

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

Post_title: 08: Sutterton

ID1: 1367

comment_author: Longstaffs

comment_content:

we very much support the proposal to include sites Sut009, 010, and 011, as potential Housing sites. They are close to the village centre, and their development for housing will be able to support local services, and the village also links very well with transport services

Officer Comment:

The support for site Sut009 is welcomed.

The support for site Sut010 is welcomed. However this site was not been identified as a Potential Housing Site in its own right (it is part of site Sut009).

The support for site Sut011 is welcomed. Although this site is considered to be developable, it is not proposed to be identified as a Preferred Housing Site in its own right - it is, however, part of site Sut009.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut009 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut010 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut011 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1368 comment_author: Mr & Mrs Ramsden

comment content:

Oppose Sut027 on the following grounds; Loss of visual amenity Concerns over increased surface water. Concern that insurance industry could contend that they perceive an increased flood risk as a pretext to alter premiums and excesses, to my financial disadvantage. Noise during construction caused by earth moving equipment and the danger of mud on the roads in winter and dust in summer. An increase of traffic on the Wigtoft Road.

Officer Comment:

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that site Sut027 has weaknesses in terms of its visual impacts, namely that it would extend the built-up area significantly and that its southern boundary does not follow any existing feature. Nonetheless, the SHLAA concludes that its impacts upon the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable. Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. Issues concerning disturbance to neighbours during construction would apply equally to all alternative sites. The Highway Authority comments that "Wigtoft Road is suitable to serve residential development on this site and the frontage is large enough to accommodate the required junction and visibility splays." However, although site Sut027 is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be one of the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut027 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1369 comment_author: Aspbury Planning Limited

comment content:

Have submitted land for consideration for housing on behalf of Lincolnshire Diocese Trust & Board of Finance. It is part of Sut014. It fronts Station Road and is south of the Spires and three properties in Churchgate. It extends southwards to the Public footpath.

Officer Comment:

This site has been registered as Sut031. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies this land as being undevelopable because it would have adverse environmental impacts.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut031 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1371 comment_author: Mr J S Maltby

comment content:

Sut007 Oppose this and current appeal. Flooding to near residents if this plan is allowed to proceed. Security to near residents as it turns a garden into a public amenity with no management in place. Sewer/water and power lines cross the site. Encourages further development outside the village envelop (as outlined in Parish Plan) especially to Sut005 which is constantly water logged.

Sut005 Despite comments printed as Sut007 but worse. This site is already water logged and has no provision to contain extra water created by housing development.

Sut026 As above. This land adjoins the previous two sites. Concerns are the same.

Sut029 Support. Previous plans passed for commercial use. This is a good use of the land obviously not required for commercial use. Will not effect any current residents.

Sut003 as above to a lesser degree.

Sut009 As above.

According to the consultation Sutterton is a sustainable village. IT IS NOT. The village has one shop/PO of some 320sqft. The school is full and is predicted to be so for a number of years. The Drs can only take another 200 patients. The public transport is poor, only operating 8am to 6pm with no evening or weekend coverage. Residents find it difficult to use public transport to get to and from work due to the start and finish of this

Officer Comment:

Sut007 - Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. It is not accepted that the development of this site would create security issues for neighbouring residents. Pipes or cables crossing the site can be incorporated into a housing layout. Neighbouring land (sites Sut005 and Sut026) is already being considered as Potential Housing Site. However, although site Sut007 is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be one of the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut005 - Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. However, although site Sut005 is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be one of the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut007 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut005 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut029 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut003 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut009 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

No change to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy is necessary.

route. This will mean, if 300 houses are built, potentially 600 cars will come to the village. Speeding is documented via speed clocks supplied by Lincs Highways. Speeds of over 80mph have been recorded. With an extra 600 vehicles in the village this is an accident waiting to happen.

Sut026 - Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. It is not accepted that the development of this site would create security issues for neighbouring residents. Pipes or cables crossing the site can be incorporated into a housing layout. Whilst land to the east (sites Sut005 and Sut07) is already being considered as a Potential Housing Site, it is accepted that the northern and western boundaries to site Sut026 do not follow physical features. These boundaries are arbitrary, and there is the potential that its allocation might increase pressure for further development to the west and/or north. However, although site Sut026 is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be one of the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut029 - The support for site Sut029 is welcomed. However, although site Sut029 is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be one of the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut003 - The support for site Sut003 is welcomed. However, the SHLAA identifies this site as being undevelopable because a satisfactory vehicular access cannot be identified.

Sut009 - The support for site Sut009 is welcomed.

It is not agreed that Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy should be amended. The decision to identify it as a Main Service Centre took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area'" (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

1372

comment_author: Mrs Norma Grove

comment content:

I would like to offer comment on the recent consultation for the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan with particular regard to the area of Sutterton. My first point relates to the positioning of Sutterton as a sustainable area for development and how statistics have been used to inform this decision. Sutterton has seen the closure of a considerable number of facilities over recent years and this does not correlate with the information detailed in the results table for services and facilities which concludes Sutterton scores a total of 66 in relation to services and facilities. In truth Sutterton has only one general store and therefore the figure under this heading should read as 4 and not the score of 8 awarded to this section. Furthermore we no longer have a public house, The Thatch closing earlier this year and again therefore this score requires amendment to 0. Sutterton has been awarded a score of 4 in relation to Community hall's with 2 points per facilities. Sutterton has only one village hall, whilst this is made up of a lounge area and hall, it also forms part of a chance to share agreement and therefore availability of use of the larger hall is restricted to non term time only and outside school hours. A more realistic score of 2 is therefore applicable. Turning now to the score of 26 awarded in respect of playing areas for children in the village, I would question where there are 13 suitable areas for children to play. Firstly I note this does not include the children's designated play area where equipment is provided. I would like to draw your attention to the photographs below which clearly show this designated play area. You will see from these pictures how throughout winter months and in wet weather this area frequently floods and is not therefore

Officer Comment:

Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area'" (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

Site Sut006 - the SHLAA identifies this site as undevelopable, because of transport issues - the Highway Authority indicates that "whilst junction visibility splays may be achievable where this site abuts Boston Road, the bend in the road to the north of where the access would be prevents a driver turning right from the site from having sufficient visibility of on-coming

Officer Recommendation:

No change to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy is necessary.

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

an area children can make use of whenever they wish. Furthermore the following areas are included within identified playing fields: 1. Bellmere Duck pond - this is not a playing field. It is a fenced off, gated area for wildlife. 2. The grassed area behind what was The Thatch - part of this is privately owned by the owners of the Thatch building and does not constitute what can be referred to as a playing field. 3. The grassed area shown on Glebe Way, Eastfield Close - this land is privately owned by the residents and therefore is not available as a playing field 4. The first piece of grassed area on Monarchs Road - this has been clearly debated at a recent planning appeal that it is not suitable as a playing field due to its close proximity to the main B1397 and being surrounded on two sides by a main access road. It is therefore not a suitable area for play. 5. The piece of green land adjacent to the village boundary on Monarchs Road - this piece of open space lies behind private shared driveways and for this reason is not available as a playing field due to the issue of access over private owned driveways. 6. The smaller piece of green space on Monarchs Road - sight of this very small area of green space with a tree taking up most of the space will alert you to the fact that this is not a feasible playing space. 7. Area of green space on Park Avenue directly in front of the school - This piece of land is owned by Mayflower housing and they were approached some time ago to ask if it could be used as a play area for the children. We were very clearly told no as this was developable land for housing and it is as you will note fenced off for this reason. It is not a playing area. 8. Cemetery - It is wholly unacceptable to suggest a cemetery as an area which is suitable for children to play. You will note I have identified at least 8 areas which are incorrectly deemed to be playing fields and this alone equates to 16 points. The statistics

vehicles. Turning at this point would therefore be unsafe & the Highway Authority would not be agreeable to the formation of a new junction here”.

for Sutterton very clearly need to be re-visited. By my calculations alone Sutterton has at least 24 points incorrectly accredited to it. Sutterton is not a sustainable area for development. We do not have a bus service of a Sunday or Bank holiday and there are no facilities to travel by bus of an evening. The earliest you can arrive in Boston is 8.25am and you must depart by 17:45. We have no gas supply and there is a dependency on oil heating and the need for a motor vehicle if choosing to live in rural Sutterton.

