

# AGENDA



South East Lincolnshire  
Joint Strategic Planning Committee

- Committee - **SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE**
- Date & Time - Friday, 11 September 2015 at 10.00 am
- Venue - Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding

## **Membership of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee:**

South Holland District Council: Councillors B Alcock, P E Coupland and R Gambba-Jones (Chairman) (Substitutes: Councillors F Biggadike, M D Booth and M D Seymour)

Boston Borough Council: Councillors P Bedford (Vice-Chairman), C Brotherton and D Brown (Substitutes: Councillors B Rush, C Rylott and S Woodliffe)

Lincolnshire County Council: Councillors A Austin, M Brookes and C Davie (Substitutes: Councillors C J T H Brewis and C N Worth)

**Substitutions** – Substitute members will have full voting rights for individual meetings only; and Substitute members allowed to attend all meetings of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee to contribute but not vote.

**Terms of Reference** – The preparation, submission, adoption, monitoring and revision of joint local development documents identified in a joint local development scheme; and the preparation, submission, adoption, monitoring and revision of a joint local development scheme, in respect of those documents.

**A voting member who is unable to attend any meeting of the Joint Committee shall inform the Chair of the Joint Committee in writing as soon as practicable and in any event not later than 24 hours before the meeting is due to take place**

Democratic Services  
Council Offices, Priory Road  
Spalding, Lincs PE11 2XE

Persons attending the meeting are  
requested to turn their mobile telephones to  
silent

Date: 28 August 2015

## A G E N D A

1. Apologies for Absence.
2. Declaration of Interests.

(Councillors are reminded that under the Code of Conduct they are not to participate in the whole of an agenda item to which they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest. In the interests of transparency, councillors may also wish to declare any other interests that they have, in relation to an agenda item, that supports the Nolan principles detailed within the Code of Conduct.)

3. Minutes - To sign as a correct record the notes of the meeting of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee meeting held on 24 July 2015 (copy enclosed). (Pages  
1 - 4)
4. South East Lincolnshire Local Plan: Draft Local Plan (including site options for development) - To seek approval of the Draft Local Plan for the purpose of public consultation. (Report of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager enclosed.) (Pages  
5 - 24)
5. Any other items which the Chairman decides are urgent.

Note: No other business is permitted unless by reason of special circumstances, which shall be specified in the minutes, the Chairman is of the opinion that the item(s) should be considered as a matter of urgency.

Minutes of a meeting of the **SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE** held in the Council Chamber, Council Offices, Priory Road, Spalding, on Friday, 24 July 2015 at 10.00 am.

## PRESENT

P Bedford (Vice-Chairman, in the Chair)

B Alcock  
P E Coupland

C Brotherton  
A Austin

M Brookes

Head of Built Environment and Development (Boston Borough Council), Joint Policy Unit Manager (South Holland District Council), Strategic Planning Manager (South Holland District Council), Forward Planning Officer, Strategic Planning Manager (Lincolnshire County Council), Senior Planning Policy Officer (South Holland District Council), Planning Policy Officer (South Holland District Council), Sustainable Places Planning Specialist (Environment Agency), Planning Solicitor and Democratic Services Officer

In Attendance: Councillors M D Booth and C J T H Brewis.

Apologies for absence were received from or on behalf of Councillors R Gamba-Jones and C Davie.

### 8. **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

No interests were declared.

### 9. **MINUTES**

The minutes of the Annual General Meeting held on 19 June 2015 were signed by the Vice-Chairman as a correct record.

### 10. **SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE LOCAL PLAN: SPATIAL STRATEGY BACKGROUND PAPER**

Consideration was given to the report of the South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager which sought approval for the Spatial Strategy Background Paper to inform further work on the preparation of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan including future public consultation exercises.

In addition to the report, members were provided with a brief presentation on the Draft Spatial Strategy Background paper which covered the following areas:

- Committee Report
- Background Paper: Section 1.0
- Section 2.0 – Policy Context
- Section 3.0 – The Preferred Options
- Lincolnshire Coastal Study (LCS)
- Exploring implications for development in ROY Zones

**SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT  
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24**

July 2015

- Key issues in planning for housing growth and flood risk
- Preferred Approaches
- Section 4.0 – Revised Approach to Housing
- Section 5.0 – Evidence on Objectively Assessed Needs for Housing
- Separate Boston SHMA
- Links to other Economic Projections/Strategies
- Section 6.0 – New methodology for assessing settlements and their role in meeting development needs
- Revised Settlement Hierarchy Categories
- Classifying settlements within the Hierarchy
- Section 7.0 – The proposed settlement hierarchy

Members discussed the content of the report and presentation as follows:

- Confirmation was sought on the 80% and 13% figures relating to the Preferred Options cap on the proportion of additional dwellings that were to be accommodated in ROY Zones in Boston Borough and South Holland District respectively.
- The impact of the reduction in housing need in South Holland District signalled in the emerging update of the Peterborough Sub-Regional SHMA was noted, as it would make a significant difference to the amount of land that had to be allocated.
- The Peterborough Sub-Regional SHMA covered the areas of Peterborough City, South Holland District, South Kesteven District and Rutland County.
- The SHMAs were prepared in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance and formed the basis upon which housing need was determined.
- The four partner authorities had agreed not to offer-up part of their housing provision to, or seek further provision from, each other.
- The assessment of housing need had been informed by population and household forecasting.
- The location of the consultants needed to be shared with members.
- The settlement hierarchy provided flexibility in meeting the five-year housing land requirement.
- Settlement boundaries would be considered at the next Joint Committee meeting.
- Village plans would need to be taken into consideration.
- The settlement hierarchy would be subject to consultation.
- An additional recommendation was required to ensure that the Spatial Strategy Background Paper, once amended, be circulated to all Parish Clerks in South East Lincolnshire.
- Concerns were raised regarding the coloured summary document within the report which did not align with comments that had previously been made. An 'aide memoire' would be provided when the document was circulated more widely to parish councils.
- The wording of the Spatial Strategy Background Paper would be agreed by local councillors prior to being finalised.

**SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT  
STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE - 24**  
July 2015

- The Shoreline Management Plan would inform the consideration of measures to address the 'worst- case flood scenarios', including improvements to the sea defences where appropriate.

**DECISION:**

- a) That the content of the report and the Draft Spatial Strategy Background paper be noted;
- b) That the Draft Spatial Strategy Background paper be approved with amendments;
- c) That the final version of the Spatial Strategy Background paper form part of the published supporting documentation accompanying subsequent stages of Local Plan preparation; and
- d) That the Spatial Strategy Background paper, once amended, be circulated to all Parish Clerks in South East Lincolnshire.

(The Strategic Planning Manager (Lincolnshire County Council) left the meeting at 11.03 am and returned to the meeting at 11.06 am, during consideration of the above item.)

(Councillor M D Booth left the meeting at 11.14 am and returned to the meeting at 11.16 am, during consideration of the above item.)

**11. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN DECIDES ARE URGENT.**

Councillor Austin submitted her apologies for the Local Plan Steering Group meeting on 14 August 2015.

(The meeting ended at 11.25 am)

(End of minutes)

This page is intentionally left blank

## SOUTH EAST LINCOLNSHIRE JOINT STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Report of:** South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager

**To:** South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (the Joint Committee) - 11 September 2015

**(Author:** Gary Alexander, South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager)

**Subject:** South East Lincolnshire Local Plan: Draft Local Plan (including site options for development)

**Purpose:** To seek approval of the Draft Local Plan for the purpose of public consultation.

### **Recommendations:**

- 1) That Members consider the contents of this report and the associated Appendices A, B, C and D;
- 2) That Members agree to approve, in principle, the contents of Appendices A (subject to update), B, C and D, with or without revisions, for the purpose of public consultation;
- 3) That following 2) above, authority be delegated to officers to make any necessary changes to the content of Appendix B in respect of matters relating to presentation or factual correction or updating; and
- 4) That the final versions of Appendices C and D form part of the published supporting documentation accompanying subsequent stages of Local Plan preparation.

### **1.0 BACKGROUND**

- 1.1 At its meeting on 06 March 2015, the South East Lincolnshire Joint Strategic Planning Committee (the Joint Committee) resolved to approve its revised local development scheme (LDS)<sup>1</sup> and that it come into effect on 20 March 2015.
- 1.2 The revised LDS indicates that the preparation of the 'Draft Local Plan (including site options for development)' (the Draft Local Plan) would be undertaken in the period up to September 2015, and that public consultation on the Draft Local Plan would be undertaken in October and November of this year.
- 1.3 In order to meet these targets, Members are asked to consider the first of two reports relating to the approval of the contents of the Draft Local Plan for public consultation. The second report will be presented to the meeting of the Joint Committee to be held on Friday, 9 October 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> The LDS is basically a project plan that sets out key milestones in the preparation of the Local Plan and can be updated and amended as and when circumstances deem it appropriate.

- 1.4 This report is concerned with proposals for 'Policies Map insets' for all seventy-seven designated settlements in the proposed South East Lincolnshire settlement hierarchy (as set out in the recently-approved Spatial Strategy Background Paper<sup>2</sup>). For convenience, the proposed settlement hierarchy is reproduced as **Appendix A**. Also set out in **Appendix A** are housing targets for each of the designated Sub-Regional Centres, Main Service Centres and Minor Service Centres which have informed the work on site options for housing development (see Section 2.0 below).
- 1.5 Policies Maps are a necessary spatial expression of where particular policies and proposals will apply across the Local Plan area. At this stage in the Local Plan's production, their purpose is to indicate the future development options for various areas of land that may be suitable for inclusion in the Local Plan. It should be noted that for certain land uses (particularly residential land) not all the areas of land included will be required, and as the plan progresses, many of these will not be taken forward. In many cases this may be due to an oversupply of land for a particular use when considered against the plan target. Section 2.0 below sets this out in more detail.
- 1.6 The subsequent report scheduled for October will set out the accompanying draft policies and proposals and public consultation questions for Members to consider.

## 2.0 POLICIES MAP INSETS

- 2.1 The Policies Map insets (insets) form **Appendix B** to this report. Each of the insets for the designated Sub-Regional Centres, Main Service Centres and Minor Service Centres in the settlement hierarchy includes proposals for policy-area boundaries and 'site options' for housing development. Some of these insets also contain 'preferred site options'<sup>3</sup> for employment development. **NB:** It should be noted that a number of site options for housing development promoted by landowning/developer interests were deemed to be unsuitable for promotion through the Local Plan process (e.g. they were not adjacent to the settlement or were too big). Details relating to such sites will be made available during the public consultation exercise.
- 2.2 Each of the insets for the designated Sub-Regional Centres, Main Service Centres and Minor Service Centres is supported by a written statement explaining what progress has been made in meeting the settlement housing target to date, information on settlement infrastructure and information relating to individual site options.
- 2.3 The insets for the fourth tier in the settlement hierarchy, Other Service Centres and Settlements, only show policy-area boundaries as it is not intended to meet targets for housing provision or other types of development through allocating land in these settlements.
- 2.4 All these insets have been prepared having regard to the guidance provided by Members at the series of Local Plan Steering Group workshops held throughout 2014, along with initial work on Sustainability Appraisal.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Spatial Strategy Background Paper was approved for publication as supporting documentation to the preparation of the Local Plan by the Joint Committee at its meeting on 24 July 2015.

<sup>3</sup> The distinction between 'site options' and 'preferred site options' can be summarised as follows:

- Site options are presented for comment to inform the process of determining which of them should be rejected as unsuitable and which should continue to the next stage of plan preparation
- Preferred site options are those which, following due process, the Joint Committee now considers to be worthy of promotion in the 'Publication' version (i.e. the version of the Local Plan that will be submitted to the Secretary of State) but, nevertheless, is seeking further views. Preferred site options need to be supported by reasons for their selection and a summary of the alternatives that were also considered.



### 3.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE POLICIES MAP INSETS

3.1 It is appreciated that the seventy-seven insets set out in **Appendix B** present a large amount of information and detail for consideration, and therefore **it would not be feasible for the meeting to examine in minute detail every single inset**. However, it is important that the Joint Committee agrees that it is, in general, content with the proposals, as mapped, for the purposes of public consultation. To this end, the consideration and approval, with or without amendments, of the insets for public consultation is being managed in the manner set out below:

- Following electronic receipt of the Joint Committee papers, Members are requested, if possible, to examine the inset maps and submit any **initial** queries relating to them to officers by **9.00am on Monday, 7 September**.
- Those queries relating to settlements in Boston Borough should be addressed to Chris Holliday at [Christopher.Holliday@boston.gov.uk](mailto:Christopher.Holliday@boston.gov.uk) and those relating to settlements in South Holland District should be addressed to Karen Johnson at [karen.johnson@sholland.gov.uk](mailto:karen.johnson@sholland.gov.uk).
- To facilitate awareness of the publication of the Joint Committee papers, a set of hard copies of the seventy-seven insets have been placed in the Members' Room at both Boston Borough and South Holland District Councils; and **all** Boston Borough and South Holland District councillors will have been notified to this effect.
- As a result of the steps outlined above, early identification of issues should enable officers to tailor the proceedings of the Joint Committee meeting with a view to focussing upon the most pressing issues.
- At the meeting on 11 September, officers will present the findings of the Member responses to steer the discussion and also raise specific issues for which they require guidance. As indicated above, at this point in the Local Plan's preparation, officers are only seeking consensus on the general acceptability of the content of the insets for the purpose of public consultation. Following the consultation exercise, the views of the public and other key stakeholders will be reported back to Members as part of the consideration of the Draft Local Plan.

### 4.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

4.1 In support of the preparation of the seventy-seven insets, officers have prepared two further draft background papers. The first is on the definition of settlement boundaries (see **Appendix C**) and the second is on the identification of site options for housing development (see **Appendix D**). These are attached to inform the discussions at the meeting on 11 September.

### 5.0 OPTIONS

5.1 Members can choose to accept the contents of Appendices A (subject to update), B, C and D.

5.2 Alternatively, Members can suggest changes to the documents which would enhance their utility.

5.3 Finally, by not approving the documents (the 'Do Nothing' option), Members would lend uncertainty to the plan-preparation process which could lead to delays in meeting the Local Plan timetable agreed by the Joint Committee.

## 6.0 REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 The reasons for the recommendations are to provide local planning authority approval on the future course of Local Plan preparation.

## 7.0 EXPECTED BENEFITS

7.1 By approving the recommendations, Members will serve to support the preparation of the Local Plan in accordance with the published timetable.

## 8.0 IMPLICATIONS

### 8.1 Carbon Footprint / Environmental Issues

8.1.1 This report concerns the general location of future housing and other developments across South East Lincolnshire which will have implications for carbon footprint/ environmental issues.

### 8.2 Constitution & Legal

8.2.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

### 8.3 Contracts

8.3.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

### 8.4 Corporate Priorities

8.4.1 The completed South East Lincolnshire Local Plan will help to deliver corporate priorities relating to the development and use of land and buildings.

### 8.5 Crime and Disorder

8.5.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

### 8.6 Equality and Diversity / Human Rights

8.6.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications

### 8.7 Financial

8.7.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

### 8.8 Health & Wellbeing

8.8.1 It is the opinion of the Report Author that there are no implications.

---

Background papers:- None

---

#### Lead Contact Officer

Name and Post: Gary Alexander, South East Lincolnshire Joint Policy Unit Manager  
Telephone Number: 01775-764467  
Email: galexander@sholland.gov.uk

**This report refers to a Mandatory Service**

**Appendices attached to this report:**

Appendix A: South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy

Appendix B: Policies Map Insets

**To view these documents please use the following link:**

<http://southeastlincslocalplan.org/wordpress/11th-september-2015/>

Appendix C: Settlement Boundaries Background Paper

Appendix D: Housing Site Options Background Paper

This page is intentionally left blank

# Appendix A

## South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Settlement Hierarchy – including proposed distribution of housing provision to meet Objectively-Assessed Housing Need (OAHN)

Settlement hierarchy	
	Housing target
<b>SUB-REGIONAL CENTRES</b>	
Spalding	7,450
Boston (incl. parts of Fishtoft and Wyberton Parishes)	5,900
<b>MAIN SERVICE CENTRES</b>	
Holbeach	1,750
Long Sutton	750
Kirton (incl. parts of Frampton Parish)	500
Crowland	500
Donington	500
Pinchbeck	250
Swineshead	400
Sutterton	300
Sutton Bridge	250
<b>MINOR SERVICE CENTRES</b>	
Gosberton	300
Moulton	250
Surfleet	200
Weston	300
Moulton Chapel	200
Whaplode	200
Wrangle	100
Bicker	50
Fleet Hargate	150
Quadring	150
Tydd St Mary	150

<b>Cowbit</b>	100
<b>Deeping St Nicholas</b>	100
<b>Fishtoft</b>	50
<b>Gedney Church End</b>	100
<b>Gedney Hill</b>	100
<b>Gosberton Clough/Risegate</b>	50
<b>Old Leake</b>	100
<b>Sutton St James</b>	100
<b>Tydd Gote</b>	100
<b>Butterwick</b>	70
<b>Wigtoft</b>	30
<b>OTHER SERVICE CENTRES AND SETTLEMENTS (No housing targets)</b>	
<b>Algarkirk</b>	<b>Langrick Bridge</b>
<b>Amber Hill</b>	<b>Leake Commonsides</b>
<b>Benington</b>	<b>Leverton</b>
<b>Fleet Church End</b>	<b>Little Sutton</b>
<b>Fosdyke</b>	<b>Lutton &amp; Lutton Gowts</b>
<b>Frampton Church End</b>	<b>Moulton Seas End</b>
<b>Frampton West</b>	<b>Nene Terrace</b>
<b>Freiston</b>	<b>Northgate, West Pinchbeck</b>
<b>Gedney Black Lion End</b>	<b>Saracens Head</b>
<b>Gedney Dawsmere</b>	<b>Shepeau Stow</b>
<b>Gedney Drove End</b>	<b>Surfleet Seas End</b>
<b>Gedney Dyke</b>	<b>Sutton St Edmund</b>
<b>Haltoft End</b>	<b>Swineshead Bridge</b>
<b>Holbeach Drove</b>	<b>Throckenholt</b>
<b>Holbeach Hurn</b>	<b>Tongue End</b>
<b>Holbeach St Johns</b>	<b>Weston Hills Austendyke</b>
<b>Holbeach St Marks</b>	<b>Weston Hills St Johns</b>
<b>Holland Fen</b>	<b>Whaplode Drove</b>
<b>Hubbert's Bridge</b>	<b>Whaplode St Catherine</b>
<b>Kirton End</b>	<b>Wrangle Common</b>
<b>Kirton Holme</b>	<b>Wyberton Church End</b>

**NB:** The proposed housing provision figures for the Boston Borough settlements have been revised in accordance with the latest OAHN derived from the Boston Borough Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Revisions to the proposed distribution throughout the South Holland District settlements will follow when the updated SHMA for that area has been finalised.

**Appendix B** provides maps for each of the above settlements together with background notes on how site options have been selected where applicable.

# **Appendix C**

## **Settlement Boundaries Background Paper**

## **1.0 Introduction**

- 1.1 This background paper outlines the approach to settlement boundaries that has been included in the draft South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The work is linked to the identification of the settlement hierarchy and the sustainability of settlements – a separate background paper<sup>1</sup> provides details on these strands of work. This background paper briefly describes the national and local policy background that has informed the definition of settlement boundaries. It also details the approach undertaken by the Joint Policy Unit in reviewing settlement boundaries, including the various workshops that were held with Members during 2014 to consider this work.

## **2.0 Policy Background**

### ***National Policy***

- 2.1 National policy remains largely silent on any specific requirement for settlement boundaries. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) do identify the need for certain specific policy boundaries, with town centres for retail-planning purposes and Green Belt being the main areas that feature.
- 2.2 It therefore falls to local planning authorities (LPAs) to consider what is appropriate in terms of development within various settlements and the resultant need for specific boundaries around settlements.

### ***Local Policy***

- 2.3 Settlement boundaries feature in the extant local plans for Boston Borough (1999)<sup>2</sup> and South Holland District (1998 and 2006)<sup>3</sup>. Each of the plans has a number of policies (primarily related to housing development and development within the open countryside) that implicitly refer to settlement boundaries defined on the proposals maps for the relevant plan. The general intention of the policies was to guide development to appropriate settlements thereby promoting sustainable development patterns within Boston Borough and South Holland District.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Spatial Strategy Background Paper can be accessed from the following website link -

<sup>2</sup> The Boston Local Plan (1999) can be accessed from the following website link -  
<http://www.boston.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=3736>

<sup>3</sup> The South Holland Local Plan (2006) can be accessed from the following website link -  
<http://www.sholland.gov.uk/environment/plandev/localplan/South+Holland+Local+Plan+2006.htm>



## 3.0 Methodology

### *Settlement Hierarchy*

- 3.1 The development of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (the Local Plan) has afforded the opportunity to consider existing settlement boundaries within the extant local plans. The work has direct links to the emerging spatial strategy for the Local Plan including an assessment of the settlement hierarchy and the sustainability of individual settlements. The work undertaken on deriving a new settlement hierarchy is briefly described below.
- 3.2 The approach to deriving an amended settlement hierarchy is set out in full in the previously-mentioned Spatial Strategy Background Paper. In summary settlements were considered within a classification covering Sub-Regional Centres, Major Service Centres, Minor Service Centres (previously Service Villages) and Other Service Centres and Settlements. **NB:** Outside of these four tiers of settlement, the rest of the Local Plan area is designated as 'Countryside'. As well as tracts of open countryside, this area includes a variety of smaller settlements and other developments. A separate policy approach applies to development proposals for sites situated in the Countryside.
- 3.3 In order to inform developers and the community as to where the settlement is defined as opposed to the Countryside, it was considered that having a settlement-boundary line provided the clearest approach.

### *Settlement Boundary Definition*

- 3.4 It is important to note at the outset that the purpose of settlement boundaries is to define where particular Local Plan policies apply. In effect, they are defining where the Countryside policy (which covers the majority of the Local Plan area) ends and where other policies relating to Sub-Regional Centres, Main Service Centres, Minor Service Centres and Other Service Centres and Settlements start. Consequently, a settlement boundary is **not** intended to include all the buildings within the immediate vicinity of the settlement. This means that a settlement boundary does not necessarily include all the dwellings and other developments that may be locally regarded as part of a given settlement; and this is often because there is a discernible open gap between the main body of the settlement and an outlying property.
- 3.5 For the Sub-Regional Centres, Main Service Centres, Minor Service Centres and Other Service Centres and Settlements, each settlement boundary has been defined having regard to the following guidelines:

- a) The settlement boundary encloses the main built-up area (or areas, in the case of a few settlements) of the town or village.
- b) The settlement boundary also encloses:
  - i. areas of amenity and/or recreational open space, the appearance and character and/or use of which is worthy of protection; and
  - ii. sites with planning permission for development situated on the edge of the main built-up area.
- c) In general settlement boundaries have been defined using discernible features on the ground (e.g. a road-line or drainage ditch), most of which will be mapped. It should be noted that a land-ownership boundary does not necessarily form a good definition for where a specific approach to planning policy for development should apply.

3.6 To aid decisions on defining settlement boundaries for those settlements categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements, the Joint Policy Unit undertook an internal consultation workshop with Members of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Steering Group (SELLPSG) to consider and agree potential changes to settlement boundaries. The briefing note sent out in advance of the workshop and a note of the workshop proceedings are attached as Appendix 1 of this background paper.

#### **4.0 Conclusion**

4.1 The output from the review of settlement boundaries is a series of maps setting out the proposed boundaries that will be consulted upon in autumn 2015.

## **Appendix 1**

### **Notes from South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Steering Group - Workshop 5 (held on Friday, 17 October 2014)**

#### **Briefing Note for Workshop 5:**

#### **Other Service Centres and Settlements – Boundary definition/review**

At Workshop 3, held on 4 July 2014, the Steering Group agreed a revised 'settlement hierarchy' for South East Lincolnshire on which to base more detailed work on the Local Plan.

As part of this work, the Steering Group proposed a review of each of the smaller settlements in the settlement hierarchy, defined as 'Other Service Centres and Settlements', to assess potential for infill development and where the settlement boundary might be defined.

For the purposes of the site survey work the previously or currently defined settlement boundaries from the SHDC or BBC Local Plans were used as a starting point.

Please note, as there are over 40 settlements to consider it is impractical to discuss every settlement in detail. So, for the purposes of this workshop, several issues for discussion will be highlighted so that the Steering Group can consider whether the general policy approach for these smaller settlements needs to be refined.

Examples of the issues will be illustrated by reference to maps of the settlements at the Workshop and Members are invited to consider whether they would like any particular settlement to be discussed.

#### **Broad issues for discussion:**

No boundaries - settlements considered too small, isolated, with poor services and/or no infill opportunities:

- Algarkirk
- Frampton Church End
- Gedney Dawsmere
- Langrick Bridge
- Nene Terrace
- Throckenholt
- Tongue End

Retain boundaries but with significant changes – removal of boundary for part of settlement **or** potential for change where non infill development would be encouraged:

- Fleet Church End
- Frampton West
- Holbeach Hurn
- Lutton & Lutton Gowts
- Saracen's Head
- Shepeau Stow
- Amber Hill\*
- Fosdyke\*
- Freiston\*
- Holbeach Drove\*
- Holbeach St. John's\*
- Holbeach St. Mark's\*
- Swineshead Bridge\*

\* These are the settlements which raise issues of a potential boundary definition which might result in non-infill development. It is intended to have more in-depth discussion on these settlements.

