

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

Post_title: 26: Sutton St James

ID1: 1620 **comment_author:** G R Merchant

comment_content:

has submitted a site on behalf of Mr M Campling. It fronts Draw Dyke, is adjacent No2 and extends eastwards to nearly opposite the Sports Pavilion.

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Suj014 in the SHLAA.

The SHLAA says that although it will not have adverse impacts on natural or historic assets the site's development would harm the appearance of the area - it would create 140m of ribbon development which, whilst a characteristic form of development locally, is undesirable in that it would (in relation to the number of dwellings it would deliver) unacceptably increase the visual impact and perceived extent of the village's built-up area upon the surrounding countryside. Other options, in contrast, can consolidate the village's built-up area. The site is unsuitable, due to adverse environmental impacts.

Officer Recommendation:

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

ID1: 1621 **comment_author:** Sutton St James Parish Council

comment_content:

Sutton St James Parish Council would support any development that had the least impact on its existing residents, highways and infrastructure and was inclusive of affordable housing. Consideration should be given to Anglia Water's cordon sanitaire surrounding the sewer works within the village.

Officer Comment:

Support for the Housing requirement is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the approach is required.

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

ID1:

1622

comment_author: Jo Smith

comment content:

Sutton St James a rural community with poor transport links and infrastructure. I am not sure how additional housing of this volume would benefit anyone . Residents would see current facilities stretched to breaking point. And all the charms of living in a very small rural community would be lost.

Officer Comment:

The approach is based on the previous growth the village has accommodated; the facilities it has, which is the second best minor village; tempered by a poor score for public transport provision and employment and flood risk, which is predominantly flood zone 3a. However, based on the dwelling capacity of the sites available, and the site specific issues discussed in Section 5 of the Housing Paper it is considered that the Local Plan should seek to slightly reduce the number of dwellings proposed in Sutton St James's.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the approach is required.

Due to these comments it is considered that a change to Sutton St James's housing requirements is required and the Local Plan should identify housing allocations in Sutton St James for 70 dwellings between April 2011 and 31st March 2036.

ID1:

1623

comment_author: Historic England

comment content:

Impact upon the setting of the Grade II* Tower of St James church will require assessment, which is again not reflected within the Sustainability Appraisal.

Officer Comment:

The comment does not refer to any particular site. It is assumed it refers to this site as it is on the opposite side of the road to the church. It currently has redundant commercial buildings and a tall lattice framed aerial on it. It is therefore previously developed land. It is in flood zone 2
The Sustainability Appraisal scores this site as the best with three positive impacts.

Officer Recommendation:

Conclusions on site Suj007 – It is considered that site Suj007 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Sutton St James and that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:
• It is previously developed land, the best flood zone and has the best score in the Sustainability Appraisal. The setting of the Church is already affected by an unused commercial site and a residential scheme would need to take account of its position in the village. There is not a conservation area in Sutton St James.

ID1:

1624

comment_author: Ann-Marie Ward

comment content:

I have put through a pre-application for planning permission at post code 'PE12 OHX'. Unfortunately the response we got was not hopeful. Please see attached the councils response as well as our request. As noted in the response from the council the village boundaries do not extend to the location that we would like to build, however I can confirm that there are several properties located along the very same road of where we would like to build our first home. I have attached the plan of the site for reference. Please could this be looked into by the Development Boundary department. Attached letter re: pre-application from South-Holland planning. I write in reply to your recent pre-application enquiry. The site is outside a defined settlement limit within an area regarded as open countryside. Policy HS7 of the South Holland Local Plan, 2006 only provides for new housing in the open countryside where it is proven to be essential to meet the needs of agricultural/other rural workers. The above policy complies with advice within Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, 2012, produced by Central Government. The latter indicates that local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside. Whilst personal circumstances are a material planning consideration they seldom outweigh established planning policy geared towards protecting the open character of the countryside and ensuring that new residential development is in a sustainable location. To determine whether there is an essential need for a dwelling the following criteria are

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Suj015 in the SHLAA.

The SHLAA says that the site is not in scale with the 80 dwellings which the emerging Local Plan seeks to be developed in Sutton St James and although it will not have adverse impacts on natural or historic assets, & the site's development would harm the appearance of the area - it is unrelated to the existing village, and would create an incongruous group of dwellings in the countryside, to the detriment of the area's character. The site is unsuitable, due to conflict with the Local Plan's locational strategy, adverse environmental impacts, and poor location.

Officer Recommendation:

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

normally strictly applied: 1. There is a clearly established existing functional need. Such a requirement may arise, for example, if workers are required to be on hand day and night to monitor livestock or crops; 2. The need relates to a full-time worker; 3. The unit/enterprise concerned has been established for at least three years, has been profitable for at least one of them, is currently financially sound, and has a clear prospect of remaining so; 4. The functional needs of the holding could not be fulfilled by another existing dwelling on the unit, or any other existing accommodation in the area which is suitable and available; 5. Other planning requirements. This planning advice is given in good faith but is an officer opinion only and therefore is not binding on any formal decision the Council may make following the receipt of a planning application. BUILDING REGULATIONS The works that you are proposing may also require Building Regulations and this informal advice or any subsequent planning permission does not give authority under Building Regulations to commence work. Please contact the Building Control section for further information on 01775 764557 Yours faithfully David Gedney, Senior Planning Officer dgedney@sholland.gov.uk

ID1: 1625 comment_author: Mr P Stubley

comment content:

has submitted land at the rear of, and including, 132 Chapelgate as a housing site.

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Suj016 in the SHLAA.

The SHLAA says services and facilities are potentially accessible by foot, bicycle and public transport, but the Highway Authority comments that the access to this land is on the existing junction of Chapel Gate (B1165), Fishergate (B1165), Broad Gate and Mill Lane. A further junction at this already complex junction would not be safe or acceptable. The site is unsuitable, due to transport issues.

Officer Recommendation:

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.