I turn now to a particular piece of land proposed as a potential site for development that being Sut006. This was previously discounted as an area not deemed to be suitable for development. My first question would be what has changed? In truth nothing. There is no access to this land other than from the sharp bend of the B1397 where you will note there are warning indicators of being on a sharp bend and highlighting the need to slow down. The house opposite already has mirrors to assist with traffic and has been the site of many an accident in the past. During the 10 years I have lived in Sutterton I have seen cars enter the ditch on this bend and crash into the outbuildings or parked cars. It is without a doubt a dangerous bend. I recall the application being made for a drop curb onto this land and reassurance being given that it would be purely for agricultural reasons - quite simply traffic from a potential 80 homes entering and exiting onto this busy stretch of road on a blind bend would be fatal. There is a bus stop not too far from this bend where school children get on and off morning and night. I would also like to point out how this land is a high flood risk and I draw your attention to the photograph below clearly showing this land under water as is normal. This site is not a suitable area for development.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1373 comment_author: Miss Sally Minns

comment content:

Sut005, Sut007, Sut026 I object to these proposed development sites as they would alter the rural landscape of this currently sparsely inhabited part of the village and destroy two ponds and their associated woodland wildlife habitats.

Sut009 I object to the scale of this proposed development site which would alter the rural/agricultural heart of the village.

In general the proposal for, in total 297 new homes to be built in Sutterton by 2036 is unreasonable. Currently there are approximately 890 homes in the village. 297 new homes would be an expansion of almost a third again and it would change the character of the village. People live in Sutterton because it is a small, friendly village & we moved here away from large impersonal housing estates.

Sut003, Sut006 Sut008, Sut011 I do not object to which would provide 111 extra houses which is enough for a village of Sutterton's current size.

Officer Comment:

Sites Sut005, Sut007 and Sut026 - The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that the development of sites Sut005, Sut007 and Sut026 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - visual impacts would be limited (confined to impacts upon views from the west, & these views would be significantly screened by the trees growing at the junction of Wigtoft Road and Blows Lane). These sites have not been identified as being of any special wildlife value (i.e. they are not a Local Wildlife Sites, etc.). However, although these sites are considered to be developable, they are not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently are not proposed to be taken forward as Preferred Housing Sites.

Site Sut009 - The SHLAA identifies that the impacts of site Sut009's development on the area's character would be acceptable - it consolidates the built-up area, & relatively few public views are available. Views from the west would be subject to the greatest change, but even these are already dominated by the employment buildings off Endeavour Way & Love Lane.

Housing requirements - It is not accepted that the development of 300 dwellings in Sutterton would inevitably harm the village's character – much depends upon the sites selected, and the sensitivity of the schemes for their eventual development. The housing requirement is for a 25 year period, and amounts to an average of 12 per year – it is considered that the village can accommodate this pace of growth without harm to its community cohesion.

Officer Recommendation:

Sites Sut005, Sut007 and Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut009 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

No change is needed to Sutterton's housing requirements.

Site Sut003 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut008 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut011 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

The support for Sut003 is welcomed. However, the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

The support for site Sut006 is welcomed. However, the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

The support for site Sut008 is welcomed. However, since planning permission B/15/0498 was granted for the residential development of part of the site, the remaining site could accommodate only 8 dwellings - i.e. It is too small to be identified as a Housing Site.

The support for site Sut011 is welcomed. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not proposed to be identified as a Preferred Housing Site in its own right - it is, however, part of site Sut009.

ID1: 1374 comment_author: David Matthews

comment content:

Firstly as a former Sutterton parish councillor and the editor of the Sutterton parish plan I would wish to confirm my whole hearted agreement with Norma Grove s recent communication. Second is the problem of flooding. I am a retired special purpose machine design Engineer who for the last 15 years, working, specialised as a consultant to the Environment Agency (EA) (among others) in the field of flood control. It was I who asked the question that caused the EA to (almost) abandon plans for the water level control on the Boston Barrier (It is on record). Continuous water level control will leave the Bostonians paddling in Wellington Boots. The problem Sutterton has is that based on the trig point on the church it is only 5 feet (1.5m) above sea level (AOD) and this can be expected to be lower elsewhere due to the fact that all the churches on the Boston plain (and the Somerset Levels) were built on the highest point (long before the drains) on small islands in the boggy fens. Flood risk assessments are based on satellite technology which has a inherent sphere of error. This means that such constructions as the used tyre factory specified by the inspector to be at least 3m AOD are almost certainly a lot lower. If building is allowed all over the area, with the land at only 1.5m AOD, and less, the water flow head is reduced significantly. The water flows more slowly, if at all, and we shall have flooding. When I was a parish councillor we regularly received reports from the cemetery manager confirming that the water table was close to the surface. Recently Boston Borough Council gave permission for a new cemetery behind the Thatched Cottage and it is reported that holes immediately filled with water. The play area in front of

Officer Comment:

The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifies that the majority of the Potential Housing Sites in Sutterton are subject to flood hazard of 'low hazard' or 'danger to some', and flood depth of '0m to 0.25m' or '0.25m to 0.5m'. Environment Agency advice indicates that, in such circumstances, 'safe' development can be ensured by finished floor levels being set 300mm above ground level, or 500mm above ground level respectively. It is thus considered that new developments can realistically be made safe from fluvial or coastal flooding. Anglian Water Services has indicated that development on any of the Potential Housing Sites would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. It is thus considered that new development can take place without creating or exacerbating surface water flooding issues.

Officer Recommendation:

No change is necessary.

the Thatch floods most winters and is not safe due to the risk of weal's disease. More building, more stagnant water, more risk. St Mary s church shows the result of historical flooding and low strength sub soil. I asked a plan representative why we do not continue to use the land for agricultural use. I was told that you already knew that flooding problems would be increased but the government is insisting. The government needs to be informed that it is simply a problem that will happen if you build. For years the EA have said that we must not build on flood plains, such as the Boston plain. How much worse is it when the plain averages ONE metre AOD and was until the 17th Century a fen bog, since drained with many ditches? A map of Sutterton shows many small islands surrounded by drainage ditches. My wife, who has only common sense in this field and did not receive a satisfactory answer.

ID1: 1375 comment_author: Mr BJ Morgan

comment content:

I have studied the areas for possible future development and whilst I understand the need for more accommodation for the ever increasing population, I would like to oppose the site Sut006, on the plan. The major reason for my opposition is based on the preservation of the homo sapiens. The dangerous position of the access road--a recent drop curb having been approved for agricultural machinery--will lead to an increase in Lincolnshire's roads death toll, already high on straight roads, let alone bendy roads. This access is on a blind sharp "S" bend, with dwellings on either side of the road. If highways have not already pointed out this fact or the council have ignored the potential for fatalities, I hope MY drawing your attention to it may lead to a more informed decision to refuse permission on this site, and that the decision to include Sut006 as a site for future housing be erased from the plan

The village of Sutterton is not able to sustain much more building, with little infrastructure to sustain more population, no village pub, one store/PO, oversubscribed primary school, Doctors surgery already overbooked and a lack of a transport system that allows people to have a social life after 9pm! I do hope, that following the many objectors letters you will receive, that their objections will be seriously evaluated and also take into consideration the change in Sutterton's reduced amenities .

