

Post\_title: **01: Boston**

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

ID1: 1 comment\_author: Mr Andrew Burling

comment content:

The following comments are in relation to the proposed Housing Allocation at Fis001 Land east of Lindis Road, Boston

Cyden Homes support the allocation of the site for housing and confirm that the capacity for development is around 180 Plots after deduction of land required for Public Open Space and Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems.

The Landowner of all four parcels of land entered into a legal agreement with us last year for the promotion and development of the land and as such confirm that all the land is secured and available for immediate development should the allocation be confirmed.

We have already undertook significant pre development enquiries and are able to confirm that the following applies:-

1. Primary Vehicular Access is proposed from Lindis Road and advise that there is no vehicular access proposed from Blackthorne Lane
2. Emergency Vehicle access only is proposed from the existing farm access positioned on Eastwood Road
3. Junction arrangements have been agreed with the Highway Authority and confirm that there is sufficient land within the control of the development to secure the necessary visibility lines
4. The existing public footpaths will be retained and incorporated into the new development layout
5. The part of the site in the location of the former Scrap Yard and Farm Yard will be investigated for any

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

This comment does not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

contamination and remediation will be proposed as part of the development

6. Anglian Water Services have confirmed to us via a pre-planning assessment report that there is sufficient capacity in both clean water and used water capacity to serve the development (copy is available if required)

7. The Witham Fourth IDB have confirmed that discharge of surface water to the adjacent watercourse is available at restricted rates

8. There are no other services or drains within the proposed development site or other natural or ecological constraints that would restrict development

We therefore confirm that the site is suitable and deliverable on sustainability grounds for the allocation of 180 dwellings with the associated infrastructure, open space and services.

---

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

ID1: 2 comment\_author: Mr Andy Carrott

## comment content:

The following comments refer to the Preferred Housing Sites. If the status of any of the other sites changes or any other sites are added please re-consult with the Board.

Fis001 - the site is served by an IDB watercourse on its eastern boundary and to which Byelaws apply. No development (including but not limited to any structure, fence, landscaping, tree planting, paths is permitted within 9m of the watercourse without the prior consent of the Board. This watercourse experiences high water levels following heavy rain and can only accommodate an attenuated discharge. Gravity outlets are likely to become submerged.

Fis003 - the site is served by an IDB watercourse on its eastern boundary and to which Byelaws apply. No development (including but not limited to any structure, fence, landscaping, tree planting, paths is permitted within 9m of the watercourse without the prior consent of the Board. This watercourse experiences high water levels following heavy rain and can only accommodate an attenuated discharge. Gravity outlets are likely to become submerged.

Fis033 - the site has IDB watercourses on its south and north boundaries and is also bisected by a Board's watercourse, and to which Byelaws apply. No development (including but not limited to any structure, fence, landscaping, tree planting, paths is permitted within 9m of the watercourse without the prior consent of the Board. These watercourses benefit from downstream improvements to allow for

## Officer Comment:

Fis001 - The comments are noted. The Byelaw requirements would not prevent the residential development of the site, but would seek to influence the layout of the eastern-most parts to ensure that the Board's access to its drain was not compromised.

Fis003 - The comments are noted. The Byelaw requirements would not prevent the residential development of the site, but would seek to influence the layout of eastern parts of the site to ensure that the Board's access to its drain was not compromised.

Fis033 - The comments are noted. The Byelaw requirements would not prevent the residential development of the site, but would seek to influence the layout of parts of the site to ensure that the Board's access to its drains was not compromised.

Fis038 - The comments are noted.

Nor006 - The comments are noted.

Wit008, Pil002, Pil005, Pil006 - The comments are noted.

## Officer Recommendation:

Fis001 - This comment does not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Fis003 - This comment does not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis003 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Fis033 - This comment does not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis033 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Fis038 - This comment does not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis038 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Nor006 - This comment does not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Nor006 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Wit008, Pil002, Pil005, Pil006 - These comments do not call into question the sites' suitability for allocation. It is therefore considered that sites Pil002 and Pil006 should be taken forward as 'Housing Allocations'. However, it is considered that there are sufficient doubts about site Pil005's availability to mean that it should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation' for the following reasons: although planning permission was granted for

development and can accommodate surface water run-off above greenfield run-off rates (subject to agreement and development charges).

Fis038 - this site has access to a Board's watercourse for an attenuated surface water discharge at its south east corner.

Nor006 - a Board maintained watercourse exists 175m (approx.) to the west of this site and could accommodate an attenuated surface water discharge.

Wit008, Pil002, Pil005, Pil006 - the Board has no assets that could benefit these sites for discharge of surface water.

In all cases Board's consent is required to discharge surface water to a watercourse (private or Board maintained).

the site's residential development in 2009, this permission has now lapsed; and the site is in three separate ownerships, and none of the owners have promoted their land for development at any point in the Local Plan process. Furthermore, the Borough Council's Planning Committee has resolved to grant planning permission (reference B/16/0007) for the development of 48 dwellings on site Wit008. Consequently, it is considered that site Wit008 should not be taken forward as a Housing Allocation, but should instead be shown as a Housing Commitment.

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

ID1: 3 comment\_author: Mr Colin Massey

## comment content:

Site BO005 Riverside Industrial Estate, Boston:

I wish to maintain my objection to the de-allocation of employment land and to the allocation of alternative land. Your responses stated in the SELP Employment Paper July 2016 section 5.3 page10, do not deal with all of the comments previously made and are inconsistent. You claim to be de-allocating and that is undeliverable due to cost of servicing and provision of infrastructure. In reality the current allocation was serviced to its boundary when the Marsh Lane extension was constructed at tax payers and land owners expense.

## Officer Comment:

The proposed 17.4ha of employment land at Riverside is not alternative land – this land is within the adopted Local Plan allocation. Lincolnshire County Council identifies that ‘when LCC straightened and improved Marsh Lane in 1996 the Council entered into a voluntary S278 agreement such that certain land owners would make a contribution towards the cost of the road improvements if they developed their land for employment uses or alternatively by a long stop date of 2006. The agreement was retrospective for improved access that LCC had provided back in 1996 to land that at that time (1996) was allocated for employment. The agreement did not imply that the sums paid would be returned if at a later date the land was deallocated. After all, the improved access which the payments helped deliver still exist. Land to the east of Heron Way, the site of the Waste Recycling Centre and land to the north of Recycling Centre were subject of the S278, LCC did receive payment from the Baptist Trust under a contract they had willingly entered in to. LCC are not aware of any threat of CPO and there was no obligation on LCC to do anything further once the payment was received. The plan attached to the agreement shows that the land to the west of Heron Way and north of Slippery Gowt Lane were never part of the agreement.’ It is considered that the parcels of land covered by the agreement should be included in the Riverside boundary, as opening up costs associated with delivery of these sites should be lower as access improvements may not be required. The NPPF is clear ‘planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land

## Officer Recommendation:

BO006 Riverside Industrial Estate is one of the more suitable employment sites in Boston Borough and should be taken forward as a Preferred Option Main Employment Allocation. Change the allocation to include land covered by the s278 agreement.

allocations should be regularly reviewed.' The land not covered by the agreement (to the west of Heron Way), would have higher opening up costs ( e.g. access and flood mitigation), and have been allocated since 1999 and not proved attractive to the market. This indicates that market demand is low and these sites may not be as deliverable as the preferred sites over the plan period.

---

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

ID1:

4

comment\_author: Ms T M Cooper

comment\_content:

Fis001 - site off Lindis Road, Boston.  
I definitely oppose the development of 180 homes. I can see Fis001 out of a bedroom window. It is very visible. the field comprises a countrified scenario behind our houses on Eastwood Road. The main area is agricultural and runs behind my property, half way down a road of 200 approx. houses. Crops are on the fields and that is how it should stay. Growing food for a growing population. Fis001 is to the extreme left corner behind me, not directly behind.

Blackthorn Lane. Noise. Cars. 180 cars or 360 if 2. We'll say 300. Blackthorn Lane running right next to the would-be-development will suffer noise with constant traffic of cars up and down, school runs. The area can't take 200-300 more cars trying to get out onto Lindis Road. It's just ridiculous. You can't just take a field, dump houses in it. As well as precious land lost, you've got many more people dumped as well.

Height of houses for flood risk. Boston area is a complete flood plain with big dykes/drains and a river. Ridiculous. Surrounded by water. Apparently being built that much higher. That will mean Blackthorn Lane houses and gardens will be overlooked, losing privacy. What are all the cars going to be parked on? It can't be tarmac. That will roll the water straight off onto other properties. You can't have gravel flying about. Is it going to be mud, then? Bringing that onto our roads.

Bins for rubbish. 360 bins and some brown ones if needed. Can you imagine the possible stink from the green bins and the space they will need. Look how

Officer Comment:

It is inevitable that the development of this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings, but this would be equally true of all alternative sites. The majority of the site is classified as 'best and most versatile' agricultural land, but this is equally true of all greenfield sites in and around Boston. It is accepted that it is preferable to develop previously-developed sites, but such sites are not available in sufficient numbers to meet Boston's housing needs.

The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation.

At the time of a planning application, the layout and design of a scheme would be carefully scrutinised to minimise overlooking and privacy loss. Anglian Water Services Ltd. has indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land;

It is inevitable that the development of this site would impact to some degree upon the character of the area, but this is equally true of all alternative sites, and it is considered highly unlikely that impacts will be as severe as the objector fears.

The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation.

The site has not been identified as being of any special wildlife value (i.e. It is not a Local Wildlife Site, etc.).

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

unsightly they will be. I shall be able to see all this from halfway down Eastwood Road. Bins, houses, cars up and down. Think of the residents already living near this. it's just awful. The area can't take being so spoilt. Quality of life completely lost.

Access. Coming out on Lindis Road. More cars + more traffic = accident risk. We don't want road humps either, damaging our vehicles. Access coming near Monteith Crescent opposite Lindis Road and Tower Road. I've mentioned (we'll say 300 cars, not quite 2 each but it is the norm nowadays). These are all coming streaming out of this site, turning left to come onto Eastwood Road. A bad corner for visibility, opposite a road joining from Woodthorpe Avenue. All trying to go the same way, coming past my house - speeding like many of them do. If they manage to turn right, they'll go down Freiston Road - 200 houses. Very busy road, going into the town. This couldn't be planned better "willing accidents to happen" with all this added traffic. Eastwood Road/Freiston Road - both heavy traffic and not suited to more cars. All the residential areas around the access will be affected very adversely. The whole Plan scenario is fraught with difficulties - "danger" we can say, and forcing people to lose any quality of life.

Wildlife - trees want keeping. They help us breathe and for birdlife. In a built up area we need open spaces. We also need the crops for food. What right have we to concrete over all our heritage of fields and spaces for the wild things. We need a balance for our survival. Development opposed. Any wildlife will be desecrated by this planned site of 180 houses. A massive number in an area already jammed up with houses, a school, old peoples home, all near to this development. Hedgehogs in decline come to people's gardens to feed.

What will happen to these? Butterflies need wild plants and flowers and like long grasses. Pheasants have always been amongst the trees to the rear of the site. It will affect them. Cuckoos also in decline need trees and hedges. in Lincolnshire, we are known for our farming community and countryside. This is being eroded by building. I have heard cuckoos here and seen bats flying around my back garden (protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981).

To concrete over Fis001 (and the fields directly behind me Fis017 and Nor013) for a pot of money will ruin so many people's lives, creating stress beyond belief. In the end we'll be stuck in our houses, unable to get anywhere for traffic and flooded out for our pains.

I say planners and councillors "What planet are you on?"

---

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

ID1: 5 comment\_author: Bruce Mather Ltd

## comment content:

Site BO005 Riverside Industrial Estate, Boston:

We wish to CONTINUE to object against the de-allocation of the 25.2ha of employment land and to the allocation of 17.4ha of alternative land. This is simply not acceptable.

The comments stated in the South East Local Plan Employment Paper from July 2016 section 5.3 page 10, do not answer all of the comments raised historically and lack consistency.

It is not right to de-allocate the land because of the servicing and infrastructure costs when it had been previously allocated due to the Landowners and tax payers paying for the area to be serviced through a request from Lincolnshire County Council. This has been done already to provide infrastructure for the agreed light industrial development and improve the facilities.

