustainability credentials. Broadgate control a brownfield site Gos003 (estimated yield 81 dwellings) which is supported. This is a site that Broadgate has promoted from the formative stages of the local plan process and is fully committed to bringing forward this component of the overall spatial strategy to meet housing need and deliver choice. The site is vacant and disused and immediately available. Further land within Broadgate's controllies to the north of this site allocation (Gos003). This greenfield site is an omission site but is an area of land that could bring forward an additional 40 dwellings in combination with the allocated brownfield land to the south of this area (Gos003). This area could be developed at a lower density but would be contained with a landscaped framework and would be suitable for a combined allocation of 120 dwellings. Development in this location will create a sympathetic landscaped edge at a key gateway to the settlement, which will create a landscaped improvement to the setting of the village.	The support for Gos003 is noted and welcomed.				Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.
Site Allocation Number:	Gos003				It was originally submitted to include half of the field to the west, which produced an artificial boundary and would introduce pressure to include the whole field upto a commercial site. Broadgate, via their agent at the time, agreed to reduce the site to the previously developed land in a letter dated 24th July 2014.				
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:							
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Soun	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate	Because of Broadgate's experience of housing delivery and the importance of the provision of strategic infrastructure to bring forward the time-scales for housing development.								
					One proposed allocation has planning permission subject to a S106 and a site which was not a proposed allocation is also awaiting a s106 obligation to be completed. Another site listed as an allocation in the housing paper also has planning permission and should not have been listed as it should be in the commitments figure.				
					The need for further land, as indicated by this representation, appears to be unnecessary.				
					Updated housing figures will be available at the examination.				

Post Title: 19: Moulton

Response Number: 377 **Respondent Number:** 2475 **Comment Author:** Mr S Theobald **Client:** **Web Link:**

Paragraph Number: **Table/Figure:** **Comment Content:** **Officer Comment:** **Officer Recommendation:**

Policy Number: **Map Number:** 19 **Site Allocation Number:** **My comment relates specifically to Moulton but also applies to other areas. I object to the local plan for three reasons -**

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

- Legally Compliant
- Sound
- Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

1 The loss of arable land.
 2 The lack of local facilities.
 3 The impact on roads.

1. I am shocked at the proposal to build on valuable arable land. In Moulton we have already seen several acres given over to house building and it would seem more land is to be taken. It is counter intuitive that the increase in population means that we will need less land to grow crops. Where are the crops to come from? We will simply be more and more dependant on imports. Imports have become more expensive since the vote to leave the EU and if the pound remains low then we can assume imports will continue to rise in price. Imports will become more difficult and expensive to obtain. Simple economics means we should produce more in the UK, not less. Once the land has been built on it cannot be reclaimed. This is an incredibly short sighted plan.

2. The school and local health centre are full, are these to be developed before any housing is built? If so then this comment is redundant, if not then the people buying the houses will have nowhere to send their children to school or a surgery to register at.

3. The local roads cannot take any increase in traffic. They are too narrow for cars and lorries to pass without one stopping. It is not unusual to see a lorry or van in the ditch. I have had several near misses when lorries have refused to slow down. With an increase in traffic the risk of accidents will increase. Are the roads to be widened or lorries banned when the houses are built? Banning lorries will take away local jobs, which means we no longer need more housing and so I'm not expecting that, what I am proposing is that the roads are widened before the houses are built.

In summary, this plan appears not to have been well thought out. The short term political and financial gain for the council and developers is considerable. The long term negative impact on the environment and economy is immense.

The purpose of the planning system is to manage land use. There is a housing need, which we have to address and this will result in agricultural land, and in some cases previously developed land being used for housing. The numbers for Moulton have been reduced over the consultations held in 2016 from 190 to 90. The impacts of Brexit are beyond the scope of this plan.

The most recent information from the County Education Department was that there is sufficient primary school capacity available for developments proposed. There is secondary school capacity currently available at Spalding secondary schools which are closest to development but it is likely that capacity will fill as children cannot attend schools at Holbeach/Bourne/Deepings. Therefore a new secondary school is required in second phase of plan. The closest sixth form is in Spalding - Sixth form capacity echoes capacity in the secondary schools which they are part of (some capacity available).

The most recent information from the CCG's was that currently there is some capacity at the local GP surgery(ies) to accommodate additional patients, however County wide there is an increasing shortage of GP's, nurses and other healthcare staff which could affect future capacity should demand increase.

One of the sites being allocated already has planning permission. There are two other sites being put forward for allocation. All three sites have been considered by the Lincolnshire County Council Highways Department.