Officer Comment:

Sut006 - the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

It is not agreed that Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy/housing requirements should be amended. The decision to identify it as a Main Service Centre took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area'" (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

No change is needed to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy or housing requirements.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

1376

comment_author:

Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd

comment content:

we object to the failure to allocate land off Monarch s Road, identified as site SUT030 on the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, that would provide a suitable extension to the current development area. Also object to the conclusions set out in the SHLAA entry for site SUT030, as these are incorrect and lead to a false conclusion that has led to the failure to identify the site as suitable for development. It is recognised that the land is the subject of a planning appeal that is yet to be determined, but this should not inform the SHLAA process that should be based on the assessment criteria used for all sites. The assessment approach is inconsistent when set against the decision to include site SUT006 as suitable, which is similar in size and nature to site SUT030, but in a more prominent location. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS “ the land d s not and cannot significantly encroach into the open countryside which separates Algarkirk from Sutterton, as it d s not fall between the two settlements, but is further to the north. This issue is fully explored by the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment prepared for the recent appeal, copy attached to this representation. INFRASTRUCTURE - the provision of a vehicular access from Monarch's Road will not lead to a loss of green infrastructure, as any green space used to provide access will be compensated for on the new development and this can be strictly controlled by the Local Authority. LOCATION - it is agreed that the land is accessible to Sutterton's existing services & facilities and is located adjacent to Sutterton's built-up area. SITE CHARACTERISTICS “ it is agreed that there are no nearby 'bad neighbour' uses and that the site has no

Officer Comment:

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) has assessed site Sut030 against the same criteria as all alternative sites. The criticisms of the SHLAA's findings are noted, and it is considered that: the findings with respect to transport impacts should be amended as sought by the consultee; and references to 'grade 1' agricultural land should be amended to refer to 'best and most verstaile' agricultural land. However, the other criticisms are not accepted, and the SHLAA continues to identify this site as undevelopable.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut030 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

intrinsic amenity value. The land is not previously developed, but it is also not grade 1 agricultural land as is claimed, which is evidenced by the Agricultural Land Classification Report submitted to the Council in connection with the recent planning appeal. A copy accompanies this submission. TRANSPORT “ it is agreed that services & facilities are accessible on foot & by bicycle, & by public transport. The recent planning application attracted no objection from the Highway Authority and it is unreasonable for the SHLAA entry to claim that development will create traffic problems. The potential impact on amenities is a matter for individual planning proposals and not the SHLAA; it is not an aspect of transport assessment criteria. We do not accept the conclusion in the SHLAA that the site is unsuitable, due to adverse environmental impacts, infrastructure impacts, and transport issues. This conclusion is not supported by a proper assessment, but by comments drawn from the recent refusal of planning permission that is subject to a yet to be determined planning appeal. We submit that the site should be deemed developable by the SHLAA and should have been included as a potential allocation on the Inset Map 8.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1377 comment_author: Beverly Jayne Gilliard

comment content:

My name is Beverly Gilliard and I live at 31 Monarchs Road, Sutterton I would like to offer comment on the recent consultation for the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan with particular regard to the area of Sutterton. My first point relates to the positioning of Sutterton as a sustainable area for development and how statistics have been used to inform this decision. Sutterton has seen the closure of a considerable number of facilities over recent years and this does not correlate with the information detailed in the results table for services and facilities which concludes Sutterton scores a total of 66 in relation to services and facilities. In truth Sutterton has only one general store and therefore the figure under this heading should read as 4 and not the score of 8 awarded to this section. Furthermore we no longer have a public house, The Thatch closing earlier this year and again therefore this score requires amendment to 0. Sutterton has been awarded a score of 4 in relation to Community hall's with 2 points per facilities. Sutterton has only one village hall, whilst this is made up of a lounge area and hall, it also forms part of a chance to share agreement and therefore availability of use of the larger hall is restricted to non term time only and outside school hours. A more realistic score of 2 is therefore applicable. Turning now to the score of 26 awarded in respect of playing areas for children in the village, I would question where there are 13 suitable areas for children to play. Firstly I note this does not include the children's designated play area where equipment is provided. I would like to draw your attention to the photographs below which clearly show this designated play area. You will see from these pictures how

Officer Comment:

Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area'" (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

Sut006 - the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy is necessary.

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

throughout winter months and in wet weather this area frequently floods and is not therefore an area children can make use of whenever they wish. Furthermore the following areas are included within identified playing fields.

1. Bellmere Duck pond - this is not a playing field. It is a fenced off, gated area for wildlife.
2. The grassed area behind what was The Thatch - part of this is privately owned by the owners of the Thatch building and does not constitute what can be referred to as a playing field.
3. The grassed area shown on Glebe Way, Eastfield Close - this land is privately owned by the residents and therefore is not available as a playing field.
4. The first piece of grassed area on Monarchs Road - this has been clearly debated at a recent planning appeal that it is not suitable as a playing field due to its close proximity to the main B1397 and being surrounded on two sides by a main access road. It is therefore not a suitable area for play.
5. The piece of green land adjacent to the village boundary on Monarchs Road - this piece of open space lies behind private shared driveways and for this reason is not available as a playing field due to the issue of access over private owned driveways.
6. The smaller piece of green space on Monarchs Road - sight of this very small area of green space with a tree taking up most of the space will alert you to the fact that this is not a feasible playing space.
7. Area of green space on Park Avenue directly in front of the school - This piece of land is owned by Mayflower housing and they were approached some time ago to ask if it could be used as a play area for the children. We were very clearly told no as this was developable land for housing and it is as you will note fenced off for this reason. It is not a playing area.
8. Cemetery - It is wholly unacceptable to suggest a cemetery as an area which is suitable for children to play. You will note I have identified at least

8 areas which are incorrectly deemed to be playing fields and this alone equates to 16 points. The statistics for Sutterton very clearly need to be re-visited. By my calculations alone Sutterton has at least 24 points incorrectly accredited to it. Sutterton is not a sustainable area for development. We do not have a bus service of a Sunday or Bank holiday and there are no facilities to travel by bus of an evening. The earliest you can arrive in Boston is 8.25am and you must depart by 17:45. We have no gas supply and there is a dependency on oil heating and the need for a motor vehicle if choosing to live in rural Sutterton.

I turn now to a particular piece of land proposed as a potential site for development that being Sut006. This was previously discounted as an area not deemed to be suitable for development. My first question would be what has changed? In truth nothing. There is no access to this land other than from the sharp bend of the B1397 where you will note there are warning indicators of being on a sharp bend and highlighting the need to slow down. The house opposite already has mirrors to assist with traffic and has been the site of many an accident in the past. During the 10 years I have lived in Sutterton I have seen cars enter the ditch on this bend and crash into the outbuildings or parked cars. It is without a doubt a dangerous bend. I recall the application being made for a drop curb onto this land and reassurance being given that it would be purely for agricultural reasons - quite simply traffic from a potential 80 homes entering and exiting onto this busy stretch of road on a blind bend would be fatal. There is a bus stop not too far from this bend where school children get on and off morning and night. I would also like to point out how this land is a high flood risk.

ID1: 1378 comment_author: Mr D Sullivan

comment content:

Having attended one of the consultation evenings, I am writing to confirm that we still wish the site previously put forward (SUT007) to continue to be included in the process. Since the site was put forward we have applied for planning permission (for up to 17 dwellings) which is currently in process and will not be determined before the expiry date of this consultation exercise. As part of the planning application we know that on site drainage is not an issue having been agreed by both the EA and local drainage board that SUDS is possible utilising the man made pond at the northern end of the site as an attenuation facility, there are no highway issues with regard to access, the sewer crossing the site can be designed into a housing scheme, and the application had the support of the local planning officer. We feel the site should be included in the new document being prepared as it is viable and available. Whilst outside of the current development boundary it is noticeable that so too are virtually all of the other proposed sites for Sutterton and therefore, the boundary would need to be altered to include the necessary parcels of land in order for Sutterton to meet it's proposed housing target.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed. However, although site Sut007 is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be one of the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut007 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

1379

comment_author:

Mrs Penelope Jane Fountain

comment content:

I would like to make it clear that I think 300 new houses would make the village of Sutterton into a completely unattractive village, especially if a great number were built on one site. The visual impact would be to overcome the few remaining houses that have character; the facilities (doctor, school, etc) are already at bursting point; and it is impossible to integrate so many newcomers if the buildings are all occupied at much the same time. Sutterton residents remain a friendly and supportive village population, and I would like to recommend that it stays that way.

The sites that have some merit in my opinion would be: Sut005 (17), Sut026(32), Sut028 (14), Sut008 (12),Sut003(16), and as an addition to the periphery of the village Sut006(80) which gives a total of 171.

Sut009 (249) with Sut011 (13) are completely out of line for a small village, and this number of new houses will certainly have a huge impact on the character of the area.

Sut007 (17) will have a great visual impact on those houses to the east of it, with views certainly not confined to those from the west.

Sut027 (38) surely there is no need to extend the village envelope, especially with this huge area. There are issues with short-distance visual impact too.

Sut029 (65) as above, there is no need to extend the village envelope. There needs to be some industrial/commercial activity in the village for the

Officer Comment:

It is not accepted that the development of 300 dwellings in Sutterton would inevitably harm the village's character – much depends upon the sites selected, and the sensitivity of the schemes for their eventual development. The housing requirement is for a 25 year period, and amounts to an average of 12 per year – it is considered that the village can accommodate this pace of growth without harm to its community cohesion. The Local Plan will have to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met.

The support for Sut003 is welcomed. However, the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

The support for Sut005 is welcomed. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

The support for Sut006 is welcomed. However, the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

The support for site Sut008 is welcomed. However, since planning permission B/15/0498 was granted for the residential development of part of the site, the remaining site could accommodate only 8 dwellings - i.e. It is too small to be identified as a Housing Site.

The support for Sut026 is welcomed. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not

Officer Recommendation:

No change is needed to Sutterton's housing requirements.

Site Sut003 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut005 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut008 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut028 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site in conjunction with Sut009.

Site Sut009 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut007 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut027 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut029 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

dwellers of the new houses to find employment without travelling great distances.

considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

The support for site Sut028 is welcomed. However, it is not proposed to be allocated in its own right, but rather as part of a larger Sut009/Sut028 site.

Sut009 - It is acknowledged that this is a development site on a scale that is unprecedented for Sutterton. However, the site offers the potential to be sub-divided into two or three smaller parcels with separate vehicular accesses. Furthermore, it offers the opportunity for a comprehensive and master-planned scheme that may be able to better address local infrastructure shortfalls more effectively than could a series of smaller, individual sites.

Sut007 - The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that the development of site Sut007 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - visual impacts would be limited (confined to impacts upon views from the west, & these views would be significantly screened by the trees growing at the junction of Wigtoft Road and Blows Lane). However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut027 - Inevitably, the development of almost any piece of land will have short-distance visual impacts from public vantage points. However, the availability of longer-distance views into sites varies greatly, and the SHLAA was seeking to make the point that few long-

distance views into site Sut027 are available. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut029 - Although site Sut029 is allocated in the Adopted Boston Borough Local Plan (April 1999) as a 'Proposed Industrial/Commercial Area', it is not proposed to be so allocated in the emerging Plan. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

ID1:	1380	comment_author:	Brown & Co
------	------	-----------------	------------

comment_content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
We, on behalf of P T M Lubbe, support development in Sutterton, in particular site Sut006.	The support is welcomed. However, the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.	Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

ID1: 1381 comment_author: Mr and Mrs J Sewell

comment content:

We feel that Sutterton is not a sustainable area and believe that the scoring is wrong. We only have one general store and no longer have a public house. We have only one village hall which is restricted to non term time and outside of school hours. We do not believe that we have 13 suitable areas for children to play. The play area where equipment is provided floods in the winter months and when we have wet weather. We do not have a bus service on a Sunday and Bank Holidays and no facilities to travel by bus in the evenings.

The piece of land proposed as potential development land Sut006. Has no access to it other than the sharp bend which already has warning indicators highlighting the need to slow down. There have been many accidents along this stretch of road, cars hitting buildings and parked cars. If built on, traffic from the site onto a busy stretch of road would be fatal. This land is also a high flood risk and I do not consider this site suitable for development.

Officer Comment:

Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area'" (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

Site Sut006 - the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy is necessary.

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

ID1: 1382 comment_author: David & Maria Hawkes

comment content:

Site Sut026 - The lack of drainage management in the area already. The pond and wood floods into our gardens every year. The dyke on the field has never been inspected regularly or dug out. The pond has a large amount of wildlife, coots, moorhens, malards. The heron nests every year. Wild geese visit, cherry trees in the wood with many wild birds resting in springtime. Noise being increased by new properties and light pollution in the village. Increased of traffic on roads that have no crossings e.g. Zebra or pelican, children walking to school with very busy vehicles. More litter being dropped from many vehicles in the village. A150 Bats feed over the pond.

Officer Comment:

Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. The site has not been identified as being of any special wildlife value (i.e. It is not a Local Wildlife Site, etc.). It is inevitable that development on this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings and have some impact upon the character of the area, but this is equally true of all alternative sites. The Highway Authority did not identify that the development of this site would create highway safety problems. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

ID1: 1383 comment_author: Historic England

comment content:

To the north of Sut009 and SutO28 is the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary. Sites Sut009 and SutO28 would impact upon open views to both the church and the historic village due to the scale of the proposal. The assessment of sustainability in respect of these allocations is defective as it fails to address these impacts.

Officer Comment:

The Borough Council's Consultant Archirect comments that, although the site does not abut heritage assets, the setting of the listed church includes the environs of Station Road and a large road junction here should be avoided. In order to preserve views of the church spire, any scheme would need to be well landscaped, low density and no higher than two storey with attics. The layout and design of the site would also need to take account of the presence of two listed houses on Station Road.

Officer Recommendation:

Sites Sut009 and Sut028 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1384 comment_author: Mr K L J Vines

comment content:

Sites Sut007, Sut005, Sut026, Sut027 In addition to the above, I also have specific objections to sites Sut007, Sut005, Sut026, and Sut027, all of which are situated on the western side of the village on Wigtoft Road. The objections are as follows: Start of development on west of village and effect on character of the area which is currently the edge of the countryside Sites Sut007, Sut005, Sut026, and Sut027 are on the very edge of the village in open countryside. Development in this area would not only have a visual impact for those properties close by on Wigtoft Road, Blows Lane, Rosegar Avenue, and Rainwalls Lane, but from further away on the approach to Sutterton. A significant concern about the proposed sites is the lack of any natural boundary to the west, thus approval of these sites could lead to further development in open countryside to the west. Road safety The accesses to sites Sut007, Sut005, Sut026, and Sut027 would be off Wigtoft Road in 30mph and 40mph zones. However, the vast majority of traffic entering the village from the west travel at speeds far in excess of this. it is estimated that the average speed is nearer 60mph, certainly not 30/40mph. The Parish Council have installed a speed/data illuminated sign which is continuing to record speeds in this area. There are many actual recorded speeds of over 70 miles an hour in general and of 80.4 miles an hour in particular, recorded at 9.55am on a Tuesday morning. This is made worse by the blind bend in the road which means that traffic is not visible until a few seconds before it is level with the proposed sites. It is felt that the introduction of a junction, or junctions, at this point can only increase risk for road users. The road layout and speed

Officer Comment:

Sut005 - The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that the development of site Sut005 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - visual impacts would be limited (confined to impacts upon views from the west, & these views would be significantly screened by the trees growing at the junction of Wigtoft Road and Blows Lane). The Highway Authority comments that (whilst site Sut005 would need to be accessed via either Sut007 or Sut026) these sites can safely accommodate the required junction and visibility splays. Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut007 - The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that the development of site Sut007 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - visual impacts would be limited (confined to impacts upon views from the west, & these views would be significantly screened by the trees growing at the junction of Wigtoft Road and Blows Lane). The Highway Authority comments that "the site has been the subject of a recent planning

Officer Recommendation:

Sites Sut005, Sut007 and Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut027 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Option Housing Allocation.

No change is needed to Sutterton's Housing Requirements.

Site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut011 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

of incoming traffic, real not theoretical, must be taken in to account or a serious accident could be the result. Drainage Sites Sut007, Sut005, and Sut026 are solely reliant on private drainage systems to cater for the disposal of surface water, the nearest Internal Drainage Board watercourse being some distance away. As a drainage engineer with over 25 years experience in internal Drainage Boards, I am fully aware of the problems such private drainage systems can cause in periods of heavy rainfall. The private watercourse along Rainwalls Lane which caters for site Sut007 already experiences problems with standing water in gardens of properties, development of these sites would only make matters worse. Even with the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS), the post development flows can very seldom be kept to pre-development green-field rates, which inevitably leads to increased flows and, in turn, increased water levels within the watercourses. Environmental impacts With regard to site Sut007, when the owner applied to change the use of this area from agricultural land in 2004, it was not just simply to form a garden. The application was for the creation of a grass paddock/wild flower area, an orchard, and a pond and nature reserve. This was consented by the planners and maintained, as per the Councils requirements, to allow it to become established. The environmental value of this site should not be under estimated. The creation of this green area and pond offers so much more environmental diversity than intensively farmed agricultural land. To allow this site to now be developed will destroy all of this, and will inevitably have an adverse environmental impact. Residents around the site know for a fact that it is regularly used as a foraging site, and perhaps even a roosting site for bats, the pond, orchard, and grass paddock providing a valuable habitat for their food

application for residential development. The site was considered to be suitable for such use in highway terms and the application was supported by the Highway Authority.” Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. The site has not been identified as being of any special wildlife value (i.e. It is not a Local Wildlife Site, etc. The refusal of planning permission was based upon: the site being located in the countryside; and the impacts stemming from the demolition of a frontage building in order to provide vehicular access. However, if the site is allocated for development, ‘countryside’ issues no longer apply and, if the site is developed in conjunction with those to its west, the demolition is no longer necessary. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut026 - The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that the development of site Sut026 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - visual impacts would be limited (confined to impacts upon views from the west, & these views would be significantly screened by the trees growing at the junction of Wigtoft Road and Blows Lane). Whilst land to the east (sites Sut005 and Sut007) is already being considered as a Potential Housing Site, it is accepted that the northern and

sources, in fact most summer evenings bats can be seen here. Likewise, owls have been seen hunting and capturing prey on the site, and the pond is known to provide habitat for a number of amphibians and invertebrates. Newts, frogs, and toads are seen regularly. I therefore feel that inclusion of this site contravenes Policy 25 - The Natural Environment. Local opposition Site Sut007 was refused outline planning permission last year (application ref B/15/0060) for the construction of up to 17 dwellings because the planning committee were against the principle of developing the site. This being the case, why is it included here? Development of this site also aroused a lot of local opposition, and a 113 signature petition from residents of Sutterton was presented as part of the objection to the application. Summary of objections Therefore, in summary, my objections are as follows:

The housing allocation for Sutterton is too high compared with neighbouring villages with far more available amenities. The housing completion and commitment figures need to be updated, and along with a reduced housing allocation, a new, reduced, residual requirement determined. The facilities in Sutterton are already at full capacity, the sustainability of further development in the village has to be seriously questioned.

Sites Sut007, Sut005, Sut026, Sut027 - Development on the west side of the village is neither necessary nor desirable. If further development is inevitable, then available sites in the centre of the village should be utilised which are nearer the village amenities, rather than development on the outskirts of the village. Sites Sut007, Sut005, Sut026, Sut027 " Road safety. Accesses to these sites will compromise safety on this

western boundaries to site Sut026 do not follow physical features. These boundaries are arbitrary, and there is the potential that its allocation might increase pressure for further development to the west and/or north. The Highway Authority comments that "Wigtoft Road is suitable to serve residential development on this site and the frontage is large enough to accommodate the required junction and visibility splays." Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut027 - The Highway Authority comments that "Wigtoft Road is suitable to serve residential development on this site and the frontage is large enough to accommodate the required junction and visibility splays." The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that site Sut027 has weaknesses in terms of its visual impacts, namely that it would extend the built-up area significantly and that its southern boundary does not follow any existing feature. Nonetheless, the SHLAA concludes that its impacts upon the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a

already dangerous section of road. Sites Sut007, Sut005, Sut026 " Drainage. These sites are totally dependent on private drainage systems for the disposal of surface water. This will be a problem during wet periods and will worsen existing drainage problems. In this respect, it would be better to utilize the larger site in the centre of the village where, because of its large size, the Internal Drainage would consider extending its drainage system to provide an effective means of surface water disposal. Site Sut007 " Environmental Impact. The change of use of this site from intensively farmed agricultural land in 2004 to a grass paddock/wild flower area, orchard, pond and nature reserve would mean a loss in environmental area if it were developed. The use of alternative brown field sites or even agricultural land within the village would be less detrimental to the environment. The inclusion of this site therefore contravenes Policy 25 - The Natural Environment. Site Sut007 " The Boston Borough Council Planning Committee have already considered the principle of building on this site and refused it outline planning permission last year. At the time there was considerable local opposition to this site being developed, with a 113 signature petition being submitted as part of the objection. For this reason I do not think it should be considered as potential development land in the Local Plan.

If further development in Sutterton is inevitable, then surely it would be better to site this development in the centre of the village rather than the outskirts. Sites Sut009, Sut011, and Sut028 would be better suited to development as they are near the centre of the village, and services such as the pre-school, primary school, and Doctor's surgery. It is interesting to note that, due to the scale of site Sut009, in the centre of the village,

Preferred Housing Site.

Housing Requirements - The Local Plan will have to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met. It is accepted that the residual housing calculations set out in the January 2106 Housing Paper for Sutterton are now out-of-date, and a new calculation based upon the situation as at 31st March 2016 should be set out.

The support for site Sut009 is welcomed.

The support for site Sut028 is welcomed. However, it is not proposed to be allocated in its own right, but rather as part of a larger Sut009/Sut028 site.

The support for site Sut011 is welcomed. However, it is not proposed to be allocated in its own right, but rather as part of a larger Sut009/Sut028 site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

the Internal Drainage Board is willing to look at extending their infrastructure in to the site to provide an effective surface water outfall. For this reason alone I would suggest that Sut009 would be a preferable site for development.

ID1: 1385 comment_author: Clive Wicks Associates

comment content:

Has commented that Sut026,005 & 007 are available for immediate development off either road frontage access or through demolition of barn set back off Wigtoft Road. A comprehensive design would be ideal. It is located in a sustainable location with little impact on other residents. With the development of Sut027 it will consolidate this area of Sutterton. Low flood risk, therefore should be supported.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed. However, although these sites are considered to be developable, they are not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently are not proposed to be taken forward as Preferred Housing Sites.

Officer Recommendation:

Sites Sut005, Sut007 and Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

1386

comment_author: Savills

comment content:

Support the proposed housing site Sut026 as shown on Inset Map 8. Site Sut026 is under the ownership of Lincolnshire County Council. We request that land to the immediate North and West of proposed housing site Sut026 be also considered as a housing site. The site in its entirety is 4.8ha in size and has the potential to deliver 144 dwellings at a density of 30 dwellings per hectare as detailed in the South East Lincolnshire SHLAA (January 2016). A site location plan is enclosed with this submission. It is considered that this site can contribute to the proposed total housing allocation for Sutterton (300 dwellings) over the plan period to 2036 as detailed in Policy 12 Distribution of Housing of the South East Lincolnshire Draft Local Plan. The site is located to the west of Sutterton and is currently used for agricultural purposes. Agricultural land surrounds the site to the north, east and west, with residential development and Wigtoft Road to the south. Wigtoft Road provides access to the South of the site. Sutterton lies approximately 2.1km to the West of the A16 which provides direct access to Boston (11.3km North) and Spalding (15.4km South). Both centres provide a wide range of services and facilities. Sutterton is also located within close proximity to a number of surrounding villages that include: i, Kirton (4.2km North); i, Algarkirk (3.8 East); and i, Wigtoft (1.7 West). The site has good public transport links with bus stops located 0.6km to the east of the site entrance with bus services providing routes to: i, Boston (B13 Bus); i, Wyberton (G53, G79 buses); i, Spalding (B13 Bus); and i, Stamford (G53, G79 buses). The site falls within Flood Zone 3. However, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment consider there is a Low Probability of the land flooding

Officer Comment:

The support for site Sut026 is welcomed. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

The larger site put forward by the objector has been given the reference Sut032. The SHLAA classifies this site as developable, but it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently it is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut032 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

with the defences in place. The development of this site would comply with paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (The Framework) which states that To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. The landowner is supportive of residential development at this site which is available, suitable and achievable for residential development now.

ID1:	1387	comment_author:	Martin Harrison
comment content:	Re: Sut006 I understand that the above area is marked as potential housing development lying north of the Monarchs Road estate in Sutterton. We are already awaiting a decision for 60 dwellings to be approved or not approved on the Monarchs Road Estate. There has been extensive objections for these 60 dwellings due to the unsustainability of Sutterton village if this was to go ahead. In relation to the above development Sut006 I cannot understand why a potential development of a further 74 dwellings should be approved if the 60 dwellings (awaiting decision) has been extensively objected to on sustainability grounds for Sutterton. I therefore OBJECT to the potential development of Sut006.	Officer Comment:	Site ut006 and the site to the east of Monarchs Road (Sut030) are different sites, although they abut one another. The fact that one is judged as undevelopable, does not automatically mean that the other is also undevelopable. Nonetheless, the SHLAA identifies that site Sut006 is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.
Officer Recommendation:		Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.	

ID1: 1388 comment_author: Brown & Co

comment content:

Support development in Sutterton in particular Sut027 & Sut029 and are willing to release them for development if allocated. Both sites have good road frontage with more than adequate highway visibility. If developed the sites would result in a balanced village layout. Sut027 and Sut029 should be considered more favourably than the alternatives put forward in the village.

Our clients would release the land between the two sites if it is required.

Officer Comment:

The support for sites Sut027 and Sut029 is welcomed. However, although these sites are considered to be developable, they are not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently are not proposed to be taken forward as Preferred Housing Sites.

The larger site area referred to by the objector has been given the reference number Sut033. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies this land as being undevelopable because it would have adverse environmental impacts.

Officer Recommendation:

Sites Sut027 and Sut029 should not be taken forward as Preferred Options Housing Allocations.

Site Sut033 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1389 comment_author: Sutterton Parish Council

comment content:

The Parish Council wishes to comment on a number of the sites earmarked for housing development as delineated on Inset map no.8. Sut005: The use of this area of land may depend on access through the adjoining areas, Sut007 or Sut026. Sut007 is currently the subject of a planning appeal. There is considerable local opposition to the development of 007 and it depends on gaining access to the site by the demolition of outbuildings which in the view of the Parish Council, make a valuable contribution to the street scene on Wigtoft Road. Sut007: See comments above relating to Sut005 Sut008: Planning permission is being sought for a phased development. Sut026: See above. The viability of this site may be affected by the planning appeal relating to Sut007.

Sut028: This site has to be considered in relation to Sut009. This site is affected by a public footpath. (not mentioned in the SELLP explanation).

009 lies between two areas of land in commercial use. The Parish Council is aware that there have already been difficulties between residents who are already close by and the commercial users. It is also well known that at least one workshop is from time to time noisy. The site does not offer tranquil surroundings. Sut009: See above.

The explanation incorporates Sut011. The parish Council points out that Sut011 is the most suitable in the village for future expansion of the cemetery. Sut011: See above. Possible cemetery site.

Officer Comment:

Sut005 - The Highway Authority comments that, whilst site Sut005 would need to be accessed via either Sut007 or Sut026, these sites can safely accommodate the required junction and visibility splays. If access was taken through site Sut026, no demolition would be required. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut007 - The refusal of planning permission was based upon: the site being located in the countryside; and the impacts stemming from the demolition of a frontage building in order to provide vehicular access. However, if the site is allocated for development, 'countryside' issues no longer apply and, if the site is developed in conjunction with those to its west, the demolition is no longer necessary. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut026 - The developability of site Sut026 is not dependent upon Sut007. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut028 - It is quite correct that it is highly unlikely that site Sut028 would be allocated in isolation. Existing

Officer Recommendation:

Sites Sut005, Sut007 and Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut028 should be taken forward as a Preferred Option Housing Allocation in conjunction with Sut009.

Site Sut009 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut011 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut027 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut029 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut003 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

No change to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy is necessary.

Sut027: This site suffers from a number of disadvantages as listed in the accompanying explanation. It also represents an extension of ribbon development away from the village centre. It shares a corner with the green burial site.

Sut029: As set out in the explanation this area was allocated for commercial development and it is already fronted by light industrial units. It is not an ideal setting for residential use. It shares a corner with the green burial site.

Sut003: This area can only be accessed via 029 or by the demolition of an existing building. It shares a boundary with the green burial site.

Sut006: This site further extends the built part of the village to the parish boundary. High flood risk and the inevitable access is problematic because of the proximity to a blind bend at The Old Cross Keys. In summary: the identified sites for housing development are practically all subject to significant difficulties. The flood risk is generally quite high and it will be very difficult to design schemes that are attractive enough to attract a proper range of new residents to the village.