## Officer Comment:

the proposed 17.4ha of employment land at Riverside is not alternative land – this land is within the adopted Local Plan allocation. In response to comments made in both the January and July 2016 consultations: Lincolnshire County Council identifies that ‘when LCC straightened and improved Marsh Lane in 1996 the Council entered into a voluntary S278 agreement such that certain land owners would make a contribution towards the cost of the road improvements if they developed their land for employment uses or alternatively by a long stop date of 2006. The agreement was retrospective for improved access that LCC had provided back in 1996 to land that at that time (1996) was allocated for employment.’ LCC confirm that ‘land to the east of Heron Way, the site of the Waste Recycling Centre and land to the north of Recycling Centre were subject of the S278 agreement. LCC did receive payment from this landowner under a contract they had willingly entered in to. The plan attached to the agreement shows that the land to the west of Heron Way and north of Slippery Gowt Lane were never part of the agreement.’ However this did not mean that the employment allocation should remain in perpetuity. National policy has changed; the NPPF is clear ‘planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed.’ All the sites have had the benefit of an employment allocation in the Local Plan since 1999, and even with this, these sites have not proved attractive to the market (and for land to the east of Heron Way even with direct access onto Marsh Lane) for employment

## Officer Recommendation:

BO006 Riverside Industrial Estate is one of the more suitable employment sites in Boston Borough and should be taken forward as a Preferred Option Main Employment Allocation. No change required to the allocation.

development. Market signals therefore indicate that these sites may not be as deliverable as the preferred sites over the plan period, particularly with flood mitigation and the opening-up infrastructure costs. Land to the north of the Recycling Centre was retained as a preferred employment site in the July 2016 consultation to reflect the better take-up of land in that part of Riverside, its relationship with existing employment uses and its compatibility with neighbouring uses. Access arrangements are development specific so it is not clear whether the access point on Marsh Lane or to the north of the Recycling Centre could accommodate vehicle movements from all future employment development – this would need to be confirmed through the planning application process. However the other sites proposed for de-allocation were not involved in these highways works and therefore it cannot be concluded that they would benefit from the s278 agreement. All the sites are greenfield and would require utilities, flood mitigation, a spine road/access, and for the land to the west of Heron Way and north of Slippery Gowt Lane would require major highways improvements to provide safe access.

ID1:

6

comment\_author:

Roslyn Deeming

comment content:

We acknowledge that a number of sites to the east of Boston, Fishtoft and Kirton are now not included as housing allocation sites which reduces potential impact on land which is functionally linked to the Wash Special Protection Area (SPA).

Officer Comment:

Natural England previously expressed concerns about three of the 'Potential Housing Sites' identified in Boston (Fis023, Fis025 and Fis038) on the basis that they were within land highlighted by their Impact Risk Zones as functionally linked to the Wash SPA where Pink Footed Geese have been known to forage. Two of these sites (Fis023 and Fis025) have not been taken forward as 'Preferred Housing Sites', and Natural England's comment suggests that these concerns are now satisfied.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that this comment justifies a change to the Plan's provisions.

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

ID1:

7

comment\_author:

Mr Kevin Smithbone (Boston Bapt

comment\_content:

Further comments received from Chair of Boston Baptist Trust (Mr Kevin Smithbone):

Email:

So strongly do we feel that a reallocation is unfair and unjust that we have decided to submit a second Comment Form, this time concentrating on the lands to the West of the specified area, notably that parcel of land on the Northern Corner of Wyberton Low Road and Slippery Gowt Lane that belongs to the Boston Baptist Trust. The Trust paid a considerable sum of money towards the establishment of infrastructure to this land and has not seen any great amount of that investment materialise to our benefit or advantage. At the time of the agreement was reached for payment, the Trust was told that we either paid or the Council would place a CPO on the land “ so with our arms very much 'up our backs' - we agreed to a very significant investment of Charity money. We feel that should the reallocation be changed the Council would be morally (if not legally) obliged to reimburse the Boston Baptist Trust at least a proportion of the payment it has made.

Comment form: The Trustees of Boston Baptist Trust strongly OBJECT to the deallocation of this 25.2ha of employment land and to the allocation of 17.4ha of alternative land, with particular reference to the 8+ acres of land at the junction of Wyberton Low Road and Slippery Gowt Lane marked '2' on the map below. The existing allocation has infrastructure provided to service it, which in this particular instance was provided at great expense by the Trust at the insistence of Lincolnshire County Council “ as a response to a

Officer Comment:

The proposed 17.4ha of employment land at Riverside is not alternative land – this land is within the adopted Local Plan allocation. Lincolnshire County Council identifies that ‘when LCC straightened and improved Marsh Lane in 1996 the Council entered into a voluntary S278 agreement such that certain land owners would make a contribution towards the cost of the road improvements if they developed their land for employment uses or alternatively by a long stop date of 2006. The agreement was retrospective for improved access that LCC had provided back in 1996 to land that at that time (1996) was allocated for employment. The agreement did not imply that the sums paid would be returned if at a later date the land was deallocated. After all, the improved access which the payments helped deliver still exist. Land to the east of Heron Way, the site of the Waste Recycling Centre and land to the north of Recycling Centre were subject of the S278, LCC did receive payment from the Baptist Trust under a contract they had willingly entered in to. LCC are not aware of any threat of CPO and there was no obligation on LCC to do anything further once the payment was received. The plan attached to the agreement shows that the land to the west of Heron Way and north of Slippery Gowt Lane were never part of the agreement.’ It is considered that the parcels of land covered by the agreement should be included in the Riverside boundary, as opening up costs associated with delivery of these sites should be lower as access improvements may not be required. The NPPF is clear ‘planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land

Officer Recommendation:

BO006 Riverside Industrial Estate is one of the more suitable employment sites in Boston Borough and should be taken forward as a Preferred Option Main Employment Allocation. Change the allocation to include land covered by the s278 agreement.

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

perceived 'threat' from LCC some years ago their applying for a CPO should the Trust decline to pay. We believe that having accepted payment, LCC has entered into a formal agreement with Boston Baptist Trust to provide infrastructure for light industrial development and to promote the sale of the land for that purpose.

For LCC to now withdraw from this agreement would leave the Trust with no other option than to seek financial recompense for monies paid, services withheld and an agreement broken.

allocations should be regularly reviewed.' The land not covered by the agreement (to the west of Heron Way), would have higher opening up costs ( e.g. access and flood mitigation), and have been allocated since 1999 and not proved attractive to the market. This indicates that market demand is low and these sites may not be as deliverable as the preferred sites over the plan period.

ID1:

8

comment\_author:

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

comment\_content:

In February we pointed out that two Sites of Nature Conservation Importance appear to be missing from the map (Porcher's Pit SNCI and Allen House Pond SNCI). In the case of Porcher's Pit SNCI this is still an omission on the map, however, Allen House Pond has since been reassessed by the Local Wildlife Sites Panel and is no longer classified as a SNCI and therefore does not need adding to the map.

There also appear to be errors in the depiction of Havenside as the areas of the site which are Local Nature Reserve appear to be shown as recreational open space rather than LNR. These mapping errors should be corrected.

Officer Comment:

The Local Plan does not show 'Sites of Local Nature Conservation Interest', because their value has not been confirmed by recent assessment. Allen House Pond no longer exists, and Porcher's Pit was subject to a scoping assessment by Scarborough Nixon Associates which concluded that it clearly lacked sufficient interest to merit fuller assessment as a potential Local Wildlife Site.

Local Nature Reserves at Havenside and Witham Way, Boston have been omitted in error.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that this comment justifies a change to the Plan's provisions.

Amend Inset Map 1 and the Policies Map to show the Local Nature Reserves at Havenside and Witham Way, Boston.

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

ID1:

9

comment\_author:

Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire

comment\_content:

I have no objections to the proposals put forward on archaeological grounds.

It is likely that all sites in Boston would require archaeological intervention/survey prior to a planning application being submitted, in line with the NPPF.

This advice is subject to change depending on the level of information available (for example, new information may come to light).

Officer Comment:

The comments are noted.

Officer Recommendation:

These comments do not call into question the sites' suitability for allocation. It is therefore considered that sites Sou006, Wes002, Fen006, Fis001, Fis033, Wyb033, Cen001, Fen001, Fen002, Fis002, Fis003, Fis038, Nor006, Pil002, Pil006, Wes001, Wit008 and Wyb013 should be taken forward as 'Housing Allocations'. However, it is considered that there are sufficient doubts about site Pil005's availability to mean that it should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation' for the following reasons: Although planning permission was granted for the site's residential development in 2009, this permission has now lapsed; and the site is in three separate ownerships, and none of the owners have promoted their land for development at any point in the Local Plan process. Furthermore, the Borough Council's Planning Committee has resolved to grant planning permission (reference B/16/0007) for the development of 48 dwellings on site Wit008. Consequently, it is considered that site Wit008 should not be taken forward as a Housing Allocation, but should instead be shown as a Housing Commitment.

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

ID1: 10 comment\_author: Bruce Mather Ltd

comment\_content:

Fis033:

Mr and Mrs Wing are the owners of the site by Alcorn Green and Smalley Road. They are in support of the site being allocated as a preferred housing site. They are in the process of working with Bruce Mather to find a suitable development partner.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis033 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

ID1: 11 comment\_author: sheila123

comment\_content:

Fen 011:  
Although Fen 011 is not a preferred housing site at the moment, please use Fen 011 in the near future for housing development with an access road from Punchbowl Lane onto Middle Drove should the need for housing in Boston increase or the current preferred housing sites not be deemed suitable. This follows our previous comment (2) under the sub heading Fen 011 in January 2016.

Officer Comment:

The SHLAA identifies site Fen011 as undevelopable because it is in six separate ownerships and the intentions of two of the owners are unknown, i.e. it is classified as 'unavailable'. These owners have not come forward to indicate that, were the site to be allocated, their land would be released for development.

Officer Recommendation:

Notwithstanding that the SHLAA classifies site Fen011 as being undevelopable, it was put forward as a 'Potential Housing Site' in the January 2016 consultation (in the hope that the remaining two owners would come forward to indicate that their land is available for development). However, the land owners did not come forward, and consequently it was not put forward as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the July 2016 consultation. The above objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Fen011 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 12 comment\_author: Bruce Mather Ltd

comment\_content:

Nor006:  
Mr Forman is the owner occupier of the site. He is in principle in support of the site being allocated as a preferred housing site. He is in the process of working with consultants to consider bringing the site for development.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Nor006 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1:

13

comment\_author:

Mrs J Price and Mr W T Price

comment\_content:

SITE Fis001

Our objections to this proposed development are as follows:

1. Lindis Road was originally only a lane and, as the Gas Board discovered when laying new pipes this year, parts of it still has the original infrastructure such as drains and telephone wires. It would seem that much of this would have to be improved to accommodate upwards of 180 new houses.
2. Having lived here for 36 years we are very well aware how contaminated the old Shooter site must be. It was used for scrap metal processing, battery storing, offal collecting, welding and breaking up of machinery to name some of the uses.
3. Every morning and evening between 8.15 and 9.15 and between 3pm and 4.30pm the roads between Eastwood Road, Blackthorn Lane and Tower Road have non-stop traffic. it is almost impossible to safely get out of our drive for small children walking and cycling to the 5 schools in this small area. With another road onto Lindis Road with the accompanying traffic and children I foresee even more danger and chaos. This also has an effect on the roads around Ashlawn Drive, caused by parents parking in front of residents' gates the length of the road, causing them to miss appointments etc. How much worse with possibly 100 plus more children and cars in the area which is in effect almost a dead-end.
4. There are 2 public footpaths crossing the proposed area which are much used by the local people, ourselves included. they won't be much of footpaths through a high-rise housing estate. These fields are prime agricultural land which have been farmed productively for at least the last 50 years that I have

Officer Comment:

1. The Local Plan will need to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met, and these matters will be dealt with in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany later versions of the Plan.
2. It is likely that part of the site has been contaminated by previous use, and that remediation works would need to be carried out. However, it is considered unlikely that such costs would impact upon development viability.
3. The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation.
4. Existing footpath routes across the site would need to be retained within any new residential layout. The majority of the site is classified as 'best and most versatile' agricultural land, but this is equally true of all greenfield sites in and around Boston.
5. It is inevitable that the development of this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings, but this would be 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.
6. It is accepted that it is preferable to develop previously-developed sites, but such sites are not available in sufficient numbers to meet Boston's housing needs.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

lived in the area and would be a loss to the rural nature of this part of Boston.

5. According to our Insurance Company we live in an area of high flood risk, and certainly parts of this land is low-lying, so the answer is to build very tall houses? Not aesthetically pleasing in an old Rural Area. When thoughts of building on what was the Paddock several years ago (part of the field behind the scrap yard) permission was only given for 12 bungalows and the builder, I understand, was to be responsible for all utilities and road structure. This, at the time, was obviously not considered viable because of all the attendant problems.

6. We do feel that the constant pressure from the Government and the growing population in this small Market Town to provide more and more new housing when there are many undeveloped brownfield sites and houses in the area which are not selling except as buy-to-let (causing yet more overcrowding problems) has not been adequately addressed by Fis001 Local Plan, and that because of the pressure to act, a completely unsuitable site has been selected without sufficient consideration for the needs of the area.

---

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

ID1: 14 comment\_author: Graham Warren Ltd

## comment content:

Boston:

Broadgate, when making representations on the Draft Plan in January/February, suggested that in order for the Plan to be found sound, allocations at Boston were required to fulfill a specific Boston housing requirement. Broadgate suggested that Wes002 be brought forward as a preferred site and The site can provide up to 1,000 dwellings. Broadgate has an ongoing development programme for this site and to this end can ensure that it will make an early contribution to the council's five year supply of deliverable housing land and that provision is made to safeguard the route of the Western Distributor Road when considering a master plan for the site as a whole.

Wyberton:

While the allocation at Boston is welcomed, Broadgate consider that the Plan does not go far enough to secure circa 5,900 dwellings in the town over the Plan period and still leaves it open to the criticism that it is unsound. The site at Wyberton (Wyb010), in which Broadgate has an interest and shown on the attached plan (plan provided by email), can support 130 dwellings. It has a boundary with to the urban area and lies within flood zone 3a. It can be seen from the attached illustrative master plan (plan provided by email) that the site can be developed in a manner that ensures it relates well to the existing urban area and countryside. This site also offers early delivery to address the five year housing requirement and Broadgate is of the Opinion that it should also be

## Officer Comment:

Wes002 - The comments are noted.

Wyb010 - It is not agreed that the Local Plan's housing allocations in Boston are inadequate to meet needs. It is not disputed that, were it to be allocated, site Wyb010 could potentially be delivered relatively quickly. However, the trajectory at the end of the Housing Paper - Boston (September 2016) shows that there is no shortage of sites expected to deliver dwellings in years 6-10 and 11-15 of the Plan period. Whilst site Wyb010 is considered to be both available and deliverable, it is not considered to be suitable for residential development because:

- Its development would have harmful impacts upon the character of the area – it would extend development into an area with a strongly rural character, to the detriment of that character;
- Its development may have adverse impacts on natural assets – the site is an orchard, and the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan includes a Habitat Action Plan for traditional orchards;
- Given its peripheral location, the site is less accessible to the majority of the town's existing services and facilities than are alternative sites; and
- The site has greater amenity value than alternative sites.

## Officer Recommendation:

Wes002 - It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Wes002 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Wyb010 - The SHLAA classifies site Wyb010 as being undevelopable, and consequently it was not put forward as a 'Potential Housing Site' in the January 2016 consultation, nor as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the July 2016 consultation. The above objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Wyb010 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

allocated to contribute to Boston's overall housing requirement.

---

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

ID1: 15 comment\_author: D and T Dainty

## comment content:

SITE Fis001  
Because changes are the same for alternative sites d sn't make them more acceptable. We, on Blackthorn Lane, have chosen this lane because of the quietness and the fact that we have relative privacy. If you choose a house that has other properties around, you are willing to accept a degree of lack of privacy.

Highway Authority comments that 180 dwellings is very high for a cul-de-sac. in fact the tone of this paragraph is that they are not totally convinced of the safety of the proposed site. Everyone agrees the junction at Lindis Road and Freiston is very poor, but it should be noted that not every car will turn left out of the proposed estate. Others turn right onto Tower Road which, at peak times, will cause problems especially when the junction of Tower Road and Freiston Road which is also difficult to use due to bad visibility to the left. How many vehicles will come from these homes? Has there been any research into this? A sensible guestimate will be 1 per house plus at least half again, which gives a grand total of 270.

Has the Government relaxed the more stringent building regulations in order to complete their perceived need for housing?

I believe there will be a sizeable number of affordable homes planned for this site. Is there any way of preventing these dwellings being used as homes of multiple occupancy? As there seems to be no one with overall responsibility in these buildings they can often look neglected. This will not contribute to the look and

## Officer Comment:

It is inevitable that the development of this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings, but this would be 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 comments that it is supportive of this allocation.

It is likely that approximately 15% of the dwellings built upon the site would be required to be affordable homes (typically homes owned and rented out by housing associations, or shared equity homes), but experience suggests that such homes are less likely to become homes in multiple occupation than are those sold on the open market

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

value of the homes. There was research last year by Lincoln in response to this query of Multiple occupancy.

ID1:	16	comment_author:	D and T Dainty		
comment content:	<p>Would you please explain the logic of offering 4,681 dwellings plus 51 additional small sites, when it is stated in the Local Plan that 3,794 dwellings were needed. This means more houses are planned than is required. Why? Surely in these times of economic uncertainty we should husband our economic resources very carefully as other areas of local and national government have to.</p>	Officer Comment:	<p>The objectors are quite correct that the Plan's housing provisions for Boston are expected to deliver 6,713 dwellings during the Plan period, whereas the requirement is for just 5,900 dwellings (i.e. provisions outstrip requirements by 13.8%). However, inevitably some sites may not come forward, the delivery of others may be delayed, or the number of dwellings delivered by a site may fall short of that expected. It is considered that a modest over-provision will provide a buffer or flexibility allowance to ensure that housing delivery rates will not fall short of expectations, even in the face of unexpected circumstances.</p> <p>Economic resources are not being wasted by proposing and allocating land for development as sites will only come forward for development when economic to do so. The sites are in private ownership and no public resources are involved in acquiring or developing sites.</p>	Officer Recommendation:	<p>It is not considered that these comments justify a change to the Plan's provisions.</p>

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

ID1: 17 comment\_author: Fisher German LLP

comment\_content:

The land as shown on the attached plan [291-293 London Road and land behind - plan provided by email] has not been identified in plan the preferred sites for development as it is an existing bus depot currently in use. However, the owner is relocating and this site will be brought to the market as a potential redevelopment site shortly. It is contained within the confines of the settlement boundary of Boston and Wyberton and would ideally suit a mixed use residential and small retail scheme. It is being made available with immediate effect. Interested parties are being invited by the owners to submit proposals for promoting the development of this site.

Officer Comment:

This site has been given the reference number Wyb041. It is currently in use as a bus depot and other commercial uses, and the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Public Consultation on Preferred Sites for Development (July 2016) shows it as being within Boston's 'Settlement Boundary' with no specific allocation. The Employment Land Technical Paper does not conclude that the site should be allocated for employment use, and the SHLAA identifies it as 'available', 'achievable', and 'suitable' and therefore concludes that it is developable.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Wyb041 would be capable of accommodating 41 dwellings (at 30 dwellings per hectare), and the SHLAA classifies it as being developable. It is therefore considered that it should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

ID1: 18 comment\_author: Mrs Sheila Anderson

comment\_content:

Fen 011:  
Although Fen 011 is not a preferred housing site at the moment, please use Fen 011 in the near future for housing development with an access road from Punchbowl Lane onto Middle Drove should the need for housing in Boston increase or the current preferred housing sites not be deemed suitable. This follows our previous comment (2) under the sub heading Fen 011 in January 2016.

Officer Comment:

The SHLAA identifies site Fen011 as undevelopable because it is in six separate ownerships and the intentions of two of the owners are unknown, i.e. it is classified as 'unavailable'. These owners have not come forward to indicate that, were the site to be allocated, their land would be released for development.

Officer Recommendation:

Notwithstanding that the SHLAA classifies site Fen011 as being undevelopable, it was put forward as a 'Potential Housing Site' in the January 2016 consultation (in the hope that the remaining two owners would come forward to indicate that their land is available for development). However, the land owners did not come forward, and consequently it was not put forward as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the July 2016 consultation. The above objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Fen011 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 19 comment\_author: JHWalter LLP

comment\_content:

1.0 Introduction and Legislative Requirements

1.1 Local planning authorities are required to consult and take into account any representations received by The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

1.2 This representation, on behalf of Cyden Homes Ltd. Has been prepared in response to the six week consultation on the Emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan that ends at 5:00pm on the Friday 12th August 2016.

1.3 The representation is specifically in relation to an area of land that lies to the east of Lindis Road, Boston. It is annotated and referred to as site Fis001 in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), the Local Plan AND Sustainability Appraisal documents. This representation provides support to this allocation.

1.4 The representation proposes an allocation on land extending to 7.46ha for around 180 dwellings.

2.0 South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Preferred Sites 2016

2.1 Boston Borough, South Holland District and Lincolnshire County Councils are collaborating to produce a single Local Plan covering the districts of Boston and South Holland. It is intended to be the development plan for the area for the next twenty years.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed, and the comments are noted.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

2.2 Between 8th January and 19th February 2016, comments were invited on the Draft version of the Plan. This included a vision and strategic priorities for the area, draft policies and options for possible land allocations. The site Fis001 was included as one such possible land allocation, extending to 7.46ha with 0.75ha of public open space, a development area of 6.71ha and a capacity of 224 dwellings.

2.3 In response to the consultation, Cyden Homes advised that they supported the site and:-

Owing to open space and SUDS requirements, the developable area is 6 ha., giving a maximum capacity of around 180 dwellings. Any proposals will include the necessary flood mitigation measures. Anglian Water confirm there are no sewers or water mains crossing the site, and that the local water network has capacity and the foul sewer network has capacity for the development. Sufficient land has been secured onto Lindis Road to accommodate the required visibility standards. The proposed 180 dwellings is below the maximum allowed from one highway access and should ease concerns of visibility issues on Freiston Road/Eastwood Road. We have agreements with all land owners and the site could be delivered in the first part of the Plan period. ☐

2.4 Two landowners also supported the allocation.

2.5 Comments are now being invited on the Preferred Sites for Development Document which includes allocation for residential, employment and other uses. The accompanying Housing Paper (July 2016) concludes that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

## 3.0 Comments

3.1 Cyden Homes fully support the inclusion of the site Fis001 as a large housing site. It is noted that, although a joint Plan is being prepared for Boston Borough and South Holland, the two areas are subject to separate strategic housing market assessments. Boston Borough covers a significant area of land beyond the town itself but the Boston Borough SHMA (July 2015) identifies that 84.6% of the Borough's housing needs to 2036 are within the town itself. The preferred sites result in 78.7%

of the supply being within the town. It is noted that this is significantly less than the SHMA need. Whilst, Cyden Homes do no object to the proportion of housing being proposed for the town in response to the SHMA need, it should be no less than currently proposed and the emphasis should be on deliverable sites to meet this need. In this context, it is noted that there has been a persistent undersupply within the Borough and only large sites that are both sustainable and deliverable can reverse the undersupply position and respond to need.

3.2 Representations received in response to the previous consultation raised objections and disputed the sustainability of the site. It is acknowledge that the Housing Paper (July 2016) responded robustly to these comments. However, Cyden Homes would wish that the following points are taken to consideration by the Joint Committee to reinforce the status of the site as both sustainable and deliverable.

3.3 Site capacity and density - It is acknowledged that there are two, parallel public right of way footpaths that cross the site from Lindis Road in the west to the

eastern boundary. Cyden Homes do not have any intention in applying to extinguish these linkages within and through the development. The need for an appropriate amount of public open space, a sustainable urban drainage system (SUDs) and a density of development to reflect the prevailing density of development in the area, are also acknowledged. Indeed, this prompted the representation earlier in the year to reduce the overall quantum from the 224 proposed in the Draft Plan to around 180.

3.4 Sustainability of the location - This is evidenced by the accessibility to services and facilities by foot/cycle and/or public transport:-

- i. The nearest convenience store providing a range of goods essential to everyday living is the Kescho Junior Convenience Store on Forbes Road. This is only 460m from the site and linked by lit adopted pavements with negligible changes in gradient. This is within the desirable walking distance as defined by the Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT) as recommended by the Department for Transport. Adjoining the store is the Lloyds Pharmacy. There is a zebra crossing across Freiston Road enroute.
- ii. The nearest school is the St. Nicholas C of E Primary School on Woad Farm Road, 650m from the site, again linked throughout by adopted lit pavements with negligible changes in gradient. This is within the acceptable walking distance defined by the IHT guidance. There is a zebra crossing across Freiston Road enroute.
- iii. The nearest public open space is on Wellington Road but it is proposed to provide on-site space accessible

within 300m of all future residents of the development and also to the benefit of the social sustainability of existing residents on the north side of Freiston Road in the Lindis Road area

iv. There are inbound and outbound bus stops directly adjacent to the site access on Lindis Road. These bus stops benefit from a raised table for level access onto low floor buses and timetable information. They are served by the IT6 and G61 services that connect directly and regularly to the town centre and the services and employment it provides. The G61 services takes just 7 minutes and there is the ability to connect to the 1, 2 or 4 services for onward travel to secondary schools and Boston Pilgrim Hospital. The total journey from the site to the Hospital or Boston High School on Spilsby Road involves one simple change and can take less than 20 minutes.

v. The IT6 and G61 bus services also connect directly and regularly to Wide Bargate. From there, there is a short walk of under 150m along adopted pavements with negligible gradient change to Parkside GP Surgery and Boston Smile Centre dental surgery, both accepting new NHS patients according to the NHS Choices web-site.

3.5 Infrastructure - It is acknowledged that the development of around 180 dwellings may impact on local infrastructure provision. However, Anglian Water has already confirmed that the local water network and the foul sewer network have capacity for the development. With regards to other infrastructure, for example education or healthcare, it is expected, at any planning application stage, that contributions will be provided where related in scale and kind to the

development proposed, reasonably required to make it acceptable as per Regulation 122(c) of the 2010 Community Infrastructure Regulations and where it is viable to do so.

3.6 Access - The comments from the County Highways Authority are supported, specifically that the site is within a sustainable location (as evidenced in paragraph 3.4) and that the residual number of vehicle trips generated by the development would not add materially to congestion such that the site should not be allocated for residential development. Applying Manual for Streets standards, it is noted that an appropriate width and visibility splay can be provided at the access onto Lindis Road with land within the developer's control. It is also noted that the extent of the site provides clear scope for providing the internal loop requested by the County Highways Authority without affecting the overall quantum of development. With regards to the wider network, and with specific reference to the junction of Lindis Road and Freiston Road, it is noted that the visibility westwards is below standard. However, as the County Highways Authority rightly identify, the residual cumulative impact would have to be 'severe' with planning appeal decisions clearly setting the bar for 'severity' very high - with a strong presumption in favour of approving residential development in sustainable location. The resultant impact of the development on this junction is not severe. Furthermore, accident data shows that, whilst there have been one serious and two slight injury collisions at this junction in the past five years, these did not involve vehicles leaving Lindis Road and there is no evidence that the poor visibility is causing an injury

accident problem;

3.7 Heritage - It is noted that none of the site is designated as a heritage asset, neither is it adjacent to such assets. Specifically, it is not within or adjacent to a conservation area. It does not contain a listed building or scheduled monument and nor are there such designated assets on adjoining land. Views of the St. Botolph's Church tower (the Stump) will be respectfully considered and preserved.

3.8 Landscape, visual impact and amenity - The site benefits from being a natural infill surrounded on three sides by existing residential development. This not only ensures that the development does not appear intrusive into the open countryside around Boston, avoiding urban sprawl and light pollution, but it also reinforces the prevailing residential character of the area. It is expected that, at the density proposed as a result of the reduced quantum of development, the residential amenity of existing residents will not be significantly affected. This would be achieved by careful siting and orientation of the new dwellings as well as the consideration of the massing of new buildings close to site boundaries.

3.9 Ecology - The site is not the subject of any formal designations such as a SSSI, SNCI or LWS. It would be expected that any application for the development of the land would be accompanied by an extended phase 1 habitat survey with any mitigation or compensation measures required identified in the survey report.

3.10 Flood risk and drainage - It is acknowledged that the site is within flood zone 3. However, as the Council's own assessment concludes and is evidenced

in this representation, the site scores highly in other respects. Indeed, amongst the potential Large Housing Sites assessed, the Sustainability Appraisal gives the site the best score. Furthermore, as detailed in paragraph 3.1 of this representation, the number of sites within Boston is already less than that evidenced as being required in the town in the SHMA (2015). Sustainable and deliverable sites such as Fis001 must therefore be retained as allocations to respond to the need.

Turning to surface water drainage, it is expected that the sequential approach will be adopted with a SUDs system proposed where infiltration is not evidenced as being possible. Such a system would respond to a 1 in 100 year event allowing for climate change and the quantum of development suggested is set at around 180 dwellings to reflect the land take for SUDs.

3.11 Deliverability - Cyden Homes are a local housebuilder that support this allocation and foresee it as a deliverable site. Indeed, there are formal legal agreements in place with all of the landowners to ensure this site is brought forward. There are no known significant opening up costs or remediation required for the majority of the site (it is acknowledged that the former scrapyard element may require remediation). In summary there are willing landowners and developers for the site and it is clearly deliverable.

## 4.0 Conclusions

4.1 It is suggested that site Fis001 (land of Lindis Road, Boston) is retained as an allocation for around 180 dwellings.

4.2 It will constitute an environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development that can

contribute to the growth objectives of Boston Borough Council and the South East Lincolnshire Joint Committee responding to the need in the SHMA (2015).

4.3 The site is deliverable with no major constraints, willing landowners and a formal legal agreement in place with Cyden Homes, a local Lincolnshire housebuilder.

---

ID1: 20 comment\_author: Mr P.E. Carter

comment\_content:

I write to oppose the planned development of site number FIS001 for the following reasons:

- 1) The addition of circa 224 dwellings would significantly reduce the amount of land for excess rainwater to soak into. Heavy rainfall in 2007 led to surface water flooding in this area, and reducing the land available for run-off would increase the chances and severity of such flood events.
- 2) The proposed 224 dwellings would mean an additional 250+ vehicles in the local area. A further exit onto Lindis Road would be a danger, but a major concern would be the Lindis Road exit at the Eastwood Road / Freiston Road crossroads. Visibility from Lindis Road at this junction is poor. This crossroads is already busy and further vehicles would mean an accident waiting to happen. The local area already suffers from traffic congestion at peak school times. There was a tragic death along Tower Road in July 2016. Do we really want to run the risk of further deaths / serious injuries?
- 3) The proposed building of 224 dwellings would increase the population of the surrounding area by around 750. To put things bluntly, there are not enough local amenities for the current population, let alone for a further 750+ people. For example, there are no large shops, doctors surgeries or parks in the area, and there are insufficient primary school places in the vicinity.
- 4) The proposed site at FIS001 is a haven for wildlife. I have seen deer, foxes, hedgehogs, sparrowhawks and

Officer Comment:

1. Anglian Water Services Ltd. has indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land.
2. The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation.
3. The Local Plan will need to demonstrate how arising infrastructure needs will be met, and these matters will be dealt with in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany later versions of the Plan.
4. The site has not been identified as being of any special wildlife value (i.e. It is not a Local Wildlife Site, Site of Special Scientific Interest, etc.).
5. An up-dated SHMA will be commissioned to identify local housing requirements in the light of the most recent population/household projections and any other material issues

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

It is not considered that the comments justify a change to Boston's housing requirements, and (subject to the findings of an up-dated SHMA) it is considered that the Local Plan should continue to seek to identify housing allocations in Boston to provide for 5,900 dwellings between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2036.

bats, to name but a few. I believe that bats are a European Protected Species, so "their breeding sites and resting places are fully protected by law". Building on this site would destroy this wildlife environment forever.

5) With the British population voting to leave the EU in the Referendum in June, there will be a reduction in the number of economic migrants within the Boston area. By the time the proposed dwellings are built there will be little demand for them. I would suggest that the supposed need for such a development was devised before the EU referendum. Given the result of that referendum, I would now suggest that, at the very least, a new housing needs survey be executed.

---

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

ID1: 21 comment\_author: Bruce Mather Ltd

## comment content:

Wyb003:

We are submitting this comments form to make you aware this site which has not been identified in the preferred sites for development is available now for development.

Presently the site has a developer interested in agreeing an option. The landowner is happy to consider development proposals and will make the site available once the option has been agreed.

The site provides sustainability with both existing, recent and new developments taking place to three of the four site boundaries. The developments are both Employment and Residential, these being the new Marston's Public House, The Chain Bridge ☐ Tesco, B & Q, the new Lidl supermarket, Wortleys Lane and Swineshead Road existing residential properties. There are also two recent successful planning applications for new residential dwellings which are located beyond this site and the settlement line. These are B/14/0013 for 20 dwellings on Swineshead Road and B/16/0138 accommodating 6 dwellings on Wortleys Lane.

Site WYBOO3 is positioned well in relation to the road networks having the roundabout exit directly leading to the frontage of site WYBOO3. There is also Wortleys Lane abutting the western site boundary.

The infrastructure costs from Boston Borough Council

## Officer Comment:

The July 2016 SHLAA acknowledges that site Wyb003 is available and achievable, but raises concerns that residential development in depth would appear incongruous in an area where frontage development only currently exists - the SHLAA goes on to acknowledge that the significance of this issue would potentially be reduced if a major urban extension is pursued at site Sou006. The emerging Local Plan does indeed identify site Sou006 as a 'Preferred Housing Site' and, given that planning permissions are outstanding for residential development to its west (reference B/16/0138) and north (reference B/14/0013) and the emerging Local Plan allocates further land to its west as a 'Preferred Housing Site' (reference Wyb013), the area's character is expected to change greatly in the relatively near future. In these circumstances, it is considered that the July 2016 SHLAA's arguments concerning adverse visual impacts are weak, and that the site could be allocated for residential development without the expectation that it would harm the character of the area. However, the County Highway Authority comments that site Wyb003 is immediately south of the A52 roundabout that links to Westbridge Road between Tesco and B&Q. This pocket of land sits within the safeguarded corridor for the Boston Distributor Road (BDR). Whilst no formal route has been allocated as yet, the proposed BDR bridge over the South Forty Foot Drain is most likely to be positioned to cross the drain and link to the north end of Westbridge Road, should that section proceed. Ideally, it would then continue to the south, to enable a smooth route. That aside, the next phase of BDR is likely to be developed through, and be linked to Chestnut Homes 'Quadrant 2'

## Officer Recommendation:

The SHLAA classified site Wyb003 as being undevelopable, and consequently it was not put forward as a 'Potential Housing Site' in the January 2016 consultation, nor as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the July 2016 consultation. It is considered that this objection raises issues that suggest that the SHLAA's assessment of the site was flawed. However it is considered that the allocation of site Wyb003 for residential development would potentially conflict with emerging plans for the provision of a Boston Distributor Road, and that consequently it should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

for this area are stated as likely to be relatively low and for this site, if it is allocated, there is a reasonable prospect that it would be developed.

With the Marston's new Public House being finished the Council have described site WYBOO3 as representing a gap in a built up frontage and the site needs a review.

In the Wortleys Lane residential Planning Approval, (B/16/0138) the council considered this location to the western boundary of site WYBOO3 as it would be very difficult to describe the location of the site to be anything other than highly sustainable given the amount of facilities and services that are within easy walking distance of this site. Additionally, Residential development exists immediately north and north east of Wortley's Lane. A further dwelling exists to the west and an extensive range of farm buildings and glass houses also adjoin the site to the west and south. The site is therefore not considered to be isolated from the surrounding development since it is across the road from development limits and it is therefore considered that, in terms of the location of the site, it can constitute a sustainable form of development".

(site Sou006). Again, whilst the route of this is not yet defined it is possible that it would need to link to the same A52/Westbridge Road roundabout due to the roads/river/housing pinchpoint at the current West End Road/Chain Bridge Road roundabout. Obviously the safeguarded corridor is designed to protect this area in the future. In this context, it is considered to be inappropriate to allocate site Wyb003 for residential development as this would potentially compromise the emerging plans for the provision of a BDR.

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

ID1: 22 comment\_author: Bruce Mather Ltd

comment\_content:

Fis003:

We represent Messrs P & J Woods, the owners of this site in Whitehouse Lane, Fishtoft, Boston. They are in support of the site being allocated as a preferred housing site and are working with Bruce Mather to find a suitable development partner.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis003 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

ID1: 23 comment\_author: Bruce Mather Ltd

comment\_content:

Wyb001:

We represent Mr N R Bowser of E W Bowser & Son Ltd, the owners of this site in Tytton Lane East, Wyberton, Boston. He is in support of the site being allocated as a preferred housing site and is working with Bruce Mather to find a suitable development partner.

Officer Comment:

Site Wyb001 is not identified as a 'Preferred Housing Site'. However, it forms part of the larger 'Preferred Housing Site' Wyb033.

The support is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that the comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Wyb033 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 25 comment\_author: Lincolnshire County Council

## comment content:

Cen008 - Access issues can be overcome, the site is well located close to the centre of Boston. Site has no worse neighbour than others in the surrounding area which have recently been given planning approval.

Wyb033 - The County Council support the allocation as landowner of part of the site (Sou001 in the SHLAA)

## Officer Comment:

Cen008 - Whilst it is agreed that the site is close to Boston's centre, it is not agreed that access issues could be overcome – it is highly unlikely that vehicular access from the A16 would be permitted, and the site adjoins no other public highways. Whilst a nearby site (the former Pilgrim Frozen Food premises) has recently been redeveloped with dwellings, it is considered that: potential 'bad neighbour' issues on the former Pilgrim Frozen Food site were less acute, given that it does not directly border onto the railway line or industrial units; and opportunities to mitigate against potential impacts are more limited on site Cen008, given its smaller size.

Wyb033 - The support is welcomed.

## Officer Recommendation:

Cen008 - The SHLAA classifies site Cen008 as being undevelopable, and consequently it was not put forward as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the July 2016 consultation. The above objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Cen008 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Wyb033 - It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Wyb033 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 26 comment\_author: Bruce Mather Ltd

comment content:

Wyb004 -

We wish to support site Wyb004 for development for the following reasons:-

The Landowner is in agreement for the site to be developed.

