

Post_title: 17: Gedney Church End

ID1: 1499

comment_author: Mr I Swinburn

comment_content:

Gedney Church End. Ged022 and Ged023. Accessibility to Ged023 via Stonegate, which is a very narrow road in itself with even narrower access at each end ie from Batemans Close to the old Gatehouse railway crossing and beyond. Some houses have a direct foot access from their front doors onto the carriageway Stonegate Which in itself is a danger. Extra storm water and sewage will the system as existing be able to cope with extra services. Ingress of natural light to existing properties from whatever type or proposed use or development. Any thoughts or consideration to other areas which are better suited for development. Ie Courtyard Farm, Rectory Farm, land adjacent to Linden House. Is local school able to cope with extra load. Churchgate is a bus route and a problem now with parents parking cars along the side of the road, especially if traffic is diverted off the A17 owing to an accident.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1500 comment_author: Laurence Marchant

comment_content:

We are objecting to the proposed plans for up to 80 dwellings on three sites in Gedney Church End The village does not have a Doctors or Health Centre, shops or post office. The local school could not cope with the influx of around a further 100 plus children.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

ID1: 1501 comment_author: Mr A B Crowden

comment_content:

has submitted a site at the end of Pinstock Lane for consideration as a housing site. It contains a dilapidated piggery and an adjoining field of about 2 acres.

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Ged028 in the SHLAA

Officer Recommendation:

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site. Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1502 comment_author: Mr T J Carey

comment content:

The proposed building of 60/95 houses on this field will create drainage problems possibly sewerage problems, impact on present property light and privacy. Stonegate Lane a narrow and poorly maintained road already accommodates , local Traffic , Frequently used by Agricultural Machinery, Heavy goods Transport Trailers, horse Riding, is a designated route for tourist cycling, and a Rat-Run from the A 17. Adding upwards of 100/200+ vehicles is not in my opinion the greatest of ideas ,and will have a detrimental effect on present day village life , In conclusion I am STRONGLY OPPOSED TO THIS PLAN.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

ID1: 1503 comment_author: James Slaughter

comment content:

It was brought to my attention today that there are plans to build on the land to the rear and side of my property. I wish to lodge my concerns as this will make a total loss of privacy to the rear and side of my property. It is as you point out on flood risk area and as a result the properties would need to be raised as well. This means they will tower over the properties adjacent including mine. An eyesore and total loss of privacy to us all. My home is my asset and savings for my old age should I need to go into care or provide my own carers. I strongly feel it would devalue the property leaving my future at risk. I am most concerned that I was not advised by the council of this proposed change of use and wish to strongly lodge my complaint and register my objections. Increased traffic and noise. Intrusion of privacy and devaluation of property. I hope I will get a response and be kept fully up to date from yourselves with any future developments that will affect me.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

ID1: 1504 comment_author: Ann Slaughter

comment content:

It was brought to my attention today that there are plans to build on the land to the rear and side of my property. I wish to lodge my concerns as this will make a total loss of privacy to the rear of my property. It is as you point out on flood risk area and as a result the properties would need to be raised as well. This means they will tower over the properties adjacent including mine. An eyesore and total loss of privacy to us all. My home is my asset and savings for my old age should I need to go into care or provide my own carers. I strongly feel it would devalue the property leaving my future at risk. I am most concerned that I was not advised by the council of this proposed change of use and wish to strongly lodge my complaint and register my objections. I hope I will get a response and be kept fully up to date from yourselves with any future developments that will affect me.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1505 comment_author: Mr G Scorthorne

comment content:

Gedney (South) is a beautiful residential community with a Primary School and a stunning church. But that is it! There is no shop, no post office, no doctors' surgery, no employment opportunities and a bus service that currently is threatened with cutbacks by Lincolnshire County Council. A generally remote location where transport is vital if people are to access work, school, leisure or simply the necessities of life. The field identified in the Local Plan as Gedney 023 is Grade 1 Agricultural Land, Government keeps on telling us that we need to protect quality food growing land. In addition the land is designated as being in Flood Risk Category 3 and we are told that land at risk of flooding should not be built on. However you appear to propose ignoring these points! We understand that at the present time, The Environment Agency are consulted on any planning application affecting sites that fall within Flood Risk Category 3 but where it is deemed necessary, houses can be built higher than existing ground levels. The SELLP for Gedney Church End 2015 suggests that floor levels should be raised by 300mm but currently planning permission is in place for a property in Gedney, in Flood Risk Category 3, to be built half a metre above existing ground levels! Within the twenty year lifespan of the Local Plan, who knows what new legislation will come into force which could make the height of the properties and our situation even worse.

As residents of Stonegate, Gedney, with views over open farm land, including specifically Gedney 023, we dread the prospect of having properties built behind us, but to have them towering over us too, is totally unacceptable. When approaching the village of Gedney

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

(South) from the A 17, one identifies with a typically charming Lincolnshire village, flat landscape and big sky. The imposition of an estate of properties rising out of the ground well above existing land levels will appear as a carbuncle on the horizon. There is no natural screening for this proposed development and therefore its stark contrast with the surrounding area will be for all to see! We bought our home twelve years ago as part of a ribbon development and paid a premium for a larger than average plot and privacy. We accepted a large number of clauses restricting the building of sheds, caravan parking, business use etc. In order to create and maintain a pleasant residential street with peace, tranquillity and a beautiful view. We did not want to live on an estate and at the time of the searches there was no suggestion that we would ever have to endure such a prospect. We also hoped that our asset, in which we invested our life savings, would appreciate in value over the years. Suddenly we are threatened with losing everything we came here for. The value of our asset, according to a highly respected local estate agent, will plummet in value. There will be a total loss of privacy with property owners behind us peering over the fences and able to look into our rear gardens and windows. The annexe to our property, built specifically to house our aged mother / mother-in-law, looks out over the open fields but the kitchen and bedroom windows are only eight feet from our rear boundary. Any occupant of the annexe will have no view whatsoever despite the plans being authorised by SHDC in 2004! We will lose the freedom to enjoy privacy in our home and in our rear garden and of course the pleasure of watching Egrets, Heron, the occasional Marsh Harrier, Kestrels and other birds that currently enjoy life to the rear of our property. We suspect that increased traffic along Stonegate, where

currently it is not easy for vehicles to pass, could see our grass verges disappear and thus further devalue our property by bringing traffic closer to our frontage and thus spoil our residential street of which we are so proud.

However, if it really is essential to increase the housing stock in our village, we believe that land to the West of Stonegate, i.e. Between Stonegate and Pinstock Lane, should be used before extending Gedney beyond its current natural boundary. Gedney 022 is in this enclosure and to extend that across to Rectory Farm would make total sense to us. The consolidation of the existing village centre rather than extending its unnatural boundary seems logical to us, but then we are not planners! In conclusion, we do have a genuine concern for the aesthetic appeal of our village and its community and we strongly believe that extending the current boundary of the village towards the A 17 is totally inappropriate. We believe that to in-fill the central area referred to above makes much more sense and could in fact enhance the quality of the village.

On a personal note we are extremely concerned that our home, our asset, in which we invested our life savings, could become virtually unsaleable and significantly drop in value. We would lose the use of our private rear garden as an amenity. On top of that we would suffer a total loss of privacy, as would any occupant of the annexe, and an overwhelming oppression as experienced by the occupants of properties on Eastgate in Fleet Hargate following a planning decision made some years ago.

We ask that you reconsider the proposal to include Gedney 023 in the Local Development Plan and thereby enable a large number of people to continue to enjoy the delights of a typical South Lincolnshire village.

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

ID1: 1506 comment_author: Mr T & Mrs R Whitehouse

comment content:

We have recently been informed that a proposal has been made to extend the village out towards the A-17 , using a field reported as ged023 , our bungalow is situated in Stonegate and is backed onto by this field , we are both in our eighties with health and mobility problems and our garden is at present our refuge with its privacy and open views and wildlife, we ask that you consider this before you takeaway our privacy, our light, our wildlife and our refuge

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1507 comment_author: Mrs F C Burrows

comment content:

I am writing to protest about the proposal to change the use of Grade 1 agricultural land (Flood Risk Category 3) situated at the rear of our property.

1 Is consideration currently being given to areas in S. Holland other than Gedney (022 and 023).

2 Environmental factors which must be fully considered: a) Raise building levels to 300mm and higher. What reassurance about rain/flood water run off affecting existing surrounding properties?

b) Density of estate under proposal (40?) will it be mixed, ie houses and bungalows will there be an element of social housing.

c) local services provisions, schools, bus, refuse collection, GP etc.

d) Wildlife Protection. Please note that bats (every evening, spring to autumn) Woodpeckers most days throughout year. Kestrel, sparrowhawks, skylark, colored doves plus more common field and garden birds.

I cannot overlook those factors which will affect me personally.

Loss of Privacy. How close to the rear of my property would the plan indicate.

Duration of buildings works. Access for builders vehicles, noise/pollution etc.

Stress/Anxiety. Most of the householders most closely affected are older or retired.

Depreciation in value of Property. Expectations are being discussed to sell or not sell-before the inevitable lowering of house values follows introducing an estate into a quiet village with few resources.

Aesthetics. Gedney 022 west of Stonegate and Pinstock have access to Rectory Farm would be a much more

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

attractive solution and help to retain a village profile rather than sprawl.

ID1: 1508 comment_author: Mr A W Tiffin

comment_content:

I am opposing the proposal to make the field behind the bungalows of myself and neighbours to qualify as building land. I believe the field is Ged023 and grade 1 land. The reasons I am objecting to this proposal are: This is prime growing land, I do not believe the access road is suitable as there would only be one way in and out, which would be the northern end of Stonegate as Stonegate peters out into a country lane at the southern end. The drainage of the field is poor now so I shudder to think where the lying water will drain off if there are access roads to new dwellings, plus driveways, pavements etc. The village has no amenities whats ver, we dont even have a shop. The majority of residents in Stonegate are retired and we would like to see out our remaining years in peace and privacy watching the local wildlife such as pheasant, partridges, sea birds and even the family of Hares in the adjoining field. Whatever happened to the Government Policy of building on brownfield land wherever possible? it would be difficult to find a greener site than Gedney023.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1509 comment_author: Mr Andrew Parks

comment content:

As for the nominated development areas I fully support the need for additional housing and affordable housing in particular. However, I would like to see special attention being given to open spaces within these developments as well as parking facilities for the affordable housing occupants. Cramped developments with narrow streets, lack of space and minimal parking facilities should be avoided.

My own concern here is for the proposed developments in Gedney. The village has one form of regular public transport and that is the 505 bus route. It is possible that this route will be exposed to cut backs in the future. At the moment the service stops at 7pm thus making it impracticable for many commuters to use. This means that the car will be the main form of transport for distance commuting. This makes it absolutely vital that private parking facilities on the Gedney development are more than adequate. It is also essential that the Parish Council have a say on how developer contributions are spent in the community with specific reference to open spaces, children's play areas etc.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

ID1: 1510 comment_author: Roger Turpin

comment content:

I refer to the proposed site Ged025 backing onto Church End and Topsgate, Gedney. Whilst it is recognized that there may be a future need for housing in this area the current infrastructure needs to be revisited. This site 's access would have to be either onto Topsgate or Church End, both of which are narrow roads joined by a tight 90 degree bend. As a resident of Topsgate I am extremely concerned at any increase in traffic. Topsgate is 16ft wide at it's narrowest and is used by the 505 bus service every 20 mins. Buses and any HGV's cannot pass other traffic and it is frequently blocked when traffic is diverted off the A17 following road traffic incidents. This would also relate to the proposed sites Ged 022 and 023. Gedney roads cannot sustain any more traffic than they do already. A secondary concern is to the capability of the sewers and drains to cope with additional properties. The sewer running under Topsgate frequently backs up and we are treated to "grey water" gushing from the manholes into the road and gardens. I can supply photo's of this and no doubt Anglian Water will confirm. This need to be addressed along with the electrical supply to the village before any more development schemes are contemplated. Gedney's existing residents do not need to be disadvantaged for the benefit of new developments.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

ID1: 1511 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

We very much support the identification of sites Ged 020, Ged 022 and Ged 023, as suitable housing sites in the SHLAA documents, and that sites Ged 022, and Ged 023 have been taken forward to be shown as 'Potential Housing sites' on the proposed Inset Map for the village. They complete a form of development close to the village centre, and their development for housing will be a logical infill to the frontage development in the location, as routinely seen in rural villages, following which, the new housing and families will be able to further support local services.