No change to the Local Plan is required.

Post Title: 19: Moulton

Response Number	424	Respondent Number:	2825	Comment Author:	Indigo Planning	Client	Diana Properties Ltd	Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	-----------------	--------	----------------------	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:	8	Map Number:	19
Site Allocation Number:	MO001		

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:	
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

In order to make the Local Plan sound, the former Gardman site should be designated as a housing allocation through Policy 11. This approach would also help to address the housing shortfall in Moulton and is in accordance with paragraph 47 of the NPPF, which requires local planning authorities to meet their full, objectively assessed needs for housing.

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

The owner of the former Gardman premises in Moulton: The Peterborough Sub-Regional Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) - Final Report (July 2014) originally indicated a requirement to provide 560 dwellings per annum (dpa) for the South Holland area, which translated to a draft allocation of 250 houses in Moulton for the plan period 2011-2036. This position was updated by the Peterborough Sub-Regional SHMA Update (October 2015), which showed a requirement of 430 dpa for the district, therefore reducing the draft allocation for Moulton to 190 housing over the period. The Local Plan 2011-2036: Publication Version (March 2017) sets out new housing site allocations throughout the plan area, in accordance with the Policies Map. Policy 11 allocates 90 houses to Moulton as a Minor Service Centre. In the reasoned justification, it is noted that the stated capacity (i.e. 90 houses for Moulton) is not a maximum or minimum allocation and that viability, design, constraints and efficient use of land should be the primary considerations in meeting housing needs. Nevertheless, this is 100 houses less than the amount identified through the SHMA Update (October 2015). In the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan: Housing Paper - Moulton (January 2017), the local planning authority note that the number of houses allocated to Moulton was reduced because many of the sites submitted to the SHLAA were considered unsuitable. As noted above, the former Gardman site is identified as Mou035 in the SHLAA April 2017. Within the relevant section of the SHLAA, dealing with sites at Moulton, Mou035 is assessed as being both suitable and achievable for residential development. However, the site is identified as being unavailable due to the site not being put forward by the marketing estate agents. For clarification, Diana Properties is seeking to promote Mou035 for residential development and intends to submit a planning application in due course to establish the principle of residential use at the site. The site is therefore available for residential uses and should be identified as such in future iterations of the SHLAA and the emerging Local Plan. The site is identified as suitable and achievable for residential use and will go some way to meet the housing shortfall not currently being met in Moulton. The housing site allocations for each settlement, as identified by Policy 11, are set out in Table 3 at p42-45 of the Local Plan. In terms of proposed draft allocations in Moulton, these are Mou016 and Mou023 which provide for 17 and 10

MO001 is identified as an Established Employment Site. However, in order for the designation to be meaningful there needs to be some degree of certainty that the site will remain in employment use over the plan period. The site has been actively marketed for several years and appears to be used on a temporary basis only. The owners indicate that the site is also no longer available for employment use in the long term. Therefore the site should no longer be protected for employment use.

Change Inset Map 19 to:
Remove the notation of MO001.

Change Policy 8 to:
Under Established Employment Sites delete row MO001

Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.

Post Title: 19: Moulton

houses in the south and north of the settlement respectively. Both sites are on greenfield land on the edge of Moulton. By contrast, Mou035 comprises 2.6 ha of previously developed brownfield land in a more sustainable location adjacent to the heart of the historic and commercial centre of the settlement. Furthermore, the site is identified within Flood Zone 1 (least likely to flood) on the Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning. Redevelopment of Mou035 will also provide the opportunity to improve the setting of the Grade I Listed Windmill, Grade II Listed Swan Public House and 20 High Street and Moulton Conservation Area. Mou035 is therefore a more sustainable and suitable site for housing development than both Mou016 and Mou023 and should be prioritised ahead of these proposed allocations in the emerging Local Plan. Summary The former Gardman site is no longer suitable or viable as an Existing Employment Site and the proposed policy allocation should be deleted. The South East Lincolnshire SHLAA (April 2017) assessed as being both suitable and achievable for residential development. The site is also available for residential development. For the reasons set out above, the current policy designation is not the most appropriate strategy for the former Gardman site. The proposed policy allocation is therefore unjustified and for that reason, the Local Plan, in its current guise is unsound.

Post Title: 20: Moulton Chapel

Response Number	355	Respondent Number:	878	Comment Author:	Matrix Planning Ltd.	Client		Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	-----	-----------------	----------------------	--------	--	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:	11	Map Number:	20
Site Allocation Number:	Mou029		

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:	
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input type="checkbox"/>
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

A. Please make reference in the supporting text of the Plan to a no-build zone around the Windmill.
 B. Extend Mou 029 westward to round off the allocation.