Infrastructure costs are considered by Boston Borough Council to be relatively low and not to place a burden on it.

The Agent has a number of experienced developers seeking a site in this area for residential development. There are services and facilities accessible on foot and by public transport.

The Highways Authority are unlikely to raise issues regarding traffic problems as the site has good access to the existing road network.

Officer Comment:

The positive attributes identified by the objector are not disputed. However, the SHLAA classifies site Wyb004 as undevelopable because:

- it is adjacent to a poultry farm which may impact upon the amenities that could be enjoyed by future occupiers of any dwellings;
- it would have harmful effects upon the character of the area (it is unrelated to the town's existing built-up area, and would create an outlier of development in an area with a strongly rural character, to the detriment of that character); and
- it is not located within nor adjacent to the town's existing built-up area.

Officer Recommendation:

The SHLAA classifies site Wyb004 as being undevelopable, and consequently it was not put forward as a 'Potential Housing Site' in the January 2016 consultation, nor as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the July 2016 consultation. This objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Wyb004 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 27 comment\_author: DLP (Planning) Limited

## comment content:

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Mr R Hardy and Richard Hardy (Fishtoft) own land to the south of Wainfleet Road, Boston ( the Site 1)

1.2 The site was previously included in the draft Local Plan for South East Lincolnshire as a 'potential housing site' (reference Fis017), but has been discounted in the 'Preferred Sites for Development' stage of the Local Plan.

1.3 Site Fis017 is shown in figure 1 below [figure 1 included in email copy of representation] and comprises the land to the south of Wainfleet Road, to the east of Boston. We have recently been made aware that site Fis017 includes a small parcel of land to the north-west corner and a small area of land on the eastern boundary (to the north of Rochford House) which are not owned by Mr R Hardy and Richard Hardy (Fishtoft) (circa 1 hectare in total). Although immaterial in the context of the remainder of the site (it does not impact upon the development potential of the site) these areas of Fis017 are not promoted through this representation. For ease of reference the site is continued to be referred to as Fis017 in this representation, but is subject to the above clarification.

1.4 The site relates well to the existing built form of Boston. In this regard, the western boundary is defined by the rear gardens of properties on Somerby Green, Somerby Way, Princess Anne Road, Sandringham Gardens and

## Officer Comment:

Boston's Housing Requirements - It is not disputed that new development in flood risk areas can be made more flood resistant and resilient. However, regardless of any engineering solutions and adaptation measures employed, any new homes built in flood risk areas would still expose their occupants to residual risks. Consequently, the NPPF indicates that "local plans should apply a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development ... By applying the Sequential Test" and "if necessary, applying the Exception Test". Thus, the NPPF's priority is clearly to steer development to areas with the lowest flood hazard, although the consideration of wider sustainability objectives can justify allocations in areas of greater hazard. It is considered that the Local Plan's provisions are entirely consistent with the NPPF's approach. It is not accepted that the Plan's provisions for Boston lack flexibility/headroom – although Boston's housing requirements (2011-2036) set out in Revised Policy 12 are for 5,900 dwellings, completions, commitments and Preferred Housing Sites are expected to deliver 6,713 dwellings within the Plan period. This equates to an 13.8% 'buffer'. Furthermore, it is not accepted that the Preferred Housing Sites are lacking in terms of the range of site type and size they offer – a total of 18 sites are identified, two of 1,000+ dwellings, four of 200-999 dwellings, and twelve of 10-199 dwellings. In addition, the trajectory identifies a further seven sites which, whilst too small in size to be identified as allocations, are nonetheless deliverable or developable.

Site Sou006 - The objector is correct that the Housing Paper: Boston (July 2016) identifies that site Sou006 is

## Officer Recommendation:

Boston's Housing Requirements - It is not considered that these comments justify a change to Boston's housing requirements, and (subject to the findings of an up-dated SHMA) it is considered that the Local Plan should continue to seek to identify housing allocations in Boston to provide for 5,900 dwellings between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2036.

Site Sou006 - It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Sou006 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Site Wes002 - It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Wes002 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Site Fis017 - The SHLAA classifies site Fis017 as being developable, and it was put forward as a 'Potential Housing Site' in the January 2016 consultation. However, it was not taken forward as a 'Preferred Housing Site' in the July 2016 consultation because better, alternative sites could be identified. This objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Fis017 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Sites Fen009, Fen011, Fis023, Nor012, Nor013, Nor014 and Wit013 - Notwithstanding that the SHLAA classifies these sites as being undevelopable, they were put forward as 'Potential Housing Sites' in the January 2016

Blackthorn Lane. The Burton House Public House and the Burton House Bowls Club lie to the north-west corner of the site. The southern boundary again adjoins the existing built form of the settlement with the rear gardens of properties on Eastwood Road defining the boundary.

1.5 The Eastern boundary has a permanent boundary which comprises Rochford Tower Lane. Rochford House is located on Rochford Tower Lane, but the dwelling and its curtilage is excluded from the site. The Ball House Public House is adjoins the north east corner of the site. The northern boundary of the site, also has a permanent boundary; it is formed by Wainfleet Road (A52). There are a small number of properties at the western end of Wainfleet Road whose rear gardens forms the northern boundary of the site in this location.

1.6 The representation is submitted to promote the site for residential development, reiterating the site's deliverability, suitability for development and ability to be brought forward for such use early in the next plan period (deliverability).

1.7 This report will provide our comments on the 'preferred sites' identified as 'Major Urban Extensions' by the Joint Committee and explain what changes we recommend in order to ensure that the plan accords with the aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

(amongst the potential Major Urban Extensions) exposed to the most severe flood risk and has a relatively poor Sustainability Appraisal score. However, the Housing Paper goes on to identify that Sou006 has three positive qualities, namely: it is surrounded on three sides by the town's built-up area and its visual impacts will be acceptable; its development could contribute directly to the provision of a distributor road to the west of Boston and take advantage of the benefits provided by such a road; and the site is being promoted by a house-builder and thus confidence about its achievability is high. The objector's argument that the site's identification as a Preferred Housing Site has been largely driven by issues around the distributor road is not therefore accepted. The selection of preferred sites (including Sou006) has been in response to a number of material planning considerations including housing delivery over the plan period. How the SHLAA sites have been assessed and decisions taken is clear in the evidence and it is not entirely predicated by the Boston Distributor Road (BDR) as is implied by the objector. Chestnut Homes have been unequivocal in their support for development of the area of land known as Sou006 even before work on the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan was started. This has not, however, made the selection of Sou006 an inevitable selection or a site selection that does not require proper evaluation of its suitability. That being said, strong evidence from a developer is a key consideration in determining the likely delivery of sites, especially sites in sustainable locations. Local Transport Plan 4 set the expectation that the Local Plan would need to demonstrate that future land use allocations for development could support a BDR. Previous work on the likely line of the BDR was that it would run to the west of the urban area linking the A16 to the south with the A16 to the north.

consultation (in the hope that owners would come forward to indicate that their land is available for development). However, the land owners did not come forward, and consequently they were not put forward as 'Preferred Housing Sites' in the July 2016 consultation. These comments do not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to these sites was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that sites Fen009, Fen011, Fis023, Nor012, Nor013, Nor014 and Wit013 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocations'.

.....

2.13 With the above in mind [see para's 2.9-2.12], it is highlighted that the site is located in the Fishtoft area which, in general, is not a deprived Ward. ONS statistics indicate that compared with the Lincolnshire average, its long term unemployment rate was below average (19.6% compared to 25.6%) as was its crime rate per 1000 at 28.5 compared to 49.7. Furthermore, the percentage of residents without access to a car is below the County average (15.1% compared to 18%). As such it is likely to be an attractive market area for housebuilders.

2.14 The allocation of further sites in Boston will also provide greater certainty that Boston Borough Council will have a five year housing land supply on adoption of the Joint Local Plan.

#### Preferred Sites

2.15 The 'Preferred Sites' Consultation seek comments supporting or opposing specific identified settlements and/or sites which the Joint Committee intend to allocate for development.

2.16 As such, Table 1 below provides our comments on the sites that the Joint Committee both intend to allocate in Boston and also provides our comments on those sites that have been discounted at this stage, including land to the south of Wainfleet Road (ref Fis017). We have focussed upon the Major

Whilst it has been accepted that development-led delivery of the BDR was well beyond the time period of the Local Plan, the opportunity that the Local Plan could offer needed to be evaluated. In terms of meeting housing needs for the Boston urban area combined with evidence brought forward through the SHLAA it was determined that some housing delivery would need to be provided by sustainable urban extensions. Chestnut Homes promotion of site Sou006 provides both a sustainable urban extension to help deliver housing needs and a potential piece of infrastructure supporting part of the BDR. Whilst the Local Plan has been in preparation Chestnut Homes were granted planning permission for Q1 which is a large mixed development scheme linked to the delivery of a new football stadium for Boston United. Part of the package of development was major road infrastructure ( a new roundabout) on the A16 to the south of the urban area. This was provided as part of the infrastructure required for the BDR. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment examines, specifically, the viability of Sou006 and the road infrastructure requirements of the BDR, through the site, were assessed as part of the opening up costs. This assessment was also shared with Chestnut Homes as part of testing the robustness of the WPVA approach and modelling. At this point in time the evidence from the WPVA suggests that providing road infrastructure to support parts of the BDR is viable. It is incorrect to state that the Joint Committee has taken any decisions with regard to Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL) but the evidence from the WPVA (at least for viability in Boston Borough) probably indicates that CIL will not be viable. This however does not override the soundness or strategy of the Local Plan given that it is a long term plan and the BDR is potentially an even longer term aspiration.

Urban Extensions as they are comparable to the site which is promoted through this representation.

Table 1:

Fen009 - The site was discounted by the Joint Committee due to site ownership constraints (the site appears to be in 13 separate ownerships). It is agreed that the site cannot be considered available and is therefore not deliverable.

Fen011 - The site was discounted by the Joint Committee due to site ownership constraints (the site appears to be in 6 separate ownerships). It is agreed that the site cannot be considered available and is therefore not deliverable.

Fis017 - The site has been discounted by the Joint Committee due to it being located to the east of Boston. The Joint Committee consider Major Urban Extensions should not be allocated to the east of Boston due to the proposed delivery of the Distributor Road identified in the 4th Lincoln Transport Plan (LTP4). The Joint Committee consider development to the east would not directly contribute to, or benefit from, the provision of such a road. LTP4 anticipates that areas of land will be identified for future development in the emerging Local Plan which may help facilitate the possibility of a Distributor Road to the west of Boston (our emphasis). Notwithstanding the above, it is highlighted that an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), is required to identify what infrastructure is required over the plan period to deliver the vision and objectives of the emerging Local Plan. It is also required to identify potential

Site Wes002 - The objector is correct that the Housing Paper: Boston (July 2016) identifies that site Wes002 is (amongst the potential Major Urban Extensions) exposed to the most severe flood risk. However, the Housing Paper goes on to identify that Wes002 has three positive qualities, namely: it has a relatively good Sustainability Appraisal score; its development could contribute directly to the provision of a distributor road to the west of Boston and take advantage of the benefits provided by such a road; and the site is being promoted by a house-builder and thus confidence about its achievability is high. The objector's argument that the site's identification as a Preferred Housing Site has been largely driven by issues around the distributor road is not therefore accepted. The selection of preferred sites (including Wes002) has been in response to a number of material planning considerations including housing delivery over the plan period. How the SHLAA sites have been assessed and decisions taken is clear in the evidence and it is not entirely predicated by the Boston Distributor Road (BDR) as is implied by the objector. Local Transport Plan 4 set the expectation that the Local Plan would need to demonstrate that future land use allocations for development could support a BDR. Previous work on the likely line of the BDR was that it would run to the west of the urban area linking the A16 to the south with the A16 to the north. Whilst it has been accepted that development-led delivery of the BDR was well beyond the time period of the Local Plan, the opportunity that the Local Plan could offer needed to be evaluated. In terms of meeting housing needs for the Boston urban area combined with evidence brought forward through the SHLAA it was determined that some housing delivery would need to be provided by sustainable urban extensions. Broadgate Homes

funding sources and any potential funding gaps.

Notably, the South East Lincolnshire Baseline Infrastructure Statement in relation to the proposed Boston Distributor Road states (paragraph 2.19);

To date no detailed modelling has been carried out as to the Distributor Road's benefits and no technical work has been undertaken related to engineering a specific route or estimated costs. Whilst the Boston Distributor Road remains an aspiration, it is unlikely to come forward in its entirety in the plan period. There is potential for future development in Boston town to contribute to a 'first phase' of a new piece of highway infrastructure, although there is no underlying evidence to draw on relating to this at present. Importantly, the implementation of a Boston Distributor Road is not critical for the delivery of the growth strategy for Boston to 2031. ☒

Evidently, the Joint Committee appear to have no clear strategy as to how the Distributor Road will be funded and associated timescales for delivery. The obvious funding option for strategic highway infrastructure such as this would be through the adoption of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). However, the Joint Committee have confirmed through discussion, that at this point in time, there is no intention to bring forward a CIL charging schedule for the Boston area (due to viability concerns).