Finally, The Parish Council says that Sutterton has been incorrectly placed as a Main Service Centre because it does not have the services, facilities and amenities needed to make it so. The sites which have been identified for housing development are simply not suitable to provide a satisfactory mix of housing within the total of 300 that are proposed, that will sustain the community of Sutterton into the future.

public footpath routes across the site would need to be retained within any new residential layout

Sut009 - It is acknowledged that the site directly abuts a number of employment uses both to its north and east - Burdens Tractors, Ark Fabricators, Dragon Biomass, Jakemans (Confectioners) Ltd., South Lincs Foodservice and Agricultural Tyres and Wheels. These employment uses may potentially impact upon the amenities that would be enjoyed by any new dwellings on the site. However, the site is large in size and consequently it should be feasible to design a residential layout that provides adequate separation between new dwellings and the employment uses, and incorporates other mitigation measures to prevent nuisance. It is noted that the Parish Council's wishes to see land off Station Road become a cemetery extension at some point in the future, and (if it were appropriate) such provision might potentially be sought as part of a comprehensive and master-planned development of the site.

Sut011 - It is noted that the Parish Council's wishes to see land off Station Road become a cemetery extension at some point in the future, but little weight can be given to this aspiration in considering the merits of this site as a possible Housing Allocation.

Sut027 - The site would be developed in depth, and therefore cannot fairly be described as 'ribbon development'. However, the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies that site Sut027 has weaknesses in terms of its visual impacts, namely that it would extend the built-up area significantly and that its southern boundary does not follow any existing feature. Nonetheless, the SHLAA

concludes that its impacts upon the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

The SHLAA acknowledges that site Sut029 is adjacent to the Spalding Road Industrial Estate which may impact upon the amenities that would be enjoyed by any new dwellings. Nonetheless, it concludes that the site is developable. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sut003 - The comments on Sut003 are noted. However, the SHLAA identifies that this site is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

Sut006 - the SHLAA identifies that site Sut006 is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and

this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area' (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

ID1: 1390 comment_author: Mr Ted Watts

comment content:

Re: Sut006 - This area was previously discounted as an area not deemed to be suitable for development. What has changed? Absolutely nothing, I would suggest! There is no access to this land other than from the sharp bend of the B1397 where you will note there are warning indicators due to very sharp bends and highlighting the need to slow down. There have been many accidents there. It is clearly a very, very dangerous bend and to have this as an access point there beggars belief! Finally all this land is a high flood risk area and to build would be a catastrophic blunder.

Officer Comment:

Sut006 - the SHLAA identifies that site Sut006 is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1: 1391 comment_author: Bridgette Gooding

comment content:

Please consider the following points when offering land for development within the village of Sutterton. I came to live in the village in 2003 and since that time have seen the reduction in the services enjoyed by the local villagers. We are currently able to offer any new inhabitants of Sutterton the following limited amenities: a small general store and post office, a hairdressing salon and a fish and chip shop having seen the loss of our independent newsagent's and both of our public houses/restaurants and I do believe there was a garage/petrol station within the centre of the village, these areas are currently being developed for housing. I think the loss of such amenities to the village of Sutterton must surely reduce the current score of 66 afforded it in the results table. If it is possible to further dissect the scoring system for the village of Sutterton it has to be noted that the village hall is only available during certain periods of the week and therefore offers restricted use. Our facilities for children and youths of the village is certainly called into question when it rains as the central playing field is subject to prolonged flooding - and how Bellmere Wildlife Sanctuary could be deemed a suitable playing area for children is questionable. The area behind The Thatch is a green field burial site and that which isn't is surely part of The Thatch and therefore private property similarly grassed areas of Eastfield Close, together with some areas of Monarchs Road's whose grassed areas lie behind private shared driveways and not easily accessible as 'playing' fields. The large open area of Monarchs Road which lies to the front of the development is surely too close to the main road (B1397) and therefore presents health and safety issues and is why the green area at

Officer Comment:

Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area'" (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

Sut006 - the SHLAA identifies that site Sut006 is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy is necessary.

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

the back of the Monarchs Road is so prized by its residents as a safe area for its children to play. Park Avenue is also deemed an area for children to play although I believe the Mayflower Housing Group may feel differently about this as they own it. I also believe that the cemetery has been identified as an area suitable for play!!! - perhaps these areas need to be revisited in order to establish the true extent of playing space for the children of the village and a more accurate score awarded it. It is difficult to rely upon public transport whilst living in Sutterton and a motor vehicle or access to one would allow for ease of movement regarding getting to work and attending leisure/entertainment activities as we currently have no bus service on a Sunday and no bus service in the evening to allow residents to pursue hobbies and leisure activities within the nearby towns. We have no gas supply in the village and must rely upon the delivery of heating oil. Clearly the limited facilities within Sutterton do not allow for sustainable development

and my particular concern is the land directly behind the property I live in (Sutt006). This piece of land had previously been deemed unsuitable for development and I am puzzled as to what has changed. The dangerous bend is still much in evidence - an accident only recently occurring between several motor vehicles one of which ended up ploughing thorough front garden fencing!!! The thought of hundreds of additional cars trying to negotiate this blind bend d sn't bear thinking about. Similarly the danger to flooding is a risk to all on this parcel of land as evidenced by the standing water after a heavy downpour and is identified as such within the literature - again I am puzzled how this has changed. I would appreciate my

comments be added to any others that may have voiced their concern regarding the proposal not only to put forward this parcel of land for development but for the reassessment of the scoring for Sutterton in light of the loss of several of our amenities/facilities and other inaccuracies on the report.

ID1:

1392

comment_author:

Mrs Samantha Greenslade

comment content:

I would like to offer comment on the recent consultation for the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan with particular regard to the area of Sutterton. My first point relates to the positioning of Sutterton as a sustainable area for development and how statistics have been used to inform this decision. Sutterton has seen the closure of a considerable number of facilities over recent years and this does not correlate with the information detailed in the results table for services. In truth Sutterton has only one general store and therefore the figure under this heading should read as 4 and not the score of 8 awarded to this section. Furthermore we no longer have a public house, The Thatched cottage closing earlier this year and again therefore this score requires amendment to 0. Sutterton has been awarded a score of 4 in relation to Community hall's with 2 points per facilities. Sutterton has only one village hall, whilst this is made up of a lounge area and hall, it also forms part of a chance to share agreement and therefore availability of use of the larger hall is restricted to non term time only and outside school hours. A more realistic score of 2 is therefore applicable. Turning now to the score of 26 awarded in respect of playing areas for children in the village, I would question where there are 13 suitable areas for children to play. Firstly I note this does not include the children's designated play area where equipment is provided and is the same equipment since the 1970's. Furthermore the following areas are included within identified playing fields. 1. Bellmere Duck pond - this is not a playing field. It is a fenced off, gated area for wildlife and the person who looks after it at any time can make it a private nature reserve. 2. The

Officer Comment:

Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area'" (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

Sut006 - the SHLAA identifies that site Sut006 is undevelopable, because an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy is necessary.

Site Sut006 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

grassed area behind what was The Thatched cottage is now a natural burial ground. 3. The grassed area shown on Glebe Way, Eastfield Close - this land is privately owned by the residents and therefore is not available as a playing field 4. The first piece of grassed area on Monarchs Road - this has been clearly debated at a recent planning appeal that it is not suitable as a playing field due to its close proximity to the main B1397 and being surrounding on two sides by a main access road. It is therefore not a suitable area for play. 5. The piece of green land adjacent to the village boundary on Monarchs Road - this piece of open space lies behind private shared driveways and for this reason is not available as a playing field due to the issue of access over private owned driveways. 6. The smaller piece of green space on Monarchs Road - sight of this very small area of green space with a tree taking up most of the space will alert you to the fact that this is not a feasible playing space. 7. Area of green space on Park Avenue directly in front of the school - This piece of land is owned by Mayflower housing and they were approached some time ago to ask if it could be used as a play area for the children. We were very clearly told no as this was developable land for housing and it is as you will note fenced off for this reason. It is not a playing area. 8. Cemetery - It is wholly unacceptable to suggest a cemetery as an area which is suitable for children to play. You will note I have identified at least 8 areas which are incorrectly deemed to be playing fields and this alone equates to 16 points. The statistics for Sutterton very clearly need to be re-visited. Sutterton is not a sustainable area for development.