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

1. We request that Mou029 (Land south of Roman Road) is extended westwards to round off this allocation. The remaining area will otherwise be hard to farm and may fall into disuse.

2. Increasing the allocation westwards will allow for a new east-west public footpath access from Woodgate Road and some built development on the land, in a manner that will respect the listed Windmill to the north of the site.

3. Detailed drawings and a heritage assessment for this have been sent by email dated 19.05.17 to the Policy section; a detailed expression for all this is also given in SHDC application reference H13-1280-16 (undecided at the time of writing).

4. An objection has to be raised as future planning application may present different arrangements than the particular development option advanced in SHDC ref. H13-1280-16. Consequently, a no-build zone is accepted and proposed around the Windmill, and reference in the supporting text of the Plan will readily require this (it will then become a readily defended material consideration) . Such a standoff zone around the windmill is a detailed matter defined by heritage assessments and future planning applications. Mou 029 needs to be extended to allow for this future debate.

5. Mou 029 as presently presented measures 2.86ha. Extending it westward will result in a site of 3.895 ha . At a density of 20 houses per hectare, 78 houses are possible. Comment is made later to Mou 029 in table 3 (paragraph 5.2.9).

The suggestion of a no-build zone, in order to protect the setting of the Grade 2 listed Moulton Chapel Mill is accepted. The issue is how to achieve it.

The simplest solution is to leave the red line for the Mou029 allocation as it is, which will result in the no-build zone being outside the Settlement Boundary. Policy 25 seeks to conserve and enhance heritage assets, which would be relevant for any proposal that sought to build in this area.

The site plan for the planning application includes all of the land between the properties on Woodgate Road and Cekhira Avenue and the site block plan received on 19 May 2017 shows the site retaining the land behind the listed mill for open space. Therefore the implementation of this application would secure the footpath and provide the no-build zone. In addition any application that positioned dwellings within the housing allocation and openspace and footpath links outside the allocation could be considered favourably as a suitable exemption.

The second option is if planning permission is granted and issued for the local plan to allocate the open space, link it to policies 25 and 28 and amend Table 3 in section 5.2 to list constraints. This would however, require all sites to be similarly considered to produce a full list, as omissions could allow an unfortunate decision.

Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.

Post Title: 20: Moulton Chapel

Response Number	356	Respondent Number:	878	Comment Author:	Matrix Planning Ltd.	Client		Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:	Table 3	Comment Content	Mou029 is presented as 2.86 ha in size. This may accommodate 57 units at 20 houses per hectare (greater than the 46 shown in the table)		Officer Comment:	The correction to the site's capacity is accepted. Update the trajectory to 57 dwellings Mou029.	
Policy Number:	11	Map Number:						Officer Recommendation: Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.	
Site Allocation Number:									
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:							
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>						
		Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:	Change site capacity of Mou 029 to 57 units .								
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 21: Old Leake

Response Number	269	Respondent Number:	1640	Comment Author:	Old Leake Parish Council	Client		Web Link										
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:											
Policy Number:		Map Number:	21	<p>The capacity for sewage and surface water drainage is in need of upgrading to cope with any further development. Anglian Water have confirmed this with their comments.</p> <p>Adams Land, referred by you as Old005 has been included as a suitable site for 10 dwellings. The parish council strongly feel this is over ambitious. School Lane which runs along two sides of the land is very narrow, two cars cannot pass at the same time. Any development here must include widening of the road especially on the bend. School Lane is a very busy road way during school drop off and pick up times. Double Decker busses and coaches have to use this road on a daily basis.</p> <p>The final point from the parish council is the statement which says the doctors surgery is able to increase its uptake of patients is not confirmed by any member of the parish. Your published statement does not reflect the reality of the service available.</p>	<p>The Local Plan allocates no sites for development in Old Leake. Growth in the village is expected to be catered for by extant planning permissions. Potential impacts on the foul and surface water networks have been taken into account in the consideration of these planning applications.</p> <p>The Local Plan does not allocate site Old005 for development.</p> <p>The CCG has not provided specific information on the capacity of the Old Leake Medical Centre. The information contained in paragraph 3.6 of the Housing Paper - Old Leake (January 2017) is a generic response from the CCG. However, the Local Plan allocates no sites for development in Old Leake. Growth in the village is expected to be catered for by extant planning permissions. Potential impacts on the Medical Centre have been taken into account in the consideration of these planning applications.</p>		<p>No change to the Local Plan is required.</p>											
Site Allocation Number:		<p><i>Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is</i></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Legally Compliant</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Sound</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:</i></p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Positively Prepared</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Justified</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Effective</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">Consistent with national policy</td> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>								Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>	Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Justified
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																	
Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>																	
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																	
Positively Prepared	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																	
Justified	<input type="checkbox"/>																	
Effective	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																	
Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>																	
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:																		
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:																		
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>																	
Why wish to participate																		

Post Title: 22: Quadring

Response Number	418	Respondent Number:	2304	Comment Author:	Alex Cobb	Client		Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	-----------	--------	--	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:		Map Number:	22	Re: 158 Main Road Quadring PE11 4PT - green infrastructure designation Following the latest version of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, we have now sought advice regarding the proposed green infrastructure designation on our land and believe this is not enforceable on a privately owned piece of land. Can you provide us with the government regulation which enables you to enforce this? Please could you also give us the references/regulation numbers/policies/procedures (and where to find them) for the following points: a) What government policies and procedures were in place to inform us as land owners that you were about to change the designation of our land. As previously discussed, we found out purely by chance when we visited Spalding planning office on an entirely separate matter. b) No other privately owned land has green infrastructure designation within any of the 72 maps on the emerging Local Plan. The green infrastructure shading shows only war memorials, cemeteries, churches and their graveyards, a green burial ground and a reed bed. These are all suggestive of areas where the general public has access. Please can you confirm if any other privately owned land without public access, has green infrastructure designation? c) We were informed by the planning department at the Donington meeting that our piece of land is for the aesthetic pleasure of the rest of the village. If this is the case, who is to oversee the maintenance of the land? How will this be enforced? Who will pay for the maintenance? d) The same planning officer at the Donington meeting said that he wasn't sure if the green infrastructure designation on our land was legal. Please supply regulation. E) The change in designation will without doubt be detrimental to the sale of our property at some future date, as it puts in to question clear ownership of the title of the land and how it should be described on the title deeds. Please supply land registry directives. Given that this piece of land has numerous tree preservation orders in place that fully cover the proposed green shaded area, surely this covers any alteration of this site from its current state, so why is there any need for the green infrastructure designation?	a) The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, Part 3 S5 (1)(a)(ii) provides for "the allocation of sites for a particular type of development or use;" b) The site was submitted to the SHLAA on 18 Feb 2016 following which the agent and both owners have been consulted on 30 June 2016 and 22 March 2017. The Green Infrastructure designation includes 10 sites that are not Churchyards or Cemeteries, 5 of which are sites not open to the public: Middlegate Road, Kirton; Grass Field, Butterwick; West Skirbeck House, Boston; Trees, Moulton Chapel and this site in Quadring. c) The sites are within the settlement boundary where development would be acceptable in principle. However, it is considered that the sites have a public amenity benefit and this should be a consideration if an application for development is submitted. Trees protected by a TPO are privately owned, but are protected on public amenity grounds, and so the principle is the same. D) See a) above e) The site has received planning permission for dwellings and as a result the GI shading was amended to take this into account. It is reasonable to amend the shading from the access way.	Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.
Site Allocation Number:						

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

Legally Compliant
 Sound
 Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

Positively Prepared
 Justified
 Effective
 Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:
 Lift green infrastructure designation from our land

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate: This has been done without consultation or discussion with ourselves

Post Title: 22: Quadring

Response Number	435	Respondent Number:	2305	Comment Author:	Howard Baxter	Client		Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:		
Policy Number:		Map Number:	22	Following our conversation last Friday I shall be delivering a plan to SHDC offices this morning, for your attention, clearly showing the approved development area in order that the Quadring plan can be amended to accommodate . My clients are advised that the designation placed on the paddock at the front of the site bordering the highway is not enforceable and it is requested that it is removed. In any case there are so many trees with TPO's on them that it would be impossible to develop. It is felt that the definition should only apply to public places and not private land and my clients intend to legally challenge this if the designation is not removed.	The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, Part 3 S5 (1)(a)(ii) provides for "the allocation of sites for a particular type of development or use;" The Green Infrastructure designation includes 10 sites that are not Churchyards or Cemeteries, 5 of which are sites not open to the public: Middlegate Road, Kirton; Grass Field, Butterwick; West Skirbeck House, Boston; Trees, Moulton Chapel and this site in Quadring. The sites are within the settlement boundary where development would be acceptable in principle. However, it is considered that the sites have a public amenity benefit and this should be a consideration if an application for development is submitted. Trees protected by a TPO are privately owned, but are protected on public amenity grounds, and so the principle is the same. The site has received planning permission for dwellings and as a result the GI shading was amended to take this into account. It is reasonable to amend the shading from the access way.		Further consideration of this matter will be necessary as part of the Examination.		
Site Allocation Number:									
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is Legally Compliant <input type="checkbox"/> Sound <input type="checkbox"/> Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not: Positively Prepared <input type="checkbox"/> Justified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent with national policy <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 22: Quadring