However, in our opinion, as substantial growth is planned for Boston as a Sub-regional centre, it would appear more sensible to consider measures such as the adoption of CIL to provide the necessary funding to deliver the Distributor Road and other necessary infrastructure (subject to viability testing). The benefit of this approach would be development across the Borough (not just that directly linked to the Distributor Road) could be 'charged', collected and pooled and so

promotion of site Wes002 provides both a sustainable urban extension to help deliver housing needs and a potential piece of infrastructure supporting part of the BDR. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment examines the viability of the delivery of sustainable urban extensions and the road infrastructure requirements of the BDR, and suggests that providing road infrastructure to support parts of the BDR is viable. It is incorrect to state that the Joint Committee has taken any decisions with regard to Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL) but the evidence from the WPVA (at least for viability in Boston Borough) probably indicates that CIL will not be viable. This however does not override the soundness or strategy of the Local Plan given that it is a long term plan and the BDR is potentially an even longer term aspiration.

Site Fis017 - The positive attributes of site Fis017 identified by the objector are not disputed. The SHLAA identifies Fis017 as developable, and the Housing Paper – Boston (July 2016) identifies that it has the best Sustainability Appraisal score of the potential Major Urban Extension sites, and that it is exposed to less severe flood risk than Sou006 and Wes002 (the two Major Urban Extension sites that are taken forward as 'Preferred Housing Sites'). However, when considered against Sou006 and Wes002, site Fis017 is considered to be an inferior site on the basis that: no housebuilder is promoting the site, which undermines confidence that (should the site be allocated) it would be brought forward quickly; and Fis017 cannot contribute directly to the provision of (nor take advantage of the benefits provided by) a distributor road to the west of Boston as envisaged by the 4th Lincolnshire Local Transport Plan (LTP4). Thus, whilst site selection has been influenced by issues concerning the Boston Distributor Road (BDR), it

provide a funding source to deliver the Distributor Road. This is favoured as opposed to the piecemeal approach currently being proposed by the Joint Committee.

Accordingly site Fis017 could be allocated alongside an adopted charging schedule and directly fund the Distributor Road. This would allow the Joint Committee to not have to restrict Major Urban Extensions to the south and west of Boston and would allow the sites with least constraints to be allocated in the emerging Local Plan.

Notwithstanding the above, it would appear that discounting sites, due to them not being able to directly support the Distributor Road, is premature ahead of detailed infrastructure

and funding analysis to establish when, or even if, the Distributor Road will come forward. The Joint Committee do not plan to provide this evidence until the next stage of the Plan which will be the Submission Version of the Local Plan.

It is reiterated that the Baseline Infrastructure Statement highlights that the implementation of a Boston Distributor Road is not critical for the delivery of the growth strategy for Boston to 2031. However, despite this, potential housing sites have been discounted as they are not located in the west where they will directly contribute to the Distributor Road. This highlights the over reliance of Joint Committee, when allocating sites, on their geographical proximity to a proposed Distributor Road where no preferred route has actually been identified, let alone land assembly, funding and engineering constraints being considered or identified.

This is inconsistent with the provisions of the Framework, which requires a Local Plan to be positively prepared and justified. With regard to the latter the

has not been based upon these issues as strongly as is implied by the objector. Nonetheless, LTP4 set the expectation that the Local Plan would need to demonstrate that future land use allocations for development could support a BDR. Previous work on the likely line of the BDR was that it would run to the west of the urban area linking the A16 to the south with the A16 to the north. Whilst it has been accepted that development-led delivery of the BDR was well beyond the time period of the Local Plan, the opportunity that the Local Plan could offer needed to be evaluated. In terms of meeting housing needs for the Boston urban area combined with evidence brought forward through the SHLAA it was determined that some housing delivery would need to be provided by sustainable urban extensions. The Whole Plan Viability Assessment examines the viability of the delivery of sustainable urban extensions and the road infrastructure requirements of the BDR, and suggests that providing road infrastructure to support parts of the BDR is viable. It is incorrect to state that the Joint Committee has taken any decisions with regard to Community Infrastructure Levies (CIL) but the evidence from the WPVA (at least for viability in Boston Borough) probably indicates that CIL will not be viable. This however does not override the soundness or strategy of the Local Plan given that it is a long term plan and the BDR is potentially an even longer term aspiration.

Sites Fen009, Fen011, Fis023, Nor012, Nor013, Nor014 and Wit013 - The support for the classification of these sites as 'undevelopable' is welcomed.

plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives based on proportionate evidence. A Plan should also be consistent with national policy, enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework. In this regard, the Joint Committee's approach is inconsistent with the Frameworks aspiration to boost significantly the supply of housing, especially considering that Boston Borough Council can only demonstrate a 2.9 year supply of housing land as at 31 March 2016.

Putting aside concerns raised by the Joint Committee about the fact that Fis017 would not contribute directly to the provision of the Boston Distributor Road, we would like to highlight the benefits associated with Fis017 and why we consider it suitable for allocation. In this regard, the Joint Committees' own assessment of site Fis17 in the Boston Housing Paper is very positive. The Paper highlights that of all the Major Urban Extensions assessed by the Joint Committee Site Fis017 secured the best score in the Sustainability Appraisal.

In addition the Paper notes that there are no ownership constraints and is available now for development. Since the last consultation on the Draft Local Plan (January 2016) discussions have been ongoing with a range of potential housebuilders who have shown strong interest in the site.

The paper does question the achievability of the site as no housebuilder is currently involved. However, discussions are ongoing with housebuilders. If the site was allocated in the Submission Local Plan it is considered likely that volume housebuilders would be committed to build out a phase of this strategic site early in the plan period. It is also noted that Larkfleet

Group supported the allocation of the site in a representation to the previous consultation and identified the site as being suitable for housing. This further demonstrates the likely developer interest in the site.

The Highway Authority has identified that the principal access into the site would be via roundabout onto Wainfleet Road and that if any access was permitted onto Blackthorn Lane, it should not be a through-route. The landowners of the site are committed to the development. Ahead of the next stage of consultation the landowners would be willing to undertake a Transport Assessment to assess the potential access into the site via a roundabout off Wainfleet Road and so assess the potential capacity of the local highway network in relation to the local highway infrastructure.

The Joint Committee SHLAA document (July 2016) correctly identifies that the site is well related to the existing built form of Boston and benefits from strong natural boundaries, namely: Wainfleet Road to the north, Rochford Tower Lane to the east, Eastwood Road to the south and the existing settlement edge of Boston to the west.

These are strong, permanent boundaries due them being part of the local highway network. This means the allocation of the site would provide a significant level of growth but would not encroach or encourage further development into the surrounding open countryside.

It is acknowledged that the site is in Flood Zone 3a however large areas of South East Lincolnshire are subject to flood risk. The size of the site allows for a comprehensive drainage attenuation scheme to be developed including SuDS to mitigate development against the risk of flooding. It should also be noted that

Site Sou006 which has been proposed to be allocated by the Joint Committee is identified as a similar risk of flooding but

is still supported for future development.

Overall, it is evident from the Joint Committee's own evidence that site Fis017 performs well in the criteria assessment of Major Urban Extension sites. However, due to the Joint Committee wanting to direct development to the south and west of Boston (to support the delivery of the Distributor Road) the site has been discounted.

Once again, it is highlighted that the Joint Committee at the current time have no detailed strategy or information as to how the Distributor Road will be delivered. The Joint Committee do not appear to be implementing a CIL for the Boston area so will be requesting S106 Agreements only from new development to fund and deliver the Distributor Road. This approach provides no certainty as to when the Distributor Road will be delivered or even if it is achievable over the plan period to 2036. Likewise, the implementation of a Boston Distributor Road is not critical for the delivery of the growth strategy for Boston.

We therefore consider that Fis017 (excluding the small parcels of land which are not in the ownership of Mr R Hardy and Richard Hardy (Fishtoft) should be allocated for housing as it is the best performing Major Urban Extension site in the Boston area when considered against the Joint Committee's Sustainability Appraisal. Furthermore Section 3 of this representation clearly identifies the site to be available, suitable and achievable.

The site would provide further choice to housebuilders and is in an attractive market area which is highlighted in Section 4 of the Sustainability Appraisal. In this

regard, the Fishtoft area benefits from below average long term unemployment rate, substantially lower crime rate and the percentage of residents without access to a car is lower than the County average.

Fis023 - Natural England object to the proposed allocation as part of the site is identified as an Impact Risk Zone and is functionally linked to the Wash Special Protection Area which is a known foraging habitat for the Pink Footed Geese.

Furthermore, the SHLAA considers the site would have a greater visual impact than alternative Major Urban Extensions. This conclusion is made due to the lack of strong, defensible boundaries particularly if site Fis033 is not developed.

It is agreed that the site cannot be considered suitable due to ecological constraints and is therefore not deliverable.

Nor012 - Site Nor012 has been discounted by the Joint Committee due to site ownership constraints (the site appears to be in 6 separate ownerships).

In addition the site performed 'relatively poorly' in the Sustainability Appraisal.

It is agreed that the site cannot be considered available and is therefore not deliverable.

Nor013 - Site Nor013 has been discounted by the Joint Committee due to site ownership constraints (the site appears to be in 6 separate ownership).

In addition the site performed 'poorly' in the Sustainability Appraisal.

The SHLAA also identified that the site does not relate well to the existing built form of Boston. The SHLAA considers the visual impact could be greater than alternative potential Major Urban Extensions.

It is agreed that the site cannot be considered available and is therefore not deliverable.

Nor014 - Site Nor014 is discounted by the Joint Committee due to site ownership constraints (the site is in four separate ownerships).

In addition the site had the poorest score in the Sustainability Appraisal of all the Major Urban Extensions.

It is agreed that the site cannot be considered available and is therefore not deliverable.

Sou006 - DLP (Planning) Ltd would not like to provide specific comments on the suitability of this site to be allocated in the emerging Local Plan, although the following observations are made.

The Joint Committee propose to allocate the site in the next stage of the plan. Notably, however, when considering the site appraisal in comparison to Site Fis017, site Sou006 is also identified as 'most severe flood risk' (Flood Zone 3a 1.0-2.0m). Despite this, Joint Committee do not consider this flood risk constraint so severe as not to allocate the site.

The site scores, 'relatively poorly' in the Sustainability Appraisal. In contrast, site Fis017 is the best performing Major Urban Extension Site when considered against the Sustainability Appraisal criteria.

It is noted that a housebuilder (Chestnut Homes) is promoting the site, but it would appear the Joint Committee's overreliance on the requirement to deliver the West Distributor Road has driven the site being proposed for allocation.

The Joint Committee's decision not to adopt CIL (as a potential source of funding to deliver the Distributor Road) is highlighted by Chestnut Homes, in the previous consultation, who highlight that specific sites will have

to contribute individually to the delivery of the Distributor Road.

This approach to the delivery of the Distributor Road is seriously questioned as the Joint Committee have no strategic approach (or funding) to link the proposed Distributor Road between any future housing allocations. In addition the Joint Committee have no control of when the allocated sites will be built out or if it is viable for the strategic allocations to facilitate the delivery of such significant highway infrastructure works. In this regard, paragraph 173 of the Framework requires that sites identified in the plan, should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. It is an entirely piecemeal approach that is not considered appropriate.

Wes002 - DLP (Planning) Ltd would not like to provide specific comments on the suitability of this site to be allocated in the emerging Local Plan, although the following observations are made.

Site Wes002 is identified as at the 'most severe flood risk' (Flood Zone 3a 1.0-2.0m). However, in contrast to site Fis017, the Joint Committee do not consider this flood risk constraint so severe so as not to allocate the site.

As per the comments in relation to site Sou006, it is noted that a housebuilder is promoting the site, but it would appear the Joint Committee's overreliance on the requirement to deliver the West Distributor Road has driven the site being proposed for allocation.

This approach to the delivery of the Distributor Road is seriously questioned as the Joint Committee have no strategic approach (or funding) to link the proposed Distributor Road between any future housing allocations. In addition the Joint Committee have no

control of when the allocated sites will be built out or if it is viable for the strategic allocations to facilitate the delivery of such significant highway infrastructure works. In this regard, paragraph 173 of the Framework requires that sites identified in the plan, should not be subject to such a scale of obligations and policy burdens that their ability to be developed viably is threatened. It is an entirely piecemeal approach that is not considered appropriate.