Sut006: This was previously discounted as an area not deemed to be suitable for development. My first question would be what has changed? In truth nothing.

There is no access to this land other than from the sharp bend of the B1397 where you will note there are warning indicators of being on a sharp bend and highlighting the need to slow down. The house opposite already has mirrors to assist with traffic and has been the site of many an accident in the past. During the 9 years I have lived in Sutterton I have seen cars enter the ditch on this bend and crash into the outbuildings or parked cars. It is without a doubt a dangerous bend. I recall the application being made for a drop curb onto this land and reassurance being given that it would be purely for agricultural reasons - quite simply traffic from a potential 80 homes entering and exiting onto this busy stretch of road on a blind bend would be fatal. There is a bus stop not too far from this bend where school children get on and off morning and night. I would also like to point out how this land is a high flood risk. This site is not a suitable area for development.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Draft for Consultation January 2016

ID1:

1393

comment_author: Mr A and Dr G Ward

comment content:

Please find below our comments on the draft South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, in particular with regards to the village of Sutterton. As residents of Sutterton we are commenting on the Sutterton part of the draft South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. Since we moved to Sutterton two years ago, we have seen the closure of two pub/restaurants, one newsagent and a caravan retailer, leaving just one small corner shop to serve the entire village. There are no public houses/eating establishments other than a fish and chip shop and there are even rumours that we may lose our remaining corner shop soon. We have chosen to remain registered at our previous doctor's surgery as we have heard it is oversubscribed at the Sutterton surgery and we have heard that we are not guaranteed to obtain a place for our child at the local school. This, coupled with the lack of employment opportunities in Sutterton, means that it is a commuter village where you require a car both for business and leisure purposes. We fail to understand how Sutterton would be able to sustain housing growth at the levels proposed in the draft Local Plan. We fail to understand the reasoning for highlighting the areas of recreational open space in the village as many of those highlighted are simply not useable recreational space. Bell Mere Pool is highlighted but is a nature reserve area, the school is highlighted which is obviously private property, and several small areas within housing estates are highlighted which if viewed from the ground would become obvious they are not usable recreational spaces. As the village is near two major A roads, it is somewhat of a cut-through for traffic, meaning that the recreational spaces that are suitable for children to use

Officer Comment:

Sutterton's place in the Plan's Spatial Strategy took account of many issues, including: the findings of the South East Lincolnshire Assessment of Settlements & their Sustainability Credentials (June 2015); the population of the parish; the local rate of housing growth between 1976 and 2011; and the local availability of land at lower risk of flooding. Furthermore, as the Spatial Strategy Background Paper makes clear "Sutterton is now defined as a Main Service Centre due to its proximity as a 'cluster' settlement and this is reflected in its sustainability score. Sutterton also offers some opportunities for growth in areas with marginally better flood risk. In preparing a plan for South East Lincolnshire as a whole, the opportunity arose to examine the settlements between the proposed Sub-Regional Centres of Boston and Spalding from a different perspective. Sutterton is in this 'mid-way area'" (paragraph 6.10). It is considered that this approach accords with the advice in paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework that "to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby."

Officer Recommendation:

No change to Sutterton's place in the Spatial Strategy is necessary.

can be problematic and unsafe to access. We would strongly question why Sutterton has been classed as a Main Service Centre meaning that it helps meet the service needs of other local communities. Having lived in Kirton previously we regularly (two to three times a week) travel back to Kirton to shop, use the cash point, visit the library etc. Much as we enjoy living in Sutterton we fail to see why people living in the surrounding villages would have a need to visit here when such few services exist. In our opinion every other single village named as a Main Service Centre has significantly more facilities than Sutterton has. We would consider Sutterton to be more on a par with a village such as Wigtoft, designated as a Minor Service Centre. In fact some of the Minor Service Centres, such as Surfleet, appear to have more services than that of Sutterton. In conclusion, we feel that the assessment of Sutterton as a Main Service Centre is based on out of date information with regards to services and is incorrect in terms of useable recreational open space. We strongly feel that Sutterton would be unable to support development at the levels indicated in the draft South East Lincolnshire Local Plan.

ID1:

1394

comment_author:

Mr S W Hawkes and Mrs M K Haw

comment content:

We are opposing any development on land block Sut026 because the woodland and pond area which are important wildlife areas should not be included within this Land block. This area would be an important feature to include as a border to any future development but it would be a huge mistake to include it within the development area Sut026. We have lived at 1 Blows Lane, Sutterton since 1989 and have a vested interest in the woodland and pond which borders our property. This woodland is not only a hugely valuable local wildlife habitat but it also contains an historical structure - a second world war pill box which we cannot find mention of within the Local Plan or the Sustainability Appraisal report for Sutterton (Sut026). We have been managing this valuable community asset for the last 27 years - removing rubbish and keeping it maintained. We have never seen anybody from the local council, who own it, undertaking any maintenance work at any time during this period (apart from last week when we witnessed workmen trimming the trees alongside the Blows Lane footpath). The existing woodland area (bordering our property) within Sut026 is important for wildlife and biodiversity within Sutterton and also acts as an important buffer area to our garden from the existing agricultural landscape and any possible future development. A well established large pond with a varied and diverse vegetation and associated wildlife (also bordering our property) is important for breeding and visiting wildfowl, wildlife and biodiversity. It has breeding coots and moorhens, as well as woodland and garden species of nesting birds. It is frequently used as feeding territory by herons and visiting stalks. It is an

Officer Comment:

Anglian Water Services has commented that the capacity of the surface water network has major constraints, and has therefore indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land or causing pollution to the pond. The Highway Authority has not indicated that new pedestrian crossings will be needed. It is agreed that, if site Sut026 is taken forward as an allocation the woodland and pond at its south-western corner should be excluded from the site. However, although this site is considered to be developable, it is not considered to be amongst the best potential housing sites in Sutterton, and consequently is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut026 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

important feeding and breeding area for a number of species of bats including Daubenton's bat (*Myotis daubentonii*) and common pipistrelle (*Pipistrellus pipistrellus*). It is also a vitally important habitat for many species of amphibians and reptiles. We would like to know what consultations have been made with the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England in relation to obtaining an Environmental Biodiversity Survey of the site prior to any development proposals. The woodland (including the historical pill box) and pond would need to be taken out of land block Sut026 for our opposition to any development within land block Sut026 to be overcome. Sustainability Appraisal report for Sut026: We note that the mature trees (woodland) and pond have been picked up as areas that contain important wildlife biodiversity which should be protected from any development and enhanced to benefit biodiversity within Sutterton and Lincolnshire. We also note that: 'development may affect the ecosystem present, by potentially affecting the water table and changing the availability of ground water, unless carefully managed surface water pollution will be a problem.' In addition: 'Disturbance due to development can result in the movement of species, therefore undermining their sustainability.' Surface water pollution from any development could cause pollution and damage to the biodiversity of the pond. In addition any surface water pollution which is not appropriately managed could cause general flooding. It is therefore essential that the woodland is also retained as well as the pond to act as a soak up and buffer for our property. We therefore oppose any development within area Sut026 due to possible damage of existing wildlife features and request the woodland and pond biodiversity areas be removed from land area Sut026. We also have concerns that

Sutterton do not have any pedestrian crossings and could not find any information within the Local Plan that as the population increases these will be provided. We would like to be informed of the plan's progress, the outcome of our opposition to development within Sut026 and any proposals for the retention and enhancement of the woodland and pond biodiversity areas.