Response Number	463	Respondent Number:	988	Comment Author:	Hume Planning Consultancy Ltd	Client	Broadgate Homes Ltd & Broadgate Builders (Spa	Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:		
Policy Number:		Map Number:	22	Quadring is identified as a "Minor Service Centre" at Policy 11 which reflects the level of services and facilities it provides and its role within the wider catchment. The settlement is expected to contribute some 130 dwellings during the local plan period. Preferred Allocation Qua004, Land East of Cresswell Drive, is expected to yield some 18 dwellings and this target yield and the allocation is supported by Broadgate who are committed to delivering this component of the overall plan strategy.	The support is noted and welcomed.		No change to the Local Plan is required.		
Site Allocation Number:	Qua004								
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is Legally Compliant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sound <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not: Positively Prepared <input type="checkbox"/> Justified <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent with national policy <input type="checkbox"/>							
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 23: Surfleet

Response Number	488	Respondent Number:	2554	Comment Author:	Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd	Client	Mrs S Tunnard and Mrs E Asprey	Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:		
Policy Number:		Map Number:	23	Sur016 was not identified as a housing allocation in the Surfleet inset Map 25 of the Local Plan Consultation of January February 2016, although following representations, it was subsequently included as a preferred housing allocation in the Public Consultation on Preferred Sites in July/August 2016. We are instructed by clients to review the Publication Draft of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan with regard to the proposals for Surfleet as set out in what is Inset Map No. 23. We support the preferred housing allocations for Surfleet Sur003, Sur006 and Sur016 - as expressed in Inset Map No 23, and consider that they and this part of the Local Plan are sound. Any request for the reintroduction of sites previously discarded following the Local Plan Consultation in January 2016 should not be considered, as the preferred housing allocations Sur003, Sur006 and Sur016- together with the existing housing commitments, completions and identified housing sites under ten dwellings provide for the construction of 169 dwellings during the plan period. These dwellings will reinforce the role of Surfleet as a Minor Service Centre in its own right, and will help to sustain existing facilities, or meet the service needs of other local communities, during the lifetime of the Local Plan.	The support is noted and welcomed.		No change to the Local Plan is required.		
Site Allocation Number:	Sur016								
Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is Legally Compliant <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sound <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not: Positively Prepared <input type="checkbox"/> Justified <input type="checkbox"/> Effective <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent with national policy <input type="checkbox"/>							
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate	We wish to participate in the oral part of the Examination to secure the allocation of our clients' land at Sur016, by expressing its advantages, including the early availability.								