Wit013 - Site discounted by the Joint Committee due to site ownership constraints (the site appears to be in 7 separate ownerships). It is agreed that the site cannot be considered available and is therefore not deliverable.

2.17 In summary, it is evident that the single most important criteria that the Joint Committee have used to assess the land for a potential Major Urban Extension is whether or not the area of land will facilitate the potential delivery of the Distributor Road to the west of Boston.

2.18 However, as explained in the table above, we have numerous concerns about this approach. The Framework provides guidance on plan making which appears to be at odds with the Joint Committee's approach.

2.19 At paragraph 154, the Framework states that Local Plans should be aspirational, but realistic (our emphasis). In this regard, we acknowledge the Joint Committee's aspiration to deliver the Distributor Road, but do not

consider it to be realistic within the next plan period due to funding and land assembly issues/constraints.

2.20 Paragraph 177 of the Framework, further states that it is important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion. By the Joint Committee's own admission it is unlikely that the Distributor Road will be delivered in its entirety (or at all) within the next plan period. This timeframe is not considered to be in a 'timely manner'.

2.21 As such it is considered that an over reliance on a 'potential' item of infrastructure, the delivery of which is unknown, should not prevent other sustainable development from coming forward on suitable, achievable and deliverable sites, such as the Land south of Wainfleet Road (Fis017).

2.22 If the Joint Committee continue to adopt this narrow approach to the allocation of sites, it is questioned if the plan meets the four tests of soundness, namely: be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy as outlined in the Framework at paragraph 182. It is not considered that the plan is the most appropriate strategy to deliver sustainable development, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence, nor that the plan is consistent with national policy.

2.23 In particular, the approach is inconsistent with the provisions of the Framework which seeks to boost significantly the supply of housing, especially given the context of Boston Borough Council's current land supply position (DLP emphasis). In this regard, the Council published an assessment of 5-year housing land supply as at 31 March 2016. The Assessment detailed that the Council could only demonstrate a housing land supply of 2.9 years.

3.0 Site Specific Details “ Land to the south of Wainfleet Road, Boston

3.1 This section provides details of the site context together with a summary of why the site is considered suitable and appropriate for the allocation of residential development.

Site Context

3.2-3.7 [Summary of section “ Outlines Boston's location, its facilities, employment opportunities and the housing target]

Site Access

3.8 The site is well located for access to local services and facilities via foot, cycle and public transport. The nearest bus stops are located on Wainfleet Road to the north east of the site.

3.9 The Highway Authority has indicated that access to the site from Wainfleet Road would potentially require the formation of a roundabout.

3.10 A Transport Assessment would be undertaken as part of any future planning application to assess the capacity of the local highway network and review the sustainable transport infrastructure within the local area.

## Public Rights of Way

3.11 Figure 3 below [figure 3 included in email copy of representation], illustrates the Public Rights of Way within the vicinity of the site. There is a footway which runs between the two fields to the south of the site and provides a link between Rochford Tower Lane and Blackthorn Lane.

3.12 A footway also follows the western boundary of the site and provides a link between Blackthorn Road and Eastwood Road. This route also provides access to Lindis Road.

3.13 Any future planning application has the potential to incorporate and enhance these Public Rights of Way as part of the development.

## Trees and Ecology

3.14 There appear to be no trees on the site but the site does benefit from hedgerow boundaries that follow the existing field boundaries. There are not known to be any protected species or habitats on the site, although confirmation would be subject to an ecological appraisal at the planning application stage.

3.15 As such there are no known ecological constraints that would prevent development coming forward at the site.

## Agricultural Land Classification

3.16 The Council's SHLAA assessment notes that the site is classified as Grade 2 agricultural land.

3.17 It is noted that the majority of land immediately surrounding the urban edge of Boston is classified as Grade 1 agricultural land. Due to the significant supply of Grade 1 agricultural land in the locality, development in this location would not result in a shortfall of best and most versatile agricultural land.

3.18 Furthermore, the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (July 2016) sets out the criteria for the assessment of site suitability. The methodology included the assessment of site characteristics including agricultural land quality. However the council have not discounted sites based upon agricultural land classification within their site assessments

## Heritage and Conservation

3.19 There are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary and the site is not located within or close to a Conservation Area.

3.20 There are five listed assets within the vicinity of the site:

Rochford Tower House (List entry number: 1147502), Grade II listed;

Rochford Tower (List entry number: 1062088), Grade I listed;

Stables at Burton Hall (List entry number: 1062090), Grade II listed;

Burton Hall and Attached Wall (List entry number:

1308496), Grade II\* listed; and

Milepost on A52 south side (List entry number: 1147521), Grade II listed.

3.21 Rochford Tower House and Tower are located on Rochford Tower Lane, which forms the eastern boundary of the site. The properties are located on the eastern side of the road therefore Rochford Tower Lane offers a degree of separation between the site and the listed structures. The impact could be mitigated by careful design and layout.

3.22 Burton Hall is located circa 200m to the north east of the site to the north of Wainfleet Road and would be well screened by the existing residential properties, public house and hotel.

3.23 It is not considered that the development of the site would have a significant detrimental impact upon any of the designated heritage assets identified above.

3.24 There are therefore not known to be any heritage or archaeological constraints to the development of this site.

#### Flood Risk

3.25 The Environment Agency flood map (fig 4) [figure 4 included in email copy of representation] indicates that the site is located in Flood Zone 3 alongside the majority of Boston.

3.26 The emerging local plan takes a precautionary approach to flood risk however it also recognises that the Boston urban area will continue to

be an area of choice for most residents to live in.

3.27 The Boston Barrier (anticipated to be completed by 2020) is expected to be of huge benefit to the viability of new development in Boston and the role of the town as a Sub-Regional Centre and so reduce flood risk overall.

3.28 It is not considered that flood risk should prevent development on the site.

#### Townscape Impact/Visual Impact

3.29 The site is flat and it is therefore considered that the topography of the land would not constrain development of the site and new development could successfully be integrated into its surroundings.

#### Planning Policy Context

3.30 The current adopted Boston Borough Local Plan (April 1999), shows the site subject to this representation on the adopted proposals map is identified as 'Countryside'.

3.31 The emerging Local Plan highlights that Boston is the second largest town in Lincolnshire with a historic core containing buildings and a street pattern that is of national significance. The town has been identified as a sub-regional centre with the capacity to support sustainable growth which will provide the means to strengthen the role of the town as a sub-regional centre.

3.32 Policy 2 (Spatial Strategy) of the emerging Local Plan lists Boston as one of two Sub-

Regional Centres which are designated as areas where development is to be directed.

3.33 Policy 11: Meeting Objectively Assessed Housing Needs states provision will be made for a net increase of at least 18,250 dwellings in South East Lincolnshire split between two identified housing Market Areas (HMA's). 7,500 at 300 per annum are allocated for the Boston Borough.

3.34 Policy 12: Distribution of New Housing states that site allocations to meet the demand of 5900 dwellings in the Sub-Regional Centre of Boston (including parts of Fishtoft and Wyberton Parishes) will be made.

3.35 The emerging plan states that Policy 12 is supported and complementary to Policy 2: Spatial Strategy. Overall housing growth for the settlements (including Boston) is considered to be proportional to existing infrastructure capacity or is in locations capable of improvement.

3.36 The emerging local plan clearly demonstrates Boston is clearly capable of growth.

#### Capacity

3.37 The site is circa 76 hectares in size, and it is considered that it could accommodate in the region of 1,600 dwellings. This figure is based on a density of 30 dwellings per hectare and an estimate of developing approximately 70% of the 76 hectares site to allow for public open space, highways etc.

3.38 The Councils sustainability appraisal identifies a potential open space contribution of 7.69ha, this can easily be accommodated within a site of this size.

3.39 It is considered that this density is commensurate with the surrounding residential environment.

#### Ownership

3.40 Mr R Hardy and Richard Hardy (Fishtoft) are the registered owners of all the land being promoted through this representation and are committed to delivering development on the site as soon as possible.

## 4.0 AVAILABILITY, SUITABILITY & ACHIEVEABILITY

#### Availability

4.1 Mr R Hardy and Richard Hardy (Fishtoft) are currently the registered owners of all the land being promoted through this representation and are committed to delivering residential development on the site.

#### Suitability

4.2 The assessment in section three of this report demonstrates that the site is not known to be unduly constrained in terms of topography, ecology, access, ecology or heritage.

4.3 The site is located adjacent to the existing urban area of a sustainable settlement which has been identified as a location for growth. The site would have access to a wide range of services and facilities that would be accessible by sustainable modes

of traffic.

4.4 The site is therefore considered to be a suitable site for residential development.

Achievable

4.5 The site is a greenfield site on the edge of the urban area. There are no known development constraints requiring extensive mitigation, other than flood risk which is a common factor to all sites around the Boston urban area. In this regard sites of a similar flood risk have been proposed for allocation (Wes002, Sou006).

4.6 The site is therefore considered to be achievable in terms of viability.

4.7 The site is not constrained by ownership issues and the landowners are keen to pursue development at the site and are in ongoing discussions with housebuilders.

4.8 The site is therefore considered to be realistically deliverable within the next plan period.

ID1: 28 comment\_author: Environment Agency

comment content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
<p>All sites:</p> <p>We note that all the proposed site allocations lies within allocations areas classified as either 'Danger for All' (flood depths 1.0-2.0m) or 'Danger for Most' (flood depths 0.5-1 m) on the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment's hazard mapping.</p> <p>It is important that the site promoter acknowledges the level, and additional costs, of flood mitigation that will be required to make the dwellings safe (i.e. confirms that the NPPF Exception Test can be passed, through built in resistance measures to mitigate against the appropriate breach scenario with allowances for climate change for the lifetime of the development). Confirmation that the sites will still be viable, and therefore deliverable, when these additional costs are taken into account should be sought from landowners/developers.</p> <p>Such mitigation can also impact on the final design of the houses, i.e. raising the height due to finished floor level requirements and sometimes needing to be 3 storey with no ground floor habitable rooms - such requirements often fall into conflict with other planning policies and you need to be confident that sites can incorporate the required mitigation, and still be acceptable on other planning grounds.</p> <p>The mitigation measures needed to make a development 'safe' required by the Environment Agency are as follows:                      - depths of &gt;1.6m It is unlikely that mitigation measures would</p>	<p>Comments on Flood Risk, flood mitigation and and viability are noted. The Local Plan has been prepared with the Environment Agency as a partner organisation and evidence material to all these issues will be subject to examination at an Examination in Public. Nonetheless it is considered that (notwithstanding the flood mitigation measures that are likely to be required on the 'Preferred Housing Sites' identified within the town) acceptable development schemes will be achievable in all cases. The owners/promoters of all the 'Preferred Housing Sites' identified within the town have been contacted to ensure that they are aware of the likely flood mitigation costs that the development of their sites will entail, and to seek reassurance from them that the development of their sites will, nonetheless, be financially viable.</p> <p>Anglian Water Services Ltd. has commented that sites Fis001, Fis033 and Fis038 would be served by the Fishtoft Water Recycling Centre which has adequate capacity to accommodate them.</p> <p>Sites Wyb013 and Wyb033 would be served by the Frampton Water Recycling Centre, which would require upgrades to its treatment capacity to accommodate them. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany the Local Plan will need to identify when and how the necessary improvements to the Water Recycling Centre will take place.</p>	<p>These comments to do not call into question the sites' suitability for allocation. It is therefore considered that sites Sou006, Wes002, Fen006, Fis001, Fis033, Wyb033, Cen001, Fen001, Fen002, Fis002, Fis003, Fis038, Nor006, Pil002, Pil006, Wes001, and Wyb013 should be taken forward as 'Housing Allocations'. However, it is considered that there are sufficient doubts about site Pil005's availability to mean that it should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation' for the following reasons: Although planning permission was granted for the site's residential development in 2009, this permission has now lapsed; and the site is in three separate ownerships, and none of the owners have promoted their land for development at any point in the Local Plan process. Furthermore, the Borough Council's Planning Committee has resolved to grant planning permission (reference B/16/0007) for the development of 48 dwellings on site Wit008. Consequently, it is considered that site Wit008 should not be taken forward as a Housing Allocation, but should instead be shown as a Housing Commitment.</p>

prevent flood water from entering the building at ground floor level. Therefore, proposals must be a minimum 2 storey with no ground floor habitable accommodation. The first floor living accommodation shall be above the highest predicted flood depth;

- depths of 1-1.6m Proposals must be a minimum 2 storey, with FFL set a minimum of 1m above ground level, flood resilient construction shall be used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level, demountable defences to 600mm above FFL;
- depths 0.5 - 1m FFL to be set 1m above ground level, flood resilient construction shall be used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level, (single storey proposals must consider the 0.1% +climate change event for setting FFL).