Retain boundaries but with no, or minor changes and minimal opportunities for infill development:

- Benington
- Gedney Black Lion End
- Gedney Drove End
- Gedney Dyke
- Haltoft End
- Holland Fen
- Hubbert's Bridge
- Kirton End
- Kirton Holme
- Leverton
- Little Sutton
- Leake Commonside
- Moulton Seas End
- Northgate West Pinchbeck
- Surfleet Seas End
- Sutton St. Edmond
- Weston Hills (Austendyke)
- Weston Hills St. Johns
- Whaplode Drove

- Whaplode St. Catherine
- Wrangle Common
- Wyberton Church End

### Note of Workshop 5 Discussion

#### 3. Other Service Centres and Settlements – Boundary definition/review (led by Chris Holliday)

- Members commented on potential confusion about the role of settlement boundaries. Following further discussion, it was agreed, firstly, to **retain** those settlements (i.e. Algarkirk, Frampton, Church End, Gedney Dawsmere, Langrick Bridge, Nene Terrace, Throckenholt and Tongue End), which had been proposed for deletion from the proposed list of Other Service Centres and Settlements and, secondly, to **retain** their existing settlement boundaries (as defined in current local plans).
- There was discussion on a second group of Other Service Centres and Settlements i.e:
  - Fleet Church End
  - Frampton West
  - Holbeach Hurn
  - Lutton & Lutton Gowts
  - Saracen's Head
  - Shepeau Stow
  - Amber Hill\*
  - Fosdyke\*
  - Freiston\*
  - Holbeach Drove\*
  - Holbeach St. John's\*
  - Holbeach St. Mark's\*
  - Swineshead Bridge\*
- Agreement was reached on accepting the proposed approach in respect of the settlements without an asterisk, i.e. remove part of the boundary where considered inappropriate; except for Holbeach Hurn, where an additional boundary would be created in addition to another stretch being lost.
- Of those settlements with an asterisk, it was agreed that each of Holbeach Drove, Holbeach St John's, Holbeach St Marks and Fosdyke would have its boundary reviewed in order to provide an opportunity for a small-scale affordable housing development.

- It was agreed that no amendments would be made to the boundaries of the third and final group of Other Service Centres and Settlements, i.e:
  - Benington
  - Gedney Black Lion End
  - Gedney Drove End
  - Gedney Dyke
  - Haltoft End
  - Holland Fen
  - Hubbert's Bridge
  - Kirton End
  - Kirton Holme
  - Leverton
  - Little Sutton
  - Leake Commonsides
  - Moulton Seas End
  - Northgate West Pinchbeck
  - Surfleet Seas End
  - Sutton St. Edmond
  - Weston Hills (Austendyke)
  - Weston Hills St. Johns
  - Whaplode Drove
  - Whaplode St. Catherine
  - Wrangle Common
  - Wyberton Church End

# Appendix D

## HOUSING SITE OPTIONS BACKGROUND PAPER

### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This background paper provides a brief explanation of how the housing site options shown on the inset maps, which form **Appendix B** to the Joint Committee report, have been identified.

### 2.0 Methodology

#### *Meeting the residual requirement*

- 2.1 The starting point for each settlement was the proposed housing provision figure previously approved by the Local Plan Steering Group for the purpose of meeting the respective housing targets for Boston Borough and South Holland District (see **Appendix A** to the Joint Committee report). From that figure was deducted the number of dwellings built since 1st April 2011 and the number of dwellings with planning permission as at 31st March 2015. This resulted in a 'residual requirement' – the number of dwellings which currently need to be provided in the form of Local Plan allocations.
- 2.2 The amount of land that is needed to provide these dwellings obviously depends on the density at which the sites are built and the assumptions that have informed the process are as follows:
- in the two Sub-Regional Centres, each gross hectare will deliver 30 dwellings; and
  - in the Main Service Centres and Minor Service Centres, each gross hectare will deliver 20 dwellings.

It should be noted that changes to these assumptions would potentially have major effects upon the area of land required.