Post Title: 25: Tydd St Mary

Response Number	343	Respondent Number:	2801	Comment Author:	Mr & Mrs Gorrod	Client		Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:		
Policy Number:		Map Number:	25	<p>We believe the consultation process has not been sufficient to allow local people to have a fair say on the proposals. The "Statement of Community Involvement" (April 2012) adopted for this process states the following:</p> <p>"General views will be sought from relevant groups and organisations with an interest in the area and from individuals living in, working in, or visiting the area. Every effort will be made to publicise this opportunity as widely as possible including the use of notices on the South East Lincolnshire Local Authority websites, notices in local newsletters and newspapers, in public and other buildings and through direct notification by email or letter".</p> <p>As residents of Tydd St Mary directly impacted by the choice of a future "Preferred Option Housing Allocation" (Tyd 014) we were unaware of this consultation process until this later stage when options had already been evaluated and preferred sites defined. We had not seen any publication in the local press nor received any direct communication by letter or email. We only learned of this consultation process recently; We therefore do not feel the consultation process has been implemented fairly and local residents views have been sought to an appropriate level consistent with the Statement of Community Involvement"</p> <p>(2) Given the preferred site (Tyd014) lies directly adjacent to the western boundary of our property, as local residents we would like to put forward the following points for consideration that we believe should have been taken into account at the earlier consultation phases:</p> <p>(a) Traffic and roads The approach to the junction on Lowgate and Church Way is very narrow and is a problem for vehicles passing each other safely added traffic will cause greater problems should extra housing be built on Tyd014.</p> <p>(b) Drainage Within the last 10 years over 70 dwellings have been built in Tydd St Mary causing extreme strain to the pumping system to the extent that for over 6 months specialised vehicles were making daily visits to Lowgate to extract sewerage from the drains. With this came the added problem of smell.</p> <p>(c) Impact on the community We believe that the village has had more than its fair share of development - our village school is oversubscribed and many parents here</p>	<p>The Local plan has had three previous consultations, commencing in May 2013 for 6 weeks, January 2016 for 6 weeks and July 2016 for 4 weeks.</p> <p>They have been advertised in the press, local parish magazines, the 2 councils websites and on social media. Also those members of the public who have commented at earlier stages have been contacted.</p> <p>During the course of the consultations the number of dwellings being sort in Tydd Sy Mary has been reduced from 200 to 40 and the sites have been assessed to chose Tyd014.</p> <p>The County Council Highways department support Tyd014. Lowgate has been improved and a suitable gap has been left for a junction with the required radii and visibilty splays.</p> <p>Anglian Water have advised that the proposed housing allocation in this area is expected to require improvements to the existing foul sewerage networks and water supply networks.</p> <p>The County Education Department has commented that there is sufficient primary school capacity available for developments proposed. There is limited secondary school capacity in first two years of plan, but an additional 1 to 2FE required over plan period - sufficient land for expansion. The closest sixth form is University Academy Holbeach - Sixth form capacity echoes capacity in the secondary schools which they are part of (no capacity available).</p>		<p>No change to the Local Plan is required.</p>		
Site Allocation Number:	Tyd014								
<p>Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is</p> <p>Legally Compliant <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Soun <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>		<p>Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:</p> <p>Positively Prepared <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Justified <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Effective <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Consistent with national policv <input type="checkbox"/></p>							
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 25: Tydd St Mary

with young children are concerned at the possibility that they may not be able to enrol their children at the school. Parking is already dangerous at drop off and pick up times. There is a very limited bus service and access to doctors and dental surgeries is between 4 and 6 miles away.

Post Title: 25: Tydd St Mary

Response Number	360	Respondent Number:	2366	Comment Author:	Mr Carl Wilson	Client		Web Link	
-----------------	-----	--------------------	------	-----------------	----------------	--------	--	----------	--

Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
-------------------	--	---------------	--	-----------------	------------------	-------------------------

Policy Number:		Map Number:	25
Site Allocation Number:	Tyd014		

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is		Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:	
Legally Compliant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Positively Prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sound	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Consistent with national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:	
--	--

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:	
--	--

Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------------	--------------------------

Why wish to participate	
-------------------------	--

I have lived in Tydd St. Mary since 1968 and have enjoyed the excellent quiet village life that it offers. I am writing to oppose the future building of circa 31 dwellings on land off Lowgate in Tydd St. Mary. This is not that I am in opposition of building for the future, but it is my view that there is more suitable land in Tydd St. Mary, down Rectory Road and Worlds End road. I have a number of concerns about the planned TYD014 development off Lowgate:-

1. It is expected that the increase in population - approximately 68 people (2.2 occupants in each of the 31 dwellings) linked with this proposed development would put extra strain on facilities over the life of the Plan.
2. UK wide there is an alarming shortage of GPs, nurses and other healthcare staff which could affect future capacity should demand increase. Healthcare in Long Sutton is already at capacity. It can take 2 weeks to gain an appointment with a GP currently and NHS Dentistry is not available locally. Wisbech is very much the same.
3. Tydd St Mary does not have enough open space to meet its residents needs already, so the additional population generated by this site and elsewhere in the settlement could increase use of local open space reducing their overall quality of life.
4. Local air and noise pollution is likely to increase with the new development through increased traffic, which together with the impact from other developments elsewhere in the area could have a negative impact on physical and mental health. Tydd St. Mary is already a 'rat run' for traffic that want to avoid the congested A17. This development will only add to that.
5. Tyd014 is outside the ideal walking distance of many of the area's services and facilities and public transport links which could have an adverse impact on social inclusion. Furthermore, there is a lack of potential employment opportunities in and around Tydd St Mary which may be problematic given that the long term unemployment rate in this area is above average.
6. The development would be likely to accommodate 31 dwellings (too many). On average every 5 homes of new housing generates 1 primary age pupil and every 7 new houses generates 1 secondary aged pupil. The development would therefore be likely to generate 6 primary pupils and 6 secondary pupils. The nearest primary school is Tydd St. Mary CofE School. I have been a Governor at Tydd St. Mary Church of England Primary School for many years, and the school is already full and

1 The County Council Highways department support Tyd014. Lowgate has been improved and a suitable gap has been left for a junction with the required radii and visibility splays. Anglian Water have advised that the proposed housing allocation in this area is expected to require improvements to the existing foul sewerage networks and water supply networks. The County Education Department has commented that there is sufficient primary school capacity available for developments proposed. There is limited secondary school capacity in first two years of plan, but an additional 1 to 2FE required over plan period - sufficient land for expansion. The closest sixth form is University Academy Holbeach - Sixth form capacity echoes capacity in the secondary schools which they are part of (no capacity available).