Officer Comment:

Concerns were raised about Gedney Church End about:

- treating Gedney Church End and Gedney Black Lion End differently when they score the same in the Sustainability of Settlements study. It exacerbates the split in the village.
- the classification of Gedney Church End as a 'Minor Service Centre'
- the scale of population increase and it being more than envisaged in Boston, Spalding and Main Service Centres
- the lack of facilities and the inability of the utilities to cope with the proposed development.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1512 comment_author: Mr and Mrs R Marsh

comment content:

Quotes from the Spatial Portrait: Lincolnshire have the richest and most extensive agricultural and horticultural resources in the country South East Lincolnshire produces 50% of the UK's horticultural crops and 40% of the UK's potato needs. It is the second most important provider in the UK. It is worth £470,000,000 towards the UK economy. A resource in 2010 Lincolnshire is primarily of rural character with extensive views and large open skies To ensure that land is used efficiently and that the loss of South East Lincolnshire's high quality agricultural land is minimised by developing in sustainable locations in appropriate densities

1. Development of G23 in Gedney goes against everything that is written in this Spatial Portrait.
 2. It would impact on the crop production for our area, albeit a small impact, it is none-the-less an important consideration, and should be measured when deliberating where new housing would best be sited.
 3. G23 in Gedney is Grade 1 prime agricultural land. Overriding this status to allow development and subsequent planning applications seems almost unbelievable. It is still being farmed; we understand a new 5 year contract has just been signed.
 4. Food production versus meeting housing quotas set by government has to be a balanced approach. There must be other plots of land, not Grade 1 Arable, that should be given priority before building on this valuable resource.
- 3.4.2 Flood Risk The field in Gedney G023 is in a Flood Risk, Category 3 Zone. Any new housing development on this field will cover a vast area of this land in concrete. The result will be a loss of the existing natural drainage through the soil. Although new builds

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

can have deeper footings (up to 300mm) to raise up the foundations of new dwellings, this will further impact on the visual impact for the existing residents. We already have an underground drain built in under the grass verge outside our property in Stonegate. This was installed as a provision when our property was built circa. 2002. Whilst there may be provision for underground drains to be installed beneath new dwellings on G023, there is a limit on how effective underground drains will be during severe weather conditions. This should be considered very seriously in any discussions about further development of this plot of land.

6.1 Retail Hierarchy Development of this site, earmarked as a Minor Service Centre has no advantage in positively affecting increased business and/or customer base in either Retail, Commerce or Small Business. There are currently none of the above in South Gedney. The existing residents rely on local services in either Long Sutton, Holbeach or the local store in Fleet Hargate. It would not help Sustain existing facilities or service needs of other local communities. Gedney residents health needs are serviced by doctors in Long Sutton, Sutton Bridge and Holbeach. These surgeries are already busy and sometimes appointments are difficult to get without having to wait a considerable time. More housing will only put more pressure on these already stretched resources. The Primary School in Gedney would need to have adequate capacity to enrol more children.

8.1.16. Public Transport The local council have already issued news through the media, that bus services have to be cut due to fiscal restraints. Service 505 which services Gedney has specifically been earmarked. Increase in housing will result in increase in car traffic through Stonegate which already has a steady stream

of local residents. The volume of this existing traffic is of course, increased at school drop off and pick up times. More importantly, when there is an incident on the A17, Stonegate is used as a by-pass round the A17 and the traffic is greatly increased; sometimes to a point of stand still.

We strongly oppose Development on Gedney Church End G023 for all of the above plus:

Access Access to this new site will be off Stonegate, between two existing bungalows. The increase in traffic from additional dwellings will be significant. We have many cyclists and dog walkers using Stonegate. In some parts, Stonegate only has a single pavement.