- 2.3 It is also important to remember that - at this stage - officers have not been seeking to identify which sites will be allocated in the Local Plan. Rather, they have been trying to identify the sites which are possible options for allocation. This means that, ideally, there is a wish to identify sites that will accommodate significantly more housing than is set out as the residual requirement. These

options can then be the subject of a public consultation exercise, the results of which can be used to inform decisions on which ones should proceed to the next stage of Local Plan preparation.

### ***Identifying options***

- 2.4 The first stage of identifying possible options for sites was to consider the land put forward by landowning and other interests in response to the two 'calls for sites' - the first in 2011 and the more recent in 2014 - which have formed part of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) process. Across the Local Plan area, these have amounted to about 850 sites in all. However, in many settlements, officers have determined that all the sites that are contenders for allocation have not been submitted. Where this has been the case, officers have identified the owners of these parcels of land and have written to invite them to put their sites forward for possible development if so wish.
- 2.5 It has also often been the case that people have submitted everything they own, and as a consequence have sometimes put forward very large areas of land which, in terms of potential dwellings, would significantly exceed the residual requirement or would dominate the settlement. If there has been the potential for part of one of these sites to work better, officers have contacted the owners to check that they would be happy for a reduced site to be considered.

### ***Assessing developability***

- 2.6 Each site has been assessed, as is required by Government guidance, in three broad ways:
- availability;
  - achievability; and
  - suitability.

These criteria are explained below.

- 2.7 For availability, the issue is whether there is knowledge of any legal or ownership issues that might prevent the site's development. Generally, a site is considered to be available as long as its owner has notified that it will be released for development in a timely fashion. A site owned by a house builder should suggest greater certainty in this regard.
- 2.8 For achievability, the issue is whether there is confidence that the site will be developed during the period of the Local Plan (which, in the case of South East Lincolnshire, is 2011-2036). Basically, this hinges on whether its development is likely to be financially viable within this period.



2.9 For suitability, the issue is whether the development of the site would contribute to the creation of sustainable, mixed communities. To this end, officers looked at:

- environmental impacts – would it harm natural or historic assets, and would it harm the amenity, character or appearance of the area?
- infrastructure – would it lead to the loss of open space, employment land, community facilities, etc? Would it place undue burdens on infrastructure?
- site location – is it close to jobs, shops, schools, healthcare, open space, etc? Is it within or adjacent to the settlement?
- site characteristics – does it have amenity value? Is it good-quality agricultural land? Is it previously-developed land? Are there any nearby ‘bad neighbour’ uses?
- transport – would it create or worsen traffic problems? Are there pedestrian, cycle and public transport links to jobs, shops, schools, etc? For Boston and Spalding, sites were assessed in respect of their potential to contribute directly to the delivery of transport infrastructure identified in the Local Transport Plan (i.e. the Spalding Western Relief Road and Boston Distributor Road).

2.10 If a site was assessed as unavailable, unachievable or unsuitable, it was classed as **undevelopable** and has proceeded no further in the process of identifying options. Many sites were eliminated from further consideration because, for example, they were not adjacent to the settlement, were too big, or sought to extend a settlement beyond a physical feature which currently constitutes a strong ‘limit’ to its growth.

2.11 If a site was assessed as available, achievable and suitable, it was classed as **developable**. These were the sites from which options were chosen. For most settlements, the process of site-assessment has resulted in the identification of site options with a total dwelling capacity that comfortably exceeds the residual requirement. The handful of settlements where this is not the case are all situated in South Holland District and these will be the subject of further investigations.

### ***The role of flood risk***

2.12 This background paper has so far made no mention of flood risk. This is because flood risk has not been used as part of the assessment of suitability. Instead, for every developable site, officers have identified the flood zone (1, 2, 3a or 3b), the flood hazard (no hazard, low hazard, danger for some, danger for most or danger for all), and flood depth (no hazard, 0-0.25m, 0.25-0.5m, 0.5-1.0m, 1-2m, and >2m). Where future decisions on the choice between sites

have to be made, flood risk will be an important factor, with the lowest risk being chosen (all other things being equal).

***Other considerations***

2.13 Another important consideration is that account has been taken of the general desirability to identify a number of smaller sites in any given settlement, rather than one large site. This is because several smaller development proposals:

- will usually integrate better into the settlement character;
- will usually give a better spread of development over the Local Plan period, rather than a single site potentially being built out in five years; and
- in terms of delivery, represent a 'safer bet' than being dependent on all going well with a single site.