

Post_title:

11: Swineshead

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

ID1: 211 comment_author: Phillip Gravett

comment content:

Swi004:

I wish to strongly oppose to this site having somehow become such a preferred site. Having lived in Bluebell Cottage for 34 years I have put a lot of time and investment into our property. Any development on this site would have a massive impact on the lives of my family, not only while it was being developed, but for as long as it remains our home. It would be very detrimental given its' prominent position centrally overlooking this high quality Grade 1 arable field, with long, open views to the west, as well as our main visual aspect, and the only property on this NE side of the field, with our plot occupying most of its' boundary to The Drayton.

However despite this prominent location you would be forgiven for not being able to identify it on inset plan No.11 for Swineshead, and throughout the consultation process so far; apart from assuming the field might be called Bluebell Cottage, and now supposedly included within Swi004. I note the watercourse which runs between us and the field has now at last been included on the latest version, but still no sign of our property. This narrow historical watercourse is probably the last remnant of the River Swin which drained into the Bicker Haven, and now drains in the opposite direction, providing us and the field with drainage. Given extreme rainfall it can just cope, but would not have the capacity for any further development, and would put us at serious risk of surface water flooding as we are approximately 1 metre lower than the field identified now as Swi004, and similarly lower than the other side of The Drayton, so water will always flow towards us and the watercourse. Frequently in the past we have

Officer Comment:

- It is inevitable that the development of this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings. Whilst this would also be true of alternative sites, because the objector's home is located almost immediately adjacent to the site's northern boundary, there is the potential for impacts to be severe. However, at the time of a planning application the layout and design of any scheme would be carefully scrutinised to minimise overlooