

Identifying potential housing sites in Boston

The Requirement - the emerging Local Plan seeks the development of approximately 5,900 dwellings at Boston between 2011 and 2036.

Completions – 350 new homes were built in Boston between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2015.

Commitments – as at 31st March 2015, planning permission was outstanding for the construction of 1,276 dwellings in Boston. Furthermore, the Borough Council's Planning Committee has resolved to grant planning permission for the development of three additional sites, which would deliver a further 479 dwellings. These are:

- Fis014 and Fis015 – 340 dwellings to the west of Toot Lane (B/14/0103);
- Fis031 – 79 dwellings to the east of Toot Lane (B/14/0210); and
- Sou007 – up to 60 dwellings at former Norton Lea NHS site, London Road (B/15/0009)

There is no evidence to suggest that these planning permissions and three further sites will not be implemented during the Plan period.

Residual requirement - thus, the identification of land to accommodate approximately 3,795 dwellings is required.

Education – the County Education Department has commented that there is a lack of capacity at primary and secondary level. Growth of this scale could not be accommodated by the expansion of existing schools, and new facilities would therefore be required.

Flood risk – the Environment Agency has made the following comments:

- Allocations in areas of hazard would need to ensure that finished floor levels (FFL) are raised to the appropriate level with additional flood resilient construction incorporated into proposals. Developers would need to confirm that they can achieve the required mitigation and that their proposals would still be deliverable.
- Flood Risk Mitigation Policy to ensure 'safe' development. FFL should be informed by the predicted flood depth maps and set as required below:
 - depths of >1.6m It is unlikely that mitigation measures would prevent flood water from entering the building at ground floor level. Therefore, proposals must be a minimum 2 storey with no ground floor habitable accommodation. The first floor living accommodation shall be above the highest predicted flood depth.
 - depths of 1-1.6m Proposals must be a minimum 2 storey, with FFL set a minimum of 1m above ground level, flood resilient construction shall

be used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level, demountable defences to 600mm above FFL.

- depths of 0.5-1m FFL to be set 1m above ground level, flood resilient construction shall be used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level, (single story proposals must consider the 0.1% + climate change event for setting FFL)
- depths of 0.25-0.5m FFL to be set 500mm above ground level, flood resilient construction shall be used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level.

Anglian Water has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and that all developments should seek to reduce flood risk and incorporate Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). They indicate that surface water may not be discharged to the public foul sewerage network, and that no new surface water flow will be permitted to discharge to the combined network.

Sewage Treatment – Anglian Water has commented that most sites would be served by the Boston Water Recycling Centre (Sewage Treatment Works), which has adequate capacity to accommodate the sites which might potentially use it. Sites to the south of the town would be served by the Frampton Water Recycling Centre, which would require upgrades to its treatment capacity to accommodate any new sites. Sites to the east of the town would be served by the Fishtoft Water Recycling Centre which would require upgrades to its treatment capacity to accommodate larger sites.

Enhancements to the capacity of the foul sewerage network may be required to accommodate the development of most sites.

Water Supply – Anglian Water has commented that, whilst water resources are adequate to serve the proposed growth, upgrades to the supply network may be required to serve some sites.

Site types – it may be useful to think in terms of three different sizes of sites:

- Major Urban Extensions (1,000+ dwellings) – potentially long lead-in periods, but more capable of delivering strategic infrastructure.
- Large Housing Sites (200-999 dwellings)
- Smaller Housing Sites (10-199 dwellings) – potentially capable of immediate development, but unlikely to contribute significantly to the provision of infrastructure

Developable sites

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment identifies the following sites at Boston which:

- do not have a residential planning permission (or are not subject to a Committee resolution to grant permission);
- are assessed as developable, or are undevelopable only as a consequence of availability issues; and
- will deliver 10 or more dwellings.

MAJOR URBAN EXTENSIONS (> 1,000 DWELLINGS)

Site	Flood Zone	Flood Hazard (2115)	Flood depth (2115)	Capacity	Notes
Fen009	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	1,717	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low flood risk • Could contribute directly towards the provision of a Distributor Road • Most boundaries are defined by strong physical features, and it has a good relationship to the town • The site appears to be in at least 13 separate ownerships • The owners of 25% of the site have not been identified or have not yet confirmed that their land is available for development • No developer involved • Highway Authority comments - development of this land would be likely to cause significant capacity issues at the junctions of Langrick Rd with Fenside Rd, and Fenside Rd with Argyle St/Brothertoft Rd. A Transport Assessment of the capacity of the local highway network is required.
Fen011	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	1,718	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low flood risk • Could contribute directly towards the provision of a Distributor Road • The site appears to be in 6 separate ownerships • The owners of more than 50% of the site have not yet confirmed that their land is available for development • No developer involved • The site has a poorer relationship to the town than many others, & realistically it could be developed only following Wes002 or Fen009 • Highway Authority comments - vehicular access from North Forty Foot Bank and Middle Drove would not be acceptable. Frontage footway and drainage works

					would be required on Punchbowl Lane. A Transport Assessment of the capacity of the local highway network is required.
Nor013	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	3,339	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low flood risk • The site appears to be in 6 separate ownerships • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • Highway Authority comments - access off either A16 or A52 would probably require a roundabout – access off Burton Corner is highly unlikely to be acceptable. If the access came off the A16, a new roundabout at the existing junction with Pilley's Lane may be appropriate. A roundabout off the A52 at the eastern end of the site would need to be co-ordinated with the Willoughby Hills junction. A Transport Assessment of the capacity of the local highway network is required. • The owners of most of the site have not yet confirmed that their land is available for development • No developer involved • The site does not relate as well to the existing town as other sites
Nor014	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	1,879	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low flood risk • Could contribute directly towards the provision of a Distributor Road • All boundaries are defined by strong physical features, and it has a good relationship to the town • The owners of 15% of the site have not yet confirmed that their land is available for development • The site appears to be in 4 separate ownerships • No developer involved • The site is bisected by a railway line • Highway Authority comments - it is likely that the proportion of traffic that would travel southwards along Tattershall Rd would not be capable of being accommodated at the Sluice Bridge junction in particular. Extensive work would be required on Green Lane, Tattershall Rd, Redcap Lane and Rawsons Lane to make them suitable to

					provide access. A Transport Assessment of the capacity of the local highway network is required.
Wit013	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	1,719	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low flood risk • Could contribute directly towards the provision of a Distributor Road • The site appears to be in at least 7 separate ownerships • The owners of 40% of the site have not yet confirmed that their land is available for development • The site does not relate as well to the existing town as other sites • No developer involved • Highway Authority comments – given its size and location, development of this site could not be considered without a comprehensive Transport Assessment. The suggested 1,730 dwellings would attract a lot of vehicle movements which would be expected to have a materially harmful impact upon, in particular, Redcap Lane, Rawsons Lane and Sluice Bridge junction.
Fis017	3a	Danger for most	1.0 – 2.0	2,300	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that the site is available for development • Good relationship to the existing town • Poorer flood risk • Possible developer involvement • Site layout will need to take account of the presence of a pumping station & and sewer crossing the site • May require upgrades to the water supply network • May require enhancement to the Water Recycling Centre • The foul sewerage network is likely to require significant additional capacity • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • Highway Authority comments - access off Wainfleet Road would probably require the formation of a roundabout. Access and development on the Rochford Tower Lane frontage would require a frontage footway and drainage. Any access onto Blackthorn Lane should

					be modest in size and not a through route. A Transport Assessment of the capacity of the local highway network is required.
Nor012	3a	Danger for most	1.0 – 2.0	1,742	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All boundaries are defined by strong physical features, and it has a good relationship to the town • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road • The site appears to be in 6 separate ownerships • The owners of 30% of the site have not yet confirmed that their land is available for development • Poorer flood risk • No developer involved • Highway Authority comments - only modest development could be served from Willoughby Rd, and a high capacity junction (such as a roundabout) would be required off the A16. A roundabout here would have a significant impact upon the large residential properties on the opposite side of the road. Pedestrian access would involve walking alongside the busy A16 for some distance. A Transport Assessment of the capacity of the local highway network is required.
Fis023	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	1,437	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • The site is in 9 separate ownerships • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer & water main which cross the site • May require upgrades to the water supply network • May require enhancement to the Water Recycling Centre • The foul sewerage network is likely to require significant additional capacity • Highway Authority comments - access should be achievable onto both Toot Lane and White House Lane, and it is suggested that these roads be linked together to provide connectivity and alternative routes for travel. A Transport Assessment of the capacity of the local

					<p>highway network is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorest flood risk • No developer involved • Poorer relationship to the town
Sou006	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	1,900	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer involved • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road • Good relationship to the town, although its southern boundary does not relate to any physical feature • The site is in multiple ownerships • May require upgrades to the water supply network • Significant new sewerage infrastructure would be required • Highway Authority comments – the impacts of this site require consideration by means of a full Transport Assessment. This site seeks to deliver a route linking the A16 with the A52 and possibly A1121 and the strategic nature of such a road would need traffic modelling. There are highway frontages onto Chain Bridge Rd and West End Rd, and these roads are unsuitable to provide the sole means of access. • Poorest flood risk
Wes002	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	1,378	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road • Developer involved • Poorest flood risk • Southern and western boundaries do not follow strong physical features, and the site does not relate as well to the existing town as other sites

- 10 sites
- Total capacity of 19,129 dwellings

LARGE HOUSING SITES (200-999 DWELLINGS)

Site	Flood Zone	Flood Hazard (2115)	Flood depth (2115)	Capacity	Notes
Fen006	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	240	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of MUE Fen009 • P.p. for inland waterways marina • Relatively low flood risk • All of the owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road • Its boundaries follow strong physical features, and it has a good relationship to the town • The site is in 3 separate ownerships • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer & water main which cross the site • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • No developer involved • Highway Authority comments – the existing highway infrastructure is not suitable to serve residential development of this scale without some fairly significant structural improvement, widening, footway and drainage provision. It is doubtful that the economic yield on 160 dwellings would be sufficient to cover the cost of the required infrastructure improvements.
Fen014	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	501	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of MUE Fen009 • Relatively low flood risk • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road • Its boundaries follow strong physical features, and it has a good relationship to the town • The site appears to be in 5 separate ownerships • The owner of 25% of the site has not yet confirmed that their land is available for development • Highway Authority comments – access off Punchbowl Lane could be achievable with footway and drainage works. Access off Fenside Road would require some carriageway widening, footway and drainage works. Access off Washdyke Lane would not be

					<p>acceptable, without substantial improvement works (and probable total reconstruction) being undertaken. A through route between Punchbowl Lane and Fenside Rd might be beneficial. A Transport Assessment of the capacity of the local highway network is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No developer involved
Fis001	3a	Danger for most	1.0 – 2.0	224	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • Surrounded by existing development on 3 sides and has a very good relationship to the town • Poorer flood risk • The site is in 4 separate ownerships • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer & water main which cross the site • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • No developer involved • Highway Authority comments – the introduction of the lower standards for junction visibility splays in Manual for Streets will have made it more likely that a new junction onto Lindis Rd to serve this site may now be possible. However, 224 dwellings are far too many to be safely served from a single point of access. Also the visibility to the right for drivers emerging from Lindis Rd into Freiston Rd/Eastwood Rd is very poor and the development of 224 dwellings on this site would increase the risk of conflicts at this junction.
Fis025	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	636	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of MUE Fis023 • P.p for 79 dwellings (B/14/0210) on northern parts of the site • All of the owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • The site is in 7 separate ownerships • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • No developer involved

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorest flood risk • Southern and eastern boundaries do not follow strong physical features, and the site does not relate as well to the existing town as other sites • Realistically the site could be developed only following Fis033
Fis033	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	569	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P.p. for 340 dwellings (B/14/0103) on northern parts of site • All of the owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • Very good relationship to the existing town • Highway Authority comments – main accesses should be from Toot Lane, with possible small scale extensions of Alcorn Green, Smalley Rd and Wing Drive (if there are no ransom strips) as culs-de-sac but no vehicular access through to Toot Lane. Pedestrian and cycle access to Toot Lane should however be provided. • The site is in 5 separate ownerships • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer & water main which cross the site • Poorest flood risk • No developer involved
Wes004	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	547	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for redevelopment • Developer involved • Good relationship to the town • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • Highway Authority comments – it is possible that Gilbert Drive and the roundabout onto Boardsides would be able to accommodate the traffic movements from 547 dwellings on this site. North Forty Foot Bank is unsuitable to accommodate additional traffic movements. • Poorest flood risk

Wyb033	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	250	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • Its boundaries follow strong physical features, and it relates well to the existing town • The site is in 4 separate ownerships • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • May require enhancements to the capacity of the Water Recycling Centre • Highway Authority comments – to serve the suggested 250 dwellings, Tytton Lane would require some substantial improvement works (widening and overlaying of the carriageway, the provision of footways, kerbs, drainage and street lighting). 250 dwellings would be too great a number for a single point of access, but there appears to have been provision made for Stephenson Close to be extended into this site. • Poorest flood risk • No developer involved
--------	----	-------------------	--------------	-----	--

- 7 sites
- Total capacity of 2,967 dwellings

SMALLER HOUSING SITES (<199 DWELLINGS)

Site	Flood Zone	Flood Hazard (2115)	Flood depth (2115)	Capacity	Notes
Fen010	3a	Danger for most	0.25 – 0.5	65	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of large housing site Fen006 and MUE Fen009 • Lowest flood risk • Largely enclosed &, although its northern boundary does not follow strong physical features, it has a good relationship to the existing town • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road, but it is a very small site • All of the owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • Highway Authority comments – this site would be suitable for development of the suggested 65 dwellings as an extension of Puritan Way • The site is in multiple ownership • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer & water main which cross the site • No developer involved
Fen003	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	116	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of MUE Fen009 • Relatively low flood risk • Its character is dominated by existing development to the south and east, and it has a good relationship to the town • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road, but it is a small site • The owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • The site is in multiple ownership • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • Highway Authority comments – the frontage footway would need to be extended and a formal drainage system provided for Punchbowl Lane. Consideration should be given to vehicular connections to Fen001 and Fen014 and possibly a through route between Punchbowl Lane and Fenside Rd

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No developer involved
Fis002	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development • Relatively low flood risk • The site is contained by the town's built-up area • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer which crosses the site • No developer involved • Highway Authority comments – access into this site is severely compromised by the frontage hedge and the fact that the site is on the inside of a bend. For this site to be developed, the hedge would have to be removed and appropriate visibility splays formed. It is difficult to assess if safe access could be achieved while the hedge remains.
Fis038	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development • Relatively low flood risk • Surrounded on two sides by the existing built-up area, & development will have few impacts • Highway Authority comments – a development of 53 dwellings may be suitably accessed, although the footway on the west side of Church Green Rd would need to be extended across the frontage of some existing dwellings to provide a continuous route for pedestrians • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • May require upgrades to the water supply network • No developer involved
Nor006	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	71	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development • Relatively low flood risk • Largely enclosed by the town's built-up area – only distant views are available • Highway Authority comments - the potential access appears adequate in

					<p>width, and visibility is acceptable in both directions (although embankment works and relationship to an existing tree and street light would require careful consideration)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • No developer involved
Pil002	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for redevelopment • Relatively low flood risk • Within the town's built-up area • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • No developer involved
Pil005	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively low flood risk • Within the town's built-up area • No known ownership problems • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer which crosses the site • No developer involved
Pil006	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for redevelopment • Relatively low flood risk • Within the town's built-up area • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • No developer involved
Wit008	3a	Danger for most	0.5 – 1.0	36	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • Relatively low flood risk • Within the town's built-up area • Highway Authority comments – subject to suitable design of the road layout, redevelopment of this site would be acceptable without any material impact upon the local highway network • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • The owner has not yet confirmed that their land is available for redevelopment • Allocated employment land, although currently under-used • No developer involved

Fen001	3a	Danger for most	1.0 – 2.0	55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of MUE Fen009 and Large Housing Site Fen014 • Two owners • The site is visually contained by the existing built-up area and woodland • Could contribute directly to the provision of a Distributor Road, but it is a very small site • The owners have confirmed that their land is available for development • Highway Authority comments – in principle, this site could be developed for 55 dwellings but the opening between the existing properties appears tight and a survey should be undertaken to establish that the required junction and road geometry could be achieved. Existing telecoms infrastructure will require relocation or strengthening. Some thought should be given to creating vehicular links to Fen003 and Fen014, and even a through route to Punchbowl Lane • Poorer flood risk • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer which crosses the site • May require upgrades to the water supply & foul sewerage networks • No developer involved
Ski001	3a	Danger for most	1.0 – 2.0	87	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development • Within the town's built-up area • Poorer flood risk • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • No developer involved • Redevelopment would involve the loss of amenity open space and a football pitch
Wit005	3a	Danger for all	0 – 0.25	26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • Within the town's built-up area • Highway Authority comments – this site should be capable of accommodating 26 dwellings without any material impact upon the local highway network • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • The owner has not yet confirmed that

					<p>their land is available for development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poorer flood risk No developer involved
Cen001	3a	Danger for all	0.5 – 1.0	19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single owner The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development Within the town's built-up area Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly Site layout will need to take account of a sewer & a water main which cross the site Poorer flood risk No developer involved
Fen002	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	35	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within the town's built-up area Single owner The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly May require upgrades to the water supply network Highway Authority comments – safe and suitable access from Langrick Rd could be achieved into this site, although 35 dwellings may be ambitious for the size of the site. There is a street light that would need to be relocated but that should not be an insurmountable problem Poorest flood risk No developer involved
Fis003	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	90	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single owner The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development Enclosed by urban uses on three sides, and relates well to the town Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly Site layout will need to take account of a sewer & a water main which cross the site May require upgrades to the foul sewerage network Highway Authority comments – the White House Lane frontage is suitable to

					<p>provide safe access into this site. A frontage footway and drainage would be required on White House Lane. Ideally, there should be more than one point of access for 90 dwellings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorest flood risk • No developer involved
Sou001	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	99	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of large housing site Wyb033 • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development • The site is visually dominated by neighbouring residential development, & its development will not harm the area's character • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • Site layout will need to take account of a sewer & a water main which cross the site • May require upgrades to the foul sewerage network • Poorest flood risk • No developer involved
Wes001	3a	Danger for all	1.0 – 2.0	11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development • Within the town's built-up area • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • Site layout will need to take account of a water main and a sewer which cross the site • Poorest flood risk • No developer involved
Wyb013	3a	Danger for all	1.0 - 2.0	85	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single owner • The owner has confirmed that their land is available for development • Within the town's built-up area • Could contribute towards the provision of a Distributor Road only indirectly • Site layout will need to take account of a water main and a sewer which cross the site, and the presence of a pumping station • Highway Authority comments – access could be achieved via the existing main access off Wortleys Lane (perhaps with

					<p>some carriageway widening and highway improvements). The existing access off the A52 is potentially acceptable but, as a point of principle, it would be safer if access were taken from Wortley's Lane. It is possible that, with loss of possibly a couple of existing properties fronting the A52, this site could provide a route to a junction onto the A52 from the south-west quadrant of a Boston Distributor Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poorest flood risk • No developer involved • Currently used for employment, although not allocated as such
--	--	--	--	--	---

- 18 sites
- Total capacity of 894 dwellings