Pedestrians will be put at greater risk with any increase in motor vehicles. Visual Visual impact on our property will be considerable. The Planning Website gives guidance to people wanting to build a single new home, or an extension to an existing property. It stipulates that any new builds or extensions must not invade or intrude onto neighbouring properties. The G023 Local Plan seems to have total dis-regard for its own restrictions and policies, and furthermore, seems to blatantly flaunt and contradict any such fact. Whilst speaking to one of the Development Advisers at one of the recent meetings, she actually said that Grade 1 arable land is no longer a consideration; the needs of local housing has now taken priority. We only bought our property two years ago. We had an Environment Survey specifically drawn up to investigate the potential of any future development on the land behind our bungalow. The results at the time indicated that since it was Arable land, no such development was ever to be likely. We bought our bungalow because it had a lovely outlook over an agricultural field, and we were assured it would stay that way for many years to come. We are angry, upset and totally devastated by this

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

Development Plan. Notwithstanding any of the above, the value of our property will doubtless be negatively impacted. We also brought this to the attention of the Development Officer and she clearly had no concern for this at all. Someone, somewhere will be making a very good profit from this venture whilst the remaining existing residents of Stonegate, overlooking the G023 plot, will be sustaining financial losses on the values of their homes. Most of us are retired residents in bungalows on this side of Stonegate. None of us, I suspect, had any plans to move from this lovely quiet street and simply wanted to enjoy the peace and tranquillity of our surroundings for many years to come. This has changed for all of us, and although this in itself is not a legal consideration for the Development Council, we would like to ask that it be put forward as a moral consideration.

ID1:

1513

comment_author:

Fletcher Salads

comment_content:

In your report regarding sustainability credentials both Gedney Church End & Gedney Black Lion End have the same score of 28 but GCE is classed as a Minor Service Centre & GBLE as Other Service Centre. This would seem to be illogical as GBLE has certainly much better road & footpath infrastructure & is closer to Long Sutton. It also seems to be exacerbating the split in the village which is undesirable, & GBLE should also encompass Albert Avenue & the whole should be known as Gedney, as in the past. It would seem that the proposals for housing in GCE are too many for the infrastructure there, especially the roads, & some could be incorporated in GBLE.

Officer Comment:

The proposal to treat Gedney Church End and Gedney Black Lion End differently was based on flood risk data in that there is undeveloped land in Gedney Church End that has a lower hazard and depth category. All the land is national flood zone 3a. However, the comments re noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1514 comment_author: Mr & Mrs J E Butler

comment content:

Ged022 & Ged023. Concerns regarding the ill equipped local infrastructure especially the sewerage system currently in use which is now some 40 years old and heavily overloaded.
Ged022 The main road through the village connecting to the A17 is unsuitable for increased traffic and the new entrance, given the volume of traffic that would be using this entrance ie 30/50 residents cars, visitors, delivery vehicles etc, would make this a potentially dangerous junction, especially at school times when cars are parked the full length of this part of the road and vehicles coming from the direction of Fleet have to travel on the opposite side of the road for long distances. Our property fronts this development and we have had flooded back gardens and garden sheds in the past due to drainage problems, can the powers that be assure us this development will not cause more flooding problems for this area.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

ID1: 1515 comment_author: Lyndsay Retzback

comment content:

Please accept this letter as our objection to the proposed change of use, to the land at the rear left hand side of our property, from Grade 1 Agricultural Land to building land. Please find below our reason for objection;

Any such change we feel will infringe on our privacy, and potentially de-value our property.

As the land is Flood Risk Category 3 the Environment Agency could advise the houses to be built higher than the existing ground levels, further impacting our privacy and reducing the amount of sunlight into our gardens. Gedney South currently has only a Primary School, a church and a bus service but these services are not enough to support the village at present, further homes will impact the current situation.

The view of the village from the A17 will be a harsh eye saw, any development will dwarf the existing village and there is no natural screening.

Stonegate is not wide enough for the current volume of traffic, adding to this will make the road dangerous; taking away our footpaths is not an option!

Whilst I understand the need for new homes I feel the land to the west of Stonegate (between Stonegate and Pinstock Lane) Gedney 022 would be more appropriate for development. It is more natural to infill the village by extending across to Rectory Farm, this would make the village more central without the need to extend the outer boundaries visible from the A17.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1516 comment_author: Peter Udy

comment content:

A petition has been received from residents of Gedney Church End. It Says:
We, the undersigned residents of Gedney South, are horrified at the proposals to include fields within our village as potential building land. It is Grade 1 Agricultural Land. It is in Flood Risk Category 3. We have a Primary School, a church and a bus service that could be axed at any time by Lincolnshire County Council. No other amenities! Stonegate will need to be widened to cope with increased traffic causing our verges to disappear. Our narrow village roads will not cope with the increased usage and access to / from the A17 will be further compromised. Drainage systems will need to be changed dramatically to cope with increased development. Currently they fail to cope adequately with heavy rain. Houses built on this land will have to be raised well above existing ground levels allowing them to look over existing properties. The value of our homes will drop dramatically. We will suffer a total loss of our privacy. We ask that for once you consider the best interests of the ordinary people of Gedney rather than the two I three landowners who stand to become mega- rich at our expense.
It is signed by 23 people from 19 addresses. At present four have submitted their own individual comments

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1517 comment_author: Hix & son

comment_content:

have resubmitted part of Ged024 for consideration as a housing site. It is located to west of Ged022. They have suggested an alternative means of access which would involve demolishing a property owned by the family that fronts Churchgate.

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Ged032 in the SHLAA

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

ID1: 1518 comment_author: Historic England

comment_content:

Site Ged025 adjoins the curtilage of the Grade I Listed Church of St Mary Magdalene to the east and that of the Grade II Listed Bramley House to the south. Strong concerns are raised regarding the impact upon the setting of the Grade I Church. The assertion within the Sustainability Appraisal on page 46 of the Gedney Church End section, that No significant historic or culturally-significant features are likely to be affected by development of the site. is not accurate.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1519 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

Overall, on behalf of our clients, it is disappointing to see that site Ged 021 has not been identified as a suitable housing sites in the SHLAA documents. Having considered the assessment comments, we propose that an area of frontage development, approximately 1.2 acres (0.5 Ha), as shown hatched red on the attached amended site plan, would be a suitable alternative form of development, being close to the village centre, and would be a consistent form of frontage development in the location, as routinely seen in rural villages, following which, the new housing and families will be able to further support local services.

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Ged033 in the SHLAA

Officer Recommendation:

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site. Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

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

ID1: 1520 comment_author: Miss E Matthews

comment content:

Inset map 17 - Gedney Church End I am writing with objections to the proposed plan for Gedney Church End. Firstly, I oppose the reclassification of Gedney Church End as a 'minor service centre'. I do not believe Church End is suitable for any large scale development. There are no services in the village except for a very small school with no space for expansion. There are no shops, and the nearest Post Office and nursery are a minimum of fifteen minutes walk away along a narrow road with no footpaths. The only pub is the other side of a busy dual carriageway, and the road leading up to the dual carriageway has a narrowed section with no footpath. Any increase in housing will lead to an increase in traffic, making these roads even more dangerous for children and the elderly. There have been incidents on the narrow roads in the area when the A17 has been blocked, where vehicles trying to pass others have left the road. Whenever there are issues with the A17, the road through Gedney becomes completely gridlocked due to vehicles being unable to pass each other. I have also had to reverse along Topsgate in the past when I have met a bus at the narrowest point and there was no room to get by. I notice that traffic from all sites will be using Topsgate/Church End/Churchgate for access. This road not only contains the school and the church, but also is narrow in places, has sharp bends, and sections with no footpaths. It is used by six buses an hour (not including school transport), and often has children playing in and alongside it. There could also be problems with an increase in traffic damaging properties and the road surface. In the area around the church, all the houses shake whenever a bus travels along the road at any

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

speed. I believe this is due to a problem with the road surface subsiding at one point, which has been reported to highways but no action has been taken. Construction traffic will only worsen this problem with the road, and therefore the effect it has on the houses surrounding the problem area, as will the increase in traffic caused by the additional homes. There is no secondary school within a walkable distance, so any large increase in homes will lead to extra traffic, and extra expense for the council, as all the children will need to be bussed to school. The plan itself states that the secondary school is full, so they may have to travel some distance.

Though I object to all the sites on safety grounds, I particularly disagree with Ged025. Most importantly, developing this site will ruin the last unspoilt view of a 13th century church (which I notice is merely labelled 'green infrastructure' on the map). This is a grade one listed building which is particularly renowned for its large size in the surrounding low lying landscape, and nicknamed the 'Cathedral of the Fens'. Surrounding it by housing on all sides would seriously diminish the impact it has on the landscape. Also, this site is on the previously mentioned narrow road, adjacent to a sharp (right angle) bend where cars struggle to pass each other, and where there is no footpath. Whether you put the site entrance just before or just after the sharp bend, you are still going to have cars entering the road with no clear view of other traffic. The bend has another road entering it already. There is also no space on this road to provide the footpath the plan states is required, so children going to school in the village will be forced to walk in the road for some distance.

Though you state the waste water and foul sewage network have the capacity for this site, I do not believe that to be true. Where the new bungalows have been

built in Topsgate, I have seen waste water bubbling up through the manhole cover during periods of heavy rain, and the manhole cover on the bend further up towards Fleet Hargate does not seem to drain properly and is often seen full of water.

Site Ged023 is on yet another narrow winding road with poor visibility and no footpaths. It is also often used by farm vehicles.

Site Ged022's access road would enter Churchgate close to the school, which increases the danger for any children walking to school. This section of the road is also heavily used for parking whenever any school or church events are happening. It is practically opposite an existing road that enters Churchgate.

Ged024 can only be accessed via a road that is barely more than a private driveway, and that is heavily used by dog walkers heading for the footpath out into the fields. This yet again leads onto Churchgate/Church End which is not suitable for any increase in traffic.

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

ID1: 1521 comment_author: Mrs S Scorthorne

comment content:

Gedney has very limited facilities, comprising of a bus service, a primary school, Church, village hall and a pub. Within the draft Local Plan is a schedule of 'sustainability credentials'. Gedney Church End has a sustainability credential score of 28 which is the lowest amongst all of the 21 Minor Service Centres. Surely it makes sense to redistribute at least some of the 80 dwellings proposed for Gedney to one of the Main Service Centres, for example, nearby Long Sutton which has a sustainability credential score of 171. The population of the parish of Gedney was 2304 as at the 2011 census. As far as I am aware no properties have been built in the Parish since 2002 therefore the figure of 2304 probably represents the current population of the village. The figure of 2304 includes the population of the villages of Gedney Dawsmere, Gedney Drove End, Gedney Dyke and rural areas such as Gedney Marsh and Gedney Fen. It is not unreasonable to assume the population of Gedney Church End which is the area under consideration amounts to not more than about 350 (maximum of about 150 dwellings within the area defined by Inset Map No.17, multiplied by an occupancy rate of say 2.2). 80 new dwellings as proposed equates to a population increase of about 192 (based on an occupancy rate of 2.2 persons per dwelling). THIS REPRESENTS A POPULATION INCREASE DURING THE PLAN PERIOD OF AROUND 55% - 60%. I doubt very much if an increase in population of this magnitude is envisaged in Boston, Spalding or any of the Main Service Centres. It is untenable and grossly unreasonable. The proposed provision of 80 new dwellings must be reduced to a more appropriate figure. I am told developers will consider a

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Gedney Church End should be re-categorised as Other Service Centres and Settlements and along with Gedney Black Lion End named 'Gedney' and shown on one map. As a result no sites will be allocated. Infill development within the settlement boundary would be acceptable. The development boundary has been drawn across Ged025 to link the rear boundaries of those properties that front Tops Gate and Church End so that it does not adjoin the curtilage of the Church.

development of 80 dwellings as proposed by GED023 in a village with very limited facilities TOO large to contemplate. The best way of achieving more manageable growth is to remove GED023 from consideration.
