

Post_title: 10: Swineshead

ID1: 1406

comment_author: Henry Cheer

comment_content:

I can confirm as land owner of approx 5.5 acres of Swi036, I am willing to make this land available for development, and I support the development of Swi036

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that the site is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If site Swi036 is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi036 is considered to be undevelopable. Furthermore, it appears that the various owners of the site do not intend to pursue it as a single entity. This raises doubts about the site's deliverability and raises the possibility that, if the site is allocated, unsatisfactory proposals for the development of parts of the site may be brought forward. Consequently, site Swi036 is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi036 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

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

ID1: 1407 comment_author: Mr A Siggee

comment content:

As a country person born and bred I object most strongly about further development of this village, there has been too much already. My father was born in this village 116 years ago and could not believe what was happening to it as long ago as the 1970's, so what he would say now I dread to think. It is systematic destruction of villages. There is no community spirit as there was in my younger days. Also the facilities, ie surgery etc (we already have to cater for two other villages) will be affected. Why not build, if this is necessary, for example, where I was born on the Skeldyke side of Algarkirk, where there are less houses now than when I was born in 1933? But no, it is not well enough situated because it is too far from main commuter route. I have no doubt my comments as to how I feel about this will, as in the past comments, be ignored and they call this progress. Well I wish them well to wear it, and in conclusion all I can say is thank goodness I was born in the era that I was because I have seen the best of times.

Officer Comment:

It is not accepted that the development of 400 dwellings in Swineshead 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 16 per year – it is considered that the village can accommodate this pace of growth without harm to its community cohesion.

Officer Recommendation:

No change is required to Swineshead's housing requirement.

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

ID1: 1408 comment_author: Michael Patterson

comment content:

Developments would preferably be on a number of small scale sites rather than the very large estate of 262 units suggested for example on the Woods Nursery site (Swi036).

A particular concern about this site is that an access point is shown at the existing 4-way junction of Tarry Hill, High Street, Station Road and Coles Lane. This junction is on a sharp bend. Heavy lorries currently accessing the site can only do so from the north because of the restricted space and have to swing round on to the wrong side of the road in order to access the nursery. Inexperienced drivers often have to reverse into the traffic in order to make the turn successfully. It would be dangerous and totally unsuitable to make an access point here. Existing properties on the north side of Coles Lane and the west side of Station Road are at a lower level than the surrounding terrain and at least two of them are known to have flooded after exceptionally heavy rainfall.

The development of sites Swi036, Swi029 and Swi038 will introduce additional areas of paved roads, footpaths, hard standings and driveways that will inevitably increase run-off towards the properties in this area and may represent an increased flooding hazard.

Officer Comment:

The preference for smaller sites is noted.

Site Swi036 - Vehicular access would be onto High Street, opposite the existing junction to Hillcrest Gardens. The Highway Authority comments that “the carriageway here is particularly wide (the road used to be the A17) and it should therefore be possible for an additional junction to be formed here without having an unacceptably harmful impact upon highway safety”. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi036 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi036 is considered to be undevelopable. Furthermore, it appears that the various owners of the site do not intend to pursue it as a single entity. This raises doubts about the site's deliverability and raises the possibility that, if the site is allocated, unsatisfactory proposals for the development of parts of the site may be brought forward. Consequently, site Swi036 is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sites Swi036, Swi029 and Swi038 - Anglian Water Services Ltd. has indicated that development on sites Swi036, Swi029 and Swi038 would need to incorporate

Officer Recommendation:

No change is required.

Site Swi029 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi036 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi038 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

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, full planning permission has been granted for the erection of a dwelling on the land which the landowner identified as providing the access from site Swi029 from Coles Lane. This calls into question the deliverability of the wider site. Furthermore, given the low-density nature of surrounding development, it is likely that site Swi029 would deliver fewer than 10 dwellings (i.e. it would be too small to be identified as a Housing Allocation). Consequently, site Swi029 is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

ID1: 1409 comment_author: Mr M Maw

comment content:

Object to Swi039 running the full length of 5 Owl Drive. I would strongly object to houses overlooking my property on the north and east boundary. I would also like to raise an objection concerning the sheer volume of school traffic parked daily in term times along Abbey Road. This proves a great hazard to traffic entering and exiting Owl Drive. This is an accident waiting to happen.

Officer Comment:

It is inevitable that the development of this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings, but this is equally true of all alternative sites. At the time of a planning application, the layout and design of a scheme would be carefully scrutinised to minimise overlooking and privacy loss. The Highway Authority does not share the consultee's concerns about traffic impacts. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi039 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi039 is considered to be undevelopable, and it is not proposed that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi039 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site

ID1: 1410 comment_author: Mrs E Florence

comment content:

Object to Swi039 on grounds of losing our privacy, more so if they are houses overlooking our bungalows. If they have to go ahead please at least let them be built so that we are not overlooked and a good distance between us. Another concern is the school in Abbey Road, when its dropping off and picking up time the area is crammed with cars. How there hasn't been an accident I don't know, so imagine if there is another 62 buildings, it will be much worse. The other great concern is the wording as poorer flood risk, no way do we want to be at any flood risk to our property.

Officer Comment:

It is inevitable that the development of this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings, but this is equally true of all alternative sites. At the time of a planning application, the layout and design of a scheme would be carefully scrutinised to minimise overlooking and privacy loss. The Highway Authority does not share the consultee's concerns about traffic impacts. It is correct that site Swi039 is at slightly poorer flood risk than the majority of the other Potential Housing Sites. Anglian Water Services Ltd. has indicated that development on site Swi039 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, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi039 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi039 is considered to be undevelopable, and it is not proposed that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi039 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site

ID1: 1411 comment_author: Mr & Mrs Shipley

comment content:

Object to Swi036: Trouble with sewage as its not very clever now in the village. Road too small for all extra traffic. Lack of pavements on Tarry Hill School not adequate to take more children Drs can't cope now with patients Drainage will be even more inadequate.

Officer Comment:

Anglian Water Services Ltd has identified that both the Swineshead Water Recycling Centre and the foul sewerage network may need to be enhanced to accommodate the development of this site. The Highway Authority comments that "the carriageway here is particularly wide (the road used to be the A17) and it should therefore be possible for an additional junction to be formed here without having an unacceptably harmful impact upon highway safety". The Local Plan will have to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi036 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi036 is considered to be undevelopable. Furthermore, it appears that the various owners of the site do not intend to pursue it as a single entity. This raises doubts about the site's deliverability and raises the possibility that, if the site is allocated, unsatisfactory proposals for the development of parts of the site may be brought forward. Consequently, site Swi036 is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi036 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site

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

ID1: 1412 comment_author: Swineshead Parish Council

comment content:

Swineshead PC Comments are: Assuming increased housing development in the village of Swineshead, our comments are: concerns that the school will have sufficient facilities and capacity without the need for increasing current class numbers; concerns about the increase in traffic around the school as the current levels already cause issues; concerns that existing facilities, such as the Doctors surgery and other local amenities would be sufficient to provide the necessary basic requirements for the residents; a requirement to be built into any plans agreed that there is a Developers contribution towards increasing/improving the facilities at the school and the Doctor s surgery.

Officer Comment:

The Local Plan will need to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met, and these matters will be dealt with in later versions of the document and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany it.

Officer Recommendation:

No change.

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

ID1: 1413 comment_author: Mr & Mrs Curtis

comment content:

We would like to raise the following concerns with respect to swi039. Anglia water has clearly stated in their report that the surface water network has major constraints and that all developments should seek to reduce flood risk. They also indicate that surface water may not be discharged into the public foul sewerage network, and that no new water flow will be permitted. The local plan report clearly shows that swi039 is marked as flood risk 2 and as poorer flood risk. The remaining references swi004 thru to swi034 show a lower flood risk. As local residents living adjacent to the swi039 plot we must raise concerns regarding the possible flood risk, and would also wish to seek clarification from the major household insurance providers if these proposed new dwellings and those existing dwellings would be insurable due to the increased risk of flooding. The land proposed for swi039 is currently deemed as agricultural so we therefore assume an application for change of use would be required before any proposed development could commence. Access to this site being through the Jelson estate and via Manwaring way and La milesse way pose danger and disruption to the residents of this estate. We note that many of the other proposed sites can be accessed directly from south street, high street, or station road thereby avoiding heavy construction vehicles traveling through residential estates. As the requirement is for approximately 355 dwellings this amount can easily be achieved without the swi039 proposal.

The required amount could be fulfilled with only 2 developments, for example swi036 (262)and swi015

Officer Comment:

It is correct that site Swi039 is at slightly poorer flood risk than the majority of the other Potential Housing Sites. Anglian Water Services Ltd. has indicated that development on site Swi039 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 construction traffic impacts would apply to all alternative sites, although it is accepted that impacts would be likely to be more severe in the case of this site. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi039 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi039 is considered to be undevelopable, and it is not proposed that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

The support for site Swi015 is welcomed.

The support for site Swi036 is welcomed. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi036 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi039 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi015 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi036 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Infrastructure - No change.

(116) dwellings these 2 sites actually providing 378 dwellings, 23 more than the required amount and both sites accessed directly from Station Road. By limiting the number of developments it will mean less disruption to the community in general.

Swineshead being a small village the current infrastructure is limited especially regarding local schooling, doctors and dental services. We therefore propose that before any developments are approved they should carry guaranteed commitments from the developers to invest in the local community, providing funding for additional school and doctor services and a much needed N H S dental practice. For the avoidance of any doubt we are not against all forms of development and accept that it is sometimes important in order for some villages to survive, it is also important that many of these dwellings are affordable for local residents to purchase thus giving them a stake in the community as opposed to renting social housing of which there should be few if any at all. One final comment we would like you to consider is that you take into account the views of local residents, far too often are residents concerns ignored by both local and regional government despite the fact we are supposed to be living in a democracy.

significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi036 is considered to be undevelopable. Furthermore, it appears that the various owners of the site do not intend to pursue it as a single entity. This raises doubts about the site's deliverability and raises the possibility that, if the site is allocated, unsatisfactory proposals for the development of parts of the site may be brought forward. Consequently, site Swi036 is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Infrastructure - The Local Plan will need to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met, and these matters will be dealt with in later versions of the document and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany it.

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

ID1: 1414 comment_author: Myra Brooks

comment content:

I live in Swineshead and I am particularly concerned that when I approached your colleagues at the exhibition in Swineshead Village Hall there was a distinct lack of knowledge regarding the affect on local services that these proposed dwellings would have. Apparently there are no plans to expand the local school, which is already oversubscribed and the Doctors surgery which also covers a large area is difficult to get appointments at now. The local Childrens Centre is under threat of closure, thus taking away a potential lifeline for those with small children who may move to the village. The transport service is also not sufficiently robust enough to support those without vehicles. These services are required if the local populace are to have any local support.

In addition to questions not answered re local impacts your colleagues could not assist with how the proposed 17000 jobs would be generated. There appears to be no inward investment from major industries or commercial ventures. Major retailers are pulling out of Boston. (Morrisons) The town is half dead on Sundays as the bigger retailers fail to open (Marks and Spencer) if they are not opening how are other retailers to be encouraged to open and make the town more vibrant. It would seem that they do not see a market for their stores and if they do not consider it worth the time and effort I cannot see how we can get Boston to be an attractive proposition for people to come to live in. If Hull and Grimsby are having problems generating jobs how is South East Lincs going to achieve this. In addition to local issues, when asked if the road system was to be improved between Peterborough and Boston

Officer Comment:

The Local Plan will need to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met, and these matters will be dealt with in later versions of the document and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany it.

The Highway Authority does not share the consultee's concerns about the traffic impacts of the development of site Swi039. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi039 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi039 is considered to be undevelopable, and it is not proposed that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

It is assumed that the land referred to as "adjacent to Abbey Road and the A52 (around Cragg Close)" is site Swi030. The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies site Swi030 as undevelopable, because it will have adverse environmental impacts and is poorly located.

Officer Recommendation:

No change.

Site Swi039 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi030 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site

and Grantham and Boston we were told that Lincs CC do not have the money for that. Without these improvements how are you going to attract business to the area?

The area of land that abuts La Milesse Way (SW39 on the plan) is apparently proposed for 62 dwellings. Currently La Milesse Way is a road which feeds into Sarthe Close, which makes those two roads a cul-de-sac. At the moment there is minimal vehicle traffic along those roads used by residents etc only. The vehicles that would be using that exit route, and also The Mainwarings which is currently another cul-de-sac which is potentially adjoining SW39, would be in the region of 248 trips daily. I have calculated this as follows. Given that those 62 houses would generate 2 cars per property, which is the norm in Swineshead due to the poor bus and transport links, that is each car in and out of the new estate each day twice a day. This would have quite an impact on the local roads. The cars would exit on to an estate road, then another estate road. The vehicles would either then go past the Primary School which is completely clogged up already with vehicles in the morning and afternoon or they would go into the village to get an exit to the A52 or A17. It would appear that the land for proposed building in Swineshead has not been selected for ease of use by the new residents.

I understand that land that is adjacent to Abbey Road and the A52 (around Cragg Close) has not been selected and would be curious to know why, as this would allow traffic to exit on a road that is free of other housing and leads directly to the A52.

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

ID1: 1415 comment_author: Miss S Walker

comment content:

I comment on this as a resident of Swineshead village. I have lived here for 7yrs after moving from Manchester. The house we purchased is on The Drayton and has only 2 near neighbours and has open views to three sides. At the time of purchase I was told that the area I lived in was outside of the building envelope and it was unlikely that building would ever be allowed. I am therefore extremely disappointed to learn that potentially I could eventually have 39 houses built right behind my house. My comments are initially directed at this particular sight (SW004) and then I will make my general comments on the proposed building in Swineshead. I was aware of the power lines directed over my garden but still choose to live there as they are not directly over my house but the field behind (the proposed site) is criss crossed with power lines, several from a pylon situated close by and then others from telegraph poles. I am currently in talks with the electricity board about the intrusion into my garden as I feel that houses should not be built near electric lines unless it can be avoided. Most of the research I have studied have a general consensus that living under power lines can be damaging to health (see appendix 1) and although I choose to live here near them I am not directly underneath them like the houses would be if this land was built on. I frequently have to keep trees underneath the lines trimmed and they are not as high as the house so I cannot see how building under these would be allowed. My other concern would be the capacity of the pumping station which is attached to my property. I am led to believe that this land was compulsory purchased off the previous owners and it has been nothing but trouble for us since which is ironic

Officer Comment:

It is inevitable that the developmnt of site Swi004 would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings, but this is equally true of all alternative sites. At the time of a planning application, the layout and design of a scheme would be carefully scrutinised to minimise overlooking and privacy loss. The site is crossed by three power lines – one high-level transmission line on lattice pylons and two lower-level distribution lines on wooden poles. On the issue of health impacts, the Government sets exposure guidelines for electromagnetic fields and the electricity system complies with these. On the issue of power lines physically preventing development, the distribution lines occupy relatively peripheral locations within the site and could generally be accommodated within gardens. The transmission line crosses the site in a more central location, but is sufficiently high above ground level that it would not obstruct development. Anglian Water has acknowledged that some localised upgrades to the network may be required to receive foul water

It is not accepted that the development of 400 dwellings in Swineshead 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 16 per year – it is considered that the village can accommodate this pace of growth without harm to its community cohesion. The Highway Authority has raised no concerns about the traffic impacts of this scale of growth. The Local Plan will have to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi004 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

No change is required to Swineshead's housing requirement.

as we have a septic tank. The sewage pump smells quite frequently and also blocks on a regular basis and Anglian water are there on an almost weekly basis. If the pumping station cannot cope at the minute how do the water board know that it will be able to cope with 39 built behind it let alone 400!!.

With regard to the village as a whole, I have settled here well as has my family and after having come from a built up urban area it was nice to meet friendly residents and for the village to not be that big that it wasn't difficult to recognise most people. If the village is increased by 400 houses that is at least another 800 adults, it would then have the feeling of a small town and lose that local village feeling. The other impact of this would be the traffic, with a potential for at least another 800 cars I feel that it is just a terrible accident waiting to happen with speed and careless driving already a big issue within the small roads of the village. I would want to be assured there would be some traffic calming measures being put into place to protect the residents and their pets! Other concerns are the medical centre, it is already difficult to get an appointment with the Doctors also taking people from surrounding villages so another 800+ people from Swineshead and however many more from the surrounding areas I feel would deeply affect the service we would get from the Doctors. The school is already full to capacity and does not have any capacity for extension, how would that be managed?. A local neighbour has moved here recently and has to send her children to Bicker! While children from Boston attend her village school how back to front is that as the local council have to pay for taxis! The whole infrastructure of the village is at risk with the extra houses and I am worried about the sustainability of the residents!! I

understand that more houses have to be built but I feel that more should be done to fill up the empty houses in areas and that the towns should be built up more. Needless to say I have grave concerns about the impact of the proposed building for the whole village and also on a more personal note.

ID1:

1416

comment_author:

Mr & Mrs C Woods

comment content:

Further to our conversation last week at the Swineshead presentation last week, I have forwarded the email I sent at the beginning of the month, which summarises matters to date. We are expecting an update from Lincolnshire Co-op next week, at which point I will let you know of progress. As I said at the village hall, I was concerned to read the comments relating to our site on the Swineshead section of the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (January 2016). The map shows our site as Swi0012, which forms part of the larger block Swi0036. The adverse comments in the text refer to the environmental impact and the access. I believe that the access issue has been addressed by the addition of Capel Lodge and the land with it, which is shown on the map, but it seems that the text has not been updated. With regard to the environmental impact, would I be correct in thinking that these comments apply to the bare land, rather than the glasshouse and yard area, which make up the majority of the site? Many thanks for your time last week, and please contact me if there is anything else you need to know. Further to our conversations at the end of last year, I am writing to update you on the current position with regard to the development potential of our nursery site in the middle of Swineshead. We have spoken to John Grant, who owns the land between our site and the Jelson development centred around King Johns Road. Although he has entered this land into the plan, we believe from our conversation that he is reluctant to sell unless he receives a very generous offer. To that end we have pursued matters without him. We have interest from Lincolnshire Co-op to build

Officer Comment:

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies site Swi012 as undevelopable because its development would have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - although it is largely screened from public view, considered in isolation, it relates poorly to the village's built form. Consequently, it is not identified as a Potential Housing Site.

Site Swi012 makes up part of site Swi036, and the SHLAA concludes that this larger site would have a satisfactory relationship to the existing village. However, it was identified as a Potential Housing Site on the understanding that the various owners would work together to bring forward a comprehensive scheme for the entire site. The site only has a satisfactory relationship to the village if considered as a whole - the pursuit of separate schemes will not produce a satisfactory result. Furthermore, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi036 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Consequently, site Swi036 is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi012 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi036 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

a food store on the site of Capel Lodge, the bungalow that we purchased last year. We are in negotiations with Ashwood Homes to develop the rest of our site, with an access road coming off the High Street beside the food store. Our glasshouse nursery is reaching the end of its working life, with most of the glass being over 35 years old. It is becoming uneconomic to repair it as most structures are now obsolete and our business does not justify rebuilding with new glasshouses. Our type of nursery business is being squeezed by the increasing demands of the multiples, and the strong pound. The only way forward is to combine with a larger nursery, which would mean an increase in lorry traffic and an extension of work hours to satisfy the market needs. (24 hours a day, seven days a week in the spring and Christmas seasons). Currently we try to keep deliveries and collections to normal work hours 8am-5pm and Saturday mornings. We have always operated in a fashion that is considerate to our immediate neighbours and the wider village community, and this would not be possible in the future. We see development of the site as soon as possible as the best way forward for all concerned, and would like to work with you to this end. We have invited Lincolnshire Co-op and Ashwood Homes to a site meeting to discuss how this can be achieved to the satisfaction of all parties, and would very much like you to be there as well. Please let us know what dates you can make over the next two weeks. I have attached a plan of the land in our ownership.

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

ID1: 1417 comment_author: Brown & Co

comment content:

We, on behalf of Mr Robert Oliver, support development in Swineshead, in particular site Swi004.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi004 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

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

ID1: 1418 comment_author: Mr & Mrs R. Morgan

comment content:

My wife & myself moved to Swineshead nearly 10years ago after looking at several villages to be near our daughter. The village has seen a few developments over these years but only on a small scale. To start larger developments would cause a major effect to the village and not for the better. Swineshead would no longer remain a village and will start losing its identity. Also, there is no indication to improve the surgery or expand the local school or improve the roads. The main concern is not to destroy the character of the village especially around the church & market square. The roads around these areas would not cope with the additional traffic and raises concerns over safety.

If further developments take place it should be the continuation of the areas swi036 & swi39 or further development of the north end swi015 & swi039 but on a smaller scale.

Officer Comment:

It is not accepted that the development of 400 dwellings in Swineshead 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 16 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 site Swi015 is welcomed.

The support for site Swi036 is welcomed. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi036 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi036 is considered to be undevelopable. Furthermore, it appears that the various owners of the site do not intend to pursue it as a single entity. This raises doubts about the site's deliverability and raises the possibility that, if the site is allocated, unsatisfactory proposals for the development of parts of the site may be brought forward. Consequently, site Swi036 is not proposed to be taken forward as a

Officer Recommendation:

No change is required to Swineshead's housing requirement.

Site Swi015 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi036 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi039 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Preferred Housing Site.

The support for site Swi039 is welcomed. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi039 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi039 is considered to be undevelopable, and it is not proposed that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

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

ID1: 1419 comment_author: Derrick Nundy

comment content:

I write regarding the above matter, and the viewing of the proposals in Swineshead Village Hall on Wednesday, 13* January 2016, and wish to make my personal comments as follows: As matters currently stand, I am TOTALLY OPPOSED to any further development in Swineshead, until certain issues are addressed, particularly with regard to safety, around the area of the school in Abbey Road. I have discussed concerns with other people in this area, who share my opinion, and it is to be hoped that they will also write and state their objection(s) It is now patently clear, the school IS IN THE WRONG PLACE, and it did not help the situation when additional building work was allowed to take place within the school boundaries, losing valuable car spaces, causing extra parking on Abbey Road, by car drivers. This extra parking, extends in to King Johns Road, which was/is already used as a rat run , by parent drivers, some of whom drive particularly carelessly when late in taking their children to school, and consequently SPEEDING as a result. These drivers have no respect, or awareness of/for other road users. At certain times, including school times, some parking is on both sides of the road in King Johns Road. It is only a matter of time before there is a collision, as this road has slight bends in it, which prevents clear and unobstructed vision for drivers. Again, and in these circumstances, I have witnessed drivers speeding through King Johns Road. In addition, I have noticed, school parking also takes place in Monks Road (off King Johns Road). Ln Haff Close, where I live, the parking for the school is constant, and sometimes ill considered. If development is allowed to proceed on Swi 039, I can foresee school parking taking place in other adjacent

Officer Comment:

The Highway Authority does not share the consultee's concerns about the traffic impacts of the development of site Swi039. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi039 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi039 is considered to be undevelopable, and it is not proposed that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Vehicle access to site Swi036 would be onto High Street, opposite the existing junction to Hillcrest Gardens. The Highway Authority comments that "the carriageway here is particularly wide (the road used to be the A17) and it should therefore be possible for an additional junction to be formed here without having an unacceptably harmful impact upon highway safety. Anglian Water Services Ltd has identified that both the Swineshead Water Recycling Centre and the foul sewerage network may need to be enhanced to accommodate the development of this site. The Highway Authority has not identified that other sites would be advantageous in terms of their impacts upon the wider highway network. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi039 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Site Swi036 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

areas nearby, such as La Milesse Way. This would come from car users from the other proposed developments, within the village.. By the nature of the siting of these proposed developments, it is inevitable that additional traffic, I would suggest a substantial amount, is going to be routed (driver choice), either through King Johns Road, or through the middle of the village to the school. Occasionally, when car parking takes place on both sides of the road, near the Post Office, Pharmacy etc. The old A17 road through the village is just not suitable, particularly for school buses, double decker service buses, and vehicles associated with agriculture, including HGV's! When parking and speeding issues have been addressed, I would still have grave concerns about most, although not all of the other sites designated in the January 2016 Housing Paper for Swineshead.

My other major concern is the proposed development Swi 036, and the suggested accesses to this site, which appear to be near the bend at Tarry Hill with Station Road, and along the top lane at Tarry Hill. Even if an entrance to this site was opposite to that of Lockton Close, I would not be happy with the junction. Accidents waiting to happen!! My understanding, when I went along to the village hall on Wednesday, 13th January 2016, was that it was a public consultation, and comments made by the public would be taken in to account, and acted upon where necessary, or where possible. Why is it then, that the land on Swi 039 and Swi 036 appears to have been left for development already? Not a very democratic process, or has someone already had inside information? Having made the comments in the previous paragraphs, I have come to the opinion that consideration does not appear to have been made of the situation, when the Swineshead

Swi036 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi036 is considered to be undevelopable. Furthermore, it appears that the various owners of the site do not intend to pursue it as a single entity. This raises doubts about the site's deliverability and raises the possibility that, if the site is allocated, unsatisfactory proposals for the development of parts of the site may be brought forward. Consequently, site Swi036 is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

By-pass has to be closed because of a Road Traffic Collision, and traffic is diverted through the village. This diversion may not be the one advocated by the authorities, but those drivers, be it car or HGV with knowledge of the area choose to come through the village (the old A17). This causes no end of problems already, when it has to be implemented. Many years ago, when I was a member of the Parish Council, it was suggested and discussed that the drain running along Abbey Road should be piped, and the road widened. Some members opposed this, because of the field being higher than the road. It should have been widened at that time, as the cost involved would have long been forgotten. In any event, you can travel to places not too far away from Swineshead, where the field IS HIGHER than the road (or lane)! Utility matters and infrastructure, such as sewerage and suitable roads, is a major concern to me. It would be helpful, if the current population could be made aware of the ACTUAL facts and figures from Anglian Water, and the Environment Agency with regard to these proposed developments, and not just a vague statement. In conclusion, I would suggest there are other parcels of land in Swineshead, more suitable for building on; having easier access to the main trunk roads either side of the village, and which could help ease the traffic flow within the village, and around the school, and alleviate the necessity of forcing other school traffic through existing housing estates. Lastly, I hope you will consider these comments when finalizing your deliberations, and I would be open to a meeting to discuss them.

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

ID1:	1420	comment_author: Historic England	
comment content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:	
1.1.1 Swi036 and Swi039 may impact upon Manwar Ings remains of a motte and bailey castle Scheduled Monument to the north. Further assessment is required to determine the impact of these potentially intrusive developments into the historic landscape, including the sustainability of the extent of development in relation to the Scheduled Monument The Sustainability Appraisal does not adequately address the impact upon the Scheduled Monument, which comments in relation to both sites that: No significant historic or culturally-significant features are likely to be affected by development of the site. ☒	The Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that sites Swi036 and Swi039 are relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If these sites are developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the sites are developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, sites Swi036 and Swi039 are considered to be undevelopable, and it is not proposed that they should be taken forward as Preferred Housing Sites.	Sites Swi036 and Swi039 should not be taken forward as Preferred Housing Sites.	

ID1:	1421	comment_author: Clive Wicks Associates	
comment content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:	
has submitted part of Swi001 and Swi034 and commented the site is located centrally within village. It can be developed in separate tranches with northern section a private driveway adj., to Westminster terrace for a site of executive units which will off-set the many low-cost projects in the Borough. A Planning Application for the north parcel of this area can be submitted within 6 months and being in one family ownership could be commenced within 2 years. Low flood risk area	The new site has been registered as Swi042. The SHLAA identifies this land as being undevelopable because the proposed access from South Street is inadequate to serve a development of this size.	Site Swi042 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.	

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

ID1: 1422 comment_author: Clive Wicks Associates

comment content:

Swi015 - has commented because of road frontage, quality detached houses can front Station Road, with the bulk of low/medium cost units inside the site. Site large enough to accommodate a major POS area that can be used by the surrounding area. Planning Application to be made within 4 months with development potentially within 2 years. Location and easy access to A17 keeps delivery lorries out of the village centre. Very good communication routes post development and ease of access to station at Swineshead Bridge. Bus stop within walking distance. Low flood risk area.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi015 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

ID1: 1423 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

Overall, on behalf of our clients, we are very disappointed that the site Swi 030 was not deemed suitable as a potential housing site in the 2016 SHLAA. We consider site Swi 030 has good locational benefits, being connected via a footpath to the village, and has easier access to the A52 than some of the sites that has been suggested as suitable potential housing sites. As an example, development in the proposed site Swi 039, will increase traffic in the already traffic laden Abbey Road near to the school. The side roads in this area, particularly La Milesse Way, Kings Johns Road, and Monks Road already suffer very poor parking at both ends of the school day. It is expected that the development of site Swi 039 will result in traffic entering and exiting the site via the cul de sac roads named already, and onto Abbey Road at the location point precisely opposite to the busy school frontage. Our client considers that no further development of housing should be agreed, until the matter of parking and additional vehicle activity in the school area is taken seriously. Our client has previously put forward a suggested alternative site. I attach again a copy of the email with site Proforma for that site off Bullens Lane, sent on 20 February 2015. The additional site, could be developed with access off Bullens Lane, which is nearer to the A52 and A17, and could be developed to also provide valuable and much needed additional parking provision for the school and playing field. It would additionally have the benefit that the occupants of houses developed on the site would be able to walk to the school without a car being required. We now also attach a further plan showing another parcel of land adjacent to the site submitted in February 2015, plan 2.

Officer Comment:

The Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) identifies site Swi030 as undevelopable, because it will have adverse environmental impacts and is poorly located

The new site has been registered as Swi043. The SHLAA identifies this land as being undevelopable because it would have adverse environmental impacts and is poorly located.

Site Swi039 - The Highway Authority does not share the consulte's concerns about traffic impacts. However, the Borough Council's Consultant Architect comments that site Swi039 is relatively close to the visually prominent Manwar Ings SAM, and would add to the recent significant growth of the village towards the Monument, which has compromised its setting. If the site is developed, the Ings would be further hemmed in by modern housing with which it has no relationship. If the site is developed, both wide and focussed views of the Ings would need to be maintained from within parts of the historic village, but there should be serious doubts about extending development too close to this site. Given this opinion, site Swi039 is considered to be undevelopable, and it is not proposed that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Sites Swi030, Swi043 and Swi039 should not be taken forward as Preferred Housing Sites.

Our client considers that the two areas suggested, are more suitable for housing sites than those suggested on the proposed Inset map for the village. The sites we propose will reduce parking congestion in the village, give easier access to the main trunk roads either side of the village and would ease the traffic flow within the village and not force school traffic through existing housing estates. Additionally, a part of the site could be set aside to provide a parking area for the school, running at the back of the Abbey Gardens estate, at the back of Mulberry Court, the bowling green and football field. It could also serve as additional parking to those amenities, in addition to the school and playing field. This will require negotiation and cooperation with the Charity and Parish Council, but development on this part of Bullens Lane could start with a roadway to the proposed parking area. We look forward to receiving an acknowledgment of this response in due course and look forward to receiving a copy of the revisions to the Local Plan proposals, as suggested above, in due course.

ID1: 1424 comment_author: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

comment_content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
There is an error on this map as part of Cole's Lane Ponds Local Wildlife Site is missing.	That part of the Local Wildlife Site located on the eastern side of Coles Lane has been omitted in error.	Amend Inset Map 10: Swineshead to show a Local Wildlife Site on the eastern as well as the western side of Coles Lane, Swineshead.

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

ID1:

1425

comment_author:

Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partn

comment_content:

One LWS is incorrectly mapped on this map. The eastern half Cole's Lane Ponds LWS is missing.

Officer Comment:

That part of the Local Wildlife Site located on the eastern side of Coles Lane has been omitted in error.

Officer Recommendation:

Amend Inset Map 10: Swineshead to show a Local Wildlife Site on the eastern as well as the western side of Coles Lane, Swineshead.

ID1:

1426

comment_author:

Mr K Harwood

comment_content:

Swi029: The notes provided in South East Lincolnshire Local Plan: Housing Paper " Swineshead (January 2016) refers in Notes section " may lead to loss of 4 trees " these have already been removed linked to planning approval for development of a part of the highlighted site. The access to the site is now limited. To facilitate access maybe an alternative route is required to the west, between 2 adjacent properties (The Croft & Lygon Lodge). For this to be appropriate the developable site area needs extending due west to incorporate the land which would form part of the access situated to the rear of Lygon Lodge.

Officer Comment:

Full planning permission has been granted for the erection of a dwelling on the land which the landowner identified as providing the access from site Swi029 from Coles Lane. This calls into question the deliverability of the wider site. Furthermore, given the low-density nature of surrounding development, it is likely that site Swi029 would deliver fewer than 10 dwellings (i.e. It would be too small to be identified as a Housing Allocation). Consequently, site Swi029 is not proposed to be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi029 should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

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

ID1:

1427

comment_author:

Waller Planning

comment content:

Within Swineshead, site Swi038 is one of the most suitable locations for new development. It is located entirely within Flood Zone 1, whereas all of the other potential housing sites identified around the edges of the settlement are at least partly within Flood Zone 2. In terms of the application of the flood risk sequential test, this site is therefore naturally the first location to which new development should be directed. The site is entirely deliverable. Ashley King Developments have commissioned a full suite of technical documents, which demonstrate the following: A suitable highway access can be constructed for the site, directly on to Station Road. This access can be delivered within land controlled by Ashley King Developments and highway land, and it would provide sufficient capacity to serve the 63 dwellings which are proposed on the site. The site would also be served by Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), such as open balancing ponds. Rain water would be attenuated within the site and then released to the adjacent water courses at a similar rate to the existing greenfield runoff rate. The site can accommodate a layout of 63 dwellings whilst complying with all of the Council's policies, and providing an area of public open space, and a Local Area for Play for young children, generous private garden areas, and a high quality public realm. The proposed development would provide a mix of both market and affordable housing. This site is entirely developable and deliverable, and is backed by Ashwood Homes, who intend to construct the above mentioned residential development. We also note that the Councils have already concluded, through their SHLAA 2016 update, that the site is suitable for development, and that:

Officer Comment:

The support for site Swi038 is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi038 should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

The site's development would not have any unacceptable adverse impacts on natural or historic assets, or the character and appearance of the area. The SHLAA 2016 also concludes that the site is in a sustainable location, accessible to existing services and facilities. A full planning application has already been submitted for a residential development of 63 dwellings, and it is due to be determined by Boston Borough Council in the coming months. We believe that the proposed development is entirely acceptable in planning terms, and we believe that it should be granted planning permission. Given the suitability of this site, its sequential preference with regard to flood risk, and the lack of any constraints, we believe that it should be identified on the Local Plan Proposals Map as a Housing Commitment.