2 The CCG's have commented that currently there is some capacity at the local GP surgery(ies) to accommodate additional patients, however County wide there is an increasing shortage of GP's, nurses and other healthcare staff which could affect future capacity should demand increase. The planning system maybe able to provide new surgeries or extensions to existing surgeries. Staffing them is beyond our remit.

3 The site will be required to provide open space for its own needs in accordance with policy 28. Developers cannot be required to replace historic deficits.

4 Policy 26 is concerned with pollution but the most significant change to air quality will come from changes to emission standards or propulsion, which is a national issue. Controlling rat runs is not a local planning issue.

5 During the course of the consultations the number of dwellings being sort in Tydd Sy Mary has been reduced from 200 to 40 and the sites have been assessed to chose Tyd014.

6 see 1 above.

7 The developer will have to agree the drainage sytem with Anglian water and Lincolnshire County Council as the Lead Local Flood Authority.

8 The land at Worlds End (Tyd006) was not chosen owing to its poor relationship with the settlement. It

No change to the Local plan is required.

Post Title: 25: Tydd St Mary

is booked to be full for years to come.

7. Anglian Water considers that the foul sewerage network will require upgrading for it to receive foul water from the site. In addition, across South East Lincolnshire Anglian Water have commented that, in terms of the surface water network, there are major constraints to the provision of infrastructure and/or treatment. The 'Twigden' estate in the middle of the village still suffers major sewerage problems every time there is a significant downpour. The village simply cannot cope unless a major overhaul of the sewerage systems is undertaken. This MUST happen before any further development takes place in the village.

8. The proposal would lead to the permanent loss of approx. 1.54ha of grade 1 agricultural land. There is land near Worlds End which is substandard and would be more suitable.

9. Having lived in Tydd St Mary, adjacent to the proposed site, most of my life, I can inform you that the field floods badly during persistent rain. The water can sit there for up to three weeks. This, then causes the drain along Lowgate to become blocked. The drainage systems seem to struggle constantly as it is and the building of a further 31 houses, I feel would only make the problem worse.

It is my view that 31 new houses at location TYD014 would be the wrong decision. Flooding, loss of grade 1 agricultural land, lack of local facilities, etc, etc, (see above) would be the wrong choice for this village. Please listen to the local population and reconsider your plans. Failing that, reduce the number of dwellings to a maximum of 25 to minimise impact.

would require Tyd003 to be allocated to suitably round off the village, but Tyd003 was not allocated owing to its size, negative impact on the character of the village and conservation area in addition to its poor Sustainability Appraisal score.

9 See 7 above

Post Title: 25: Tydd St Mary

Response Number	497	Respondent Number:	2810	Comment Author:	Mr & Mrs Hilliam	Client		Web Link	
Paragraph Number:		Table/Figure:		Comment Content	Officer Comment:		Officer Recommendation:		
Policy Number:		Map Number:	25	We wish to put forward our strongest protest for the proposed building of several houses on the site on Lowgate Tydd St Mary. The field in question is very important and very fertile arable farmland. It should not be permanently buried under bricks and concrete. The access onto Lowgate Road from the site would create hazards having also already witnessed a collision at this point. The extra traffic and noise created by traffic will rob the present occupants of a peaceful existence stopping and starting. The extra load put onto the already overloaded sewerage system would create problems into the future. Serious thoughts should be given before this site is considered and rendered a blot on the landscape. Please keep Tydd St Mary an attractive smallish village. The traffic car lights coming out of the proposed site would shine directly into our sitting room and be annoying.	The County Council Highways department support Tyd014. Lowgate has been improved and a suitable gap has been left for a junction with the required radii and visibility splays. Anglian Water have advised that the proposed housing allocation in this area is expected to require improvements to the existing foul sewerage networks and water supply networks. During the course of the consultations the number of dwellings being sort in Tydd Sy Mary has been reduced from 200 to 40 and the sites have been assessed to chose Tyd014.		No change to the Local Plan is required.		
Site Allocation Number:	Tyd014	Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is Legally Compliant <input type="checkbox"/> Soun <input type="checkbox"/> Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							
Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:									
Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:									
Participate in Examination:	<input type="checkbox"/>								
Why wish to participate									

Post Title: 26: Weston

Response Number: 348 Respondent Number: 2802 Comment Author: Mr C Dicks Client: Web Link:

Paragraph Number: Table/Figure: Comment Content: Officer Comment: Officer Recommendation:

Policy Number: Map Number: 26 Site Allocation Number: The Village of Weston is spread over a vast area and has approximately 450 residential dwellings and is served by a small shop which doubles as the Post Office, a church which currently has no permanent vicar and a Primary School, (St Mary's) which can accommodate 56 pupils, but currently has 45, and only with permission of the Educational Authority could it be increased to 76. The only immediate businesses in Weston are Baytree Garden centre, The Fun Farm and Wimberley Farm Shop. The Local Plan suggests that up to 300 dwellings could be built on 4 plots of land, which have been deemed by SHDC as their 'preferred sites'. All but one of these sites is Prime Agricultural Land and if this plan should be implemented it would increase the village by some 69%, however with other smaller developments being passed by SHDC and land in Small Drove with 10 prefab style accommodation soon to be removed and a larger number of housing to be built, it is likely that the total number of residential dwellings that could be built will be in the region of 350 which then increase the size of Weston by 77%, which without the required infrastructure to support this number means the Plan is NOT SOUND. The White Paper delivered by the Government states that Infrastructure should be built alongside the building of new developments, but the S.E.L.L.P gives no detail of ANY infrastructure to be built. The S.E.L.L.P also has directly copied many paragraphs straight from the White Paper so should be aware that infrastructure is urgently required. I would suggest that with the current proposed building programme under the Local Plan Weston is in the position of being unsustainable due to the lack of current infrastructure or any detailed programme for infrastructure to built alongside any proposed developments. The other major flaw in this plan for Weston is that the Plan wishes to use Prime Agricultural Land at a time when Lincolnshire has been highlighted by Government Ministers as the main grower of produce for the whole of the United Kingdom. If this plan were to go ahead then this land would be lost forever and could impact on employment in the area of South Holland and then have a detrimental effect on food prices throughout the UK, let alone South Holland District. The report also mentions Neighbourhood Planning quoting the Localism Act 2011 whereby communities have the power to help decide on planning issues within their communities, however there is no evidence that any comments/suggestions and objections raised from past consultations have been

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

- Legally Compliant
- Sound
- Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate:

The Housing Paper for Weston indicates that commented that there is primary school capacity currently available. An extension to 0.5FE required in phase 2 of plan period requiring one additional classroom - land shortage would require additional playing fields. Secondary school capacity currently available at Spalding secondary schools which are closest to development. It is likely that capacity will fill as children cannot attend schools at Holbeach/Bourne/Deepings. A new secondary school is required in second phase of plan. The closest sixth form is in Spalding - Sixth form capacity echoes capacity in the secondary schools which they are part of (some capacity available). Anglian Water has commented that the surface water network capacity has major constraints and all sites should seek to reduce flood risk and incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems with connection to the sewer seen as the last option. They have also commented all of the proposed housing allocations in this area is expected to require improvements to the existing foul sewerage and water supply networks to enable development to come forward on these sites. The CCG's have commented that currently there is some capacity at the local GP surgery(ies) to accommodate additional patients, however County wide there is an increasing shortage of GP's, nurses and other healthcare staff which could affect future capacity should demand increase. Owing to the Council not having a 5 year land supply 2 of the 3 proposed housing allocations have planning permission, subject to a legal agreement being completed. The comments we have received have been considered and responded to in the January and July 2016 and January 2017 housing papers.

No change to the Local Plan is required.

Post Title: 26: Weston

taken into account, in fact genuine issues have been raised to SHDC, but appear to have been ignored in face of Government pressure for a housing programme. I accept that we need more housing but it needs to be sympathetically viewed, and not at the cost of losing prime agricultural land and jobs. This whole plan has come about due to SHDC locally failing to deliver its 5 year plan for housing requirements, and having attended several planning meetings as a member of the public, it is evident that many of the planning committee have little idea of Planning matters and have to be guided by either the planning officers or the Chairman, which means that Planning officers can influence committee members, hence certain applications get passed despite genuine objections which get ignored. I will be surprised if this email receives much interest by SHDC, but residents of Weston feel strongly over what is 'over development of their village, a response in time would be appreciated.