In addition, we note that the Frampton and Fishtoft Water Recycling Centres, serving the south and east of the town will likely require upgrades to accommodate the site allocations. Phasing of development to ensure that adequate capacity is available to deal with foul water drainage before new dwellings are occupied will be required in order to avoid environmental harm.

---

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

ID1: 29 comment\_author: Mr R Borrett

## comment content:

I am particularly interested in how/when/if site Fis 001 is developed.

Thank you for your email response dated 7<sup>th</sup> March 2016 to my previous letter to you dated 11 February 2016.

I picked up a copy of the above paper at the Butterwick consultation evening. I note that some of the issues concerning me were addressed in general terms by the responsible authorities e.g. Education, Water Supply, Sewage, Flooding and Health.

The Highways Authority seemed to agree with me in the SE Lincs Local Plan Consultation January 2016. However, in the July 2016 Paper they seem to have dismissed, with a shrug, the issue of increased congestion and poor visibility at junctions because they see no way to address and resolve them ! They will not go away.

I strongly disagree with Boston Woods Trust that future housing should be built to the East of the river on the grounds that this is where the facilities are, therefore avoiding river crossings.

Firstly, many facilities are to the West of the river e.g, major supermarkets and, of course, Boston Woods themselves! Moreover, with more residents on the East of the river, they will need to join John Adams Way and cross the river every time they want to leave Boston to the West and South or visit Boston Woods and these supermarkets!

Finally, I would be interested to know if I have any way of influencing planning developments on Fis001 to prevent my back garden from becoming "landlocked", thus preventing any development I may wish to make there in the future. ( I have a 60metre common

## Officer Comment:

The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation. It is agreed that the town's trip-attractors (schools, shops, hospital, work-places, etc.) are located on both the east and west sides of the river. It is therefore considered that there would be no particular advantage to concentrating new housing development on either side of the river.

The objector could tackle the last issue by making comments at the time of a planning application or could get in touch with the site promoters (Cyden Homes) before they draw up their detailed scheme for the site's development

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

boundary with Fis001]

---

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

ID1: 30 comment\_author: Rita Dunmore

## comment content:

Planning Permission for Dwellings to be built on Field Fis001

we the undersigned are submitting the following petition above on the grounds listed below,

1. Since the referendum and the downturn in the housing market do the required Government figures still apply? -

Is there going to be less need for housing?

will we be left with unoccupied building left unattended with the possibility of squatters or vandalism?

Although the following views have been expressed at the earlier consultation we feel they bear repeating for your consideration

2. The intention of the developer is to make an access road which will be situated almost half way between existing junctions on Hardway and Monteith Crescent. The number of dwellings proposed is 180 and the number of extra vehicles, will probably number at least zoo This will constitute a danger, both to pedestrians and drivers when the pressure of the new traffic meets the original.

3 . Many complaints over the years have referred to the excess speed of vehicles that use this section.of Lindis Road. Lindis Road at this point is relatively straight and as such, provides an opportunity- that many motorists take to race to the junction.

4 .with such an increase of traffic it is literally an accident possibly fatal waiting to happen.

5.The proposal also refers to a second restricted access road for this development.

It has been noted bythe Highways Authority that drivers emerging from Lindis Road into Eastwood

## Officer Comment:

1. An up-dated SHMA will be commissioned to identify local housing requirements in the light of the most recent population/household projections and any other material issues.

2. The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation;

3. The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation;

4. The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation;

5. The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation;

6. The Highway Authority comments that it is supportive of this allocation;

7. Anglian Water Services Ltd. has indicated that development on this site would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems, which are intended to replicate natural systems (to collect and store surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land;

8. It is inevitable that the development of this site would impact to some degree upon the character of the area, but this is equally true of all alternative sites, and it is considered highly unlikely that impacts will be as severe as the objectors fear;

9. Thorough remediation works would need to be carried out;

10. It is inevitable that the development of this site would impact to some degree upon the character of the area, but this is equally true of all alternative sites, and it is considered highly unlikely that impacts will be as severe as the objectors fear;

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that the comments justify a change to Boston's housing requirements, and (subject to the findings of an up-dated SHMA) it is considered that the Local Plan should continue to seek to identify housing allocations in Boston to provide for 5,900 dwellings between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2036.

It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Fis001 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Road/Freiston Road have very poor visibility

6 How many drivers will try to find different routes out of the traffic and so create rat runs which would cause problems in other streets and roads?

Flooding

7 .The water authorities have commented on the need to address the question of flooding. Could we cope with flash flooding or rain storms if so much of the land is covered with concrete etc? This lack of run off may be used by our insurers to hike up our premiums

8. According to your policy statement you endeavour to keep good relations with the neighbouring areas.

Has that been taken into account when considering the upheaval and noise and dirt which will inevitably put a strain on the community?

Contamination and pollution

9. There is an expectation that the investigation of Tommy Shooter's yard will be rigorous. It is of great concern that in disturbing the ground during the creation of the access road the contamination may be spread.

10. Due to the large number of dwellings there will be 400+ wheelie bins. Are the Environmental Health going to be responsible for extra infestation and complaints of smells in the air?

11. The actual building process will result in great disturbance to the wildlife which we all appreciate and we risk losing them. It has been reported locally that only in 4 of us see a hedgehog and this disturbance will risk putting this figure G in 4 very soon

12. We have yet to see the style of dwellings to be built and are very concerned that the taller houses will over look our properties.

13. Finally the concentration of buildings and it's population will destroy the very reason why many of the residents decided to move to Blackthorn Lane. It is

11. The site has not been identified as being of any special wildlife value (i.e. It is not a Local Wildlife Site, Site of Special Scientific Interest, etc.)

12. It is inevitable that the development of this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings, but this would be 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;

13. It is inevitable that the development of this site would impact to some degree upon the character of the area, but this is equally true of all alternative sites, and it is considered highly unlikely that impacts will be as severe as the objectors fear.

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

a quiet, peaceful and stable community on the edge of the countryside.

A list of 95 names from 60 addresses was attached.

---

ID1:	32	comment_author:	Bruce Mather Ltd
comment content:	Nor006  Supports in principle the site being allocated as a preferred housing site. He is in the process of working with consultants to consider bringing forward the site for development.	Officer Comment:	The support is welcomed.
Officer Recommendation:		It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Nor006 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.	

---

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

ID1: 33 comment\_author: Anglian Water

## comment content:

All of the proposed housing allocations in this area are expected to require improvements to the existing foul sewerage network to enable development to come forward on these sites. Similarly a number of the proposed housing allocation sites are expected to require improvements to the existing water supply network. Please refer to the enclosed spreadsheet [received via email] for detailed comments relating to these sites.

## Officer Comment:

The comment is noted, and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany the Local Plan will need to identify when and how the necessary enhancements to the water supply and foul sewerage networks will take place.

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that this comment calls into question the suitability of the 'Preferred Housing Sites' for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that sites Sou006, Wes002, Fen006, Fis001, Fis033, Wyb033, Cen001, Fen001, Fen002, Fis002, Fis003, Fis038, Nor006, Pil002, Pil006, Wes001, and Wyb013 should be taken forward as 'Housing Allocations'. However, it is considered that there are sufficient doubts about site Pil005's availability to mean that it should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation' for the following reasons: although planning permission was granted for the site's residential development in 2009, this permission has now lapsed; and the site is in three separate ownerships, and none of the owners have promoted their land for development at any point in the Local Plan process. Furthermore, the Borough Council's Planning Committee has resolved to grant planning permission (reference B/16/0007) for the development of 48 dwellings on site Wit008. Consequently, it is considered that site Wit008 should not be taken forward as a Housing Allocation, but should instead be shown as a Housing Commitment.

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

ID1: 34 comment\_author: Chestnut Homes

## comment content:

We have reviewed the documentation produced for the preferred sites for development in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan and have little to add at this stage of the process to our previous representations.

The continued emphasise of development in the Boston Urban area is the right approach which will maximise the overall benefits of new development and ensure it provides the most sustainable option within the Local Plan.

We note and fully support the Planning Authorities decision to allocate the Q2 Development (Local Plan ref Sou 006 " Land to the South of Chain Bridge Road, Boston) as one of the potential Major Urban Extensions within the Preferred Sites documentation as both a major Housing site, as well as an Employment site and allocation as a mixed use development.

We believe that this site is unique, in the context of the other potential identified sites within Boston, in its ability to deliver on a wide range of policy objectives in a planned and controlled manner over the lifetime of the next Local Plan. It is a logical extension of the town, in a sustainable location, with the potential to help deliver major elements of Boston's housing, transport and economic regeneration requirements.

It provides a perfect opportunity for the public and private sectors to deliver a major regeneration project in partnership, as well as enabling the local community to help shape future development in their area through an appropriate masterplanning process.

## Officer Comment:

Boston's Housing Requirements - the support is welcomed.

Site Sou006 - Support for promoting Q2 as a mixed use site is welcome. Recognition that the site can accommodate employment uses is also noted. It is agreed that the site provides an opportunity to deliver a range of Local Plan objectives, including part of the Boston Distributor Road. Although these benefits are recognised, it is not accepted that smaller sites do not offer benefits to the town, benefits of delivering smaller sites are different to those generated by a SUE, but exist nevertheless.

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that the comments justify a change to Boston's housing requirements, and (subject to the findings of an up-dated SHMA) it is considered that the Local Plan should continue to seek to identify housing allocations in Boston to provide for 5,900 dwellings between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2036.

It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Sou006 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

BO008 Q2: The Quadrant is one of the more suitable employment sites in Boston Borough and should be taken forward as a Preferred Option Main Employment Allocation. No change required to the allocation.

The Quadrant project has already commenced with work started this year on Q1 delivering the first part of the Distributor road enabling the first phase of development to commence. Q2 forms the next logical phase of the project providing a cohesive plan for the future of this part of Boston, maximising the benefits to the town compared to the ad hoc nature of developing a series of smaller sites.

We look forward to continuing to work with the Local Planning Authority and local community to deliver this major project through the Local Plan process.

---

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

ID1: 35 comment\_author: Larkfleet Homes

## comment content:

Site Fen003 - The site is identified as a 'Housing Commitment' following the granting of outline planning permission in May 2016 and the site is included within the settlement limits. An application for Reserved Matters has been submitted and it is anticipated that following approval of that application, that work will commence on site. This is likely to be later this year or early next year. We welcome the proposal for the Western Distributor Road, but have concerns how this will be delivered and the precise details of the route bearing in mind that part of our site is covered by the 'Safeguarding Corridor'. This annotation is confusing as it suggests that development should not be allowed within this area. However, it appears that this is not strictly the case as a number of the preferred sites for housing are actually located within this safeguarding area. It appears that the intention is that development within this area is expected to contribute to the provision of the road, but it is not clear by what means this will be achieved.

Site Nor013 - This site, in its entirety, was assessed as 'Major Urban Expansion' site and the JPU concluded that this site was not one of the more suitable sites for a Major Urban Extension. Larkfleet has an interest in part of this site and this is currently the subject of a planning application and appeal. At committee Members largely agreed that the site was an appropriate location for housing and the only concern was to do with access and the Local Highway

## Officer Comment:

Site Fen003 - The comments are noted and, although the site is located within the 'Safeguarding Corridor', this would not in any way prevent the planning permission from being exercised.

Site Nor013 - if planning permission is granted for the residential development of all or part of site Nor013, Inset Map No. 1 will be amended to show the permission as a 'Housing Commitment', and to include it within the 'Settlement Boundary'.

## Officer Recommendation:

Site Fen003 - It is not considered that this comment justifies a change to the Plan's provisions.

Site Nor013 - It is not considered that this comment justifies a change to the Plan's provisions.

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

Authority's objection. Whilst that application has been appealed, Larkfleet also submitted a revised application showing an altered access in an attempt to overcome the objections of the LHA. That application and the appeal remain to be determined, but a decision in respect of the appeal is expected within the next few weeks.

Subject to the appeal being allowed, and/or the application being approved, we suggest that the settlement limits are redrawn and that the site is identified as a Preferred Housing Site' and also a 'Housing Commitment'. A copy of the layout, which was presented to Committee, is attached [plan provided by email].

ID1:	36	comment_author:	Mrs F Smith (GLNP)	comment_content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
In the response to the February consultation the GLNP highlighted that two SNCIs were missing from the map.		The Local Plan does not show 'Sites of Local Nature Conservation Interest', because their value has not been confirmed by recent assessment. Allen House Pond no longer exists, and Porcher's Pit was subject to a scoping assessment by Scarborough Nixon Associates which concluded that it clearly lacked sufficient interest to merit fuller assessment as a potential Local Wildlife Site.		It is not considered that this comment justifies a change to the Plan's provisions.		
Porcher's Pit SNCI is still an omission on the map, however, Allen House Pond has since been reassessed by the Local Wildlife Sites Panel and is no longer classified as a SNCI and therefore does not need adding to the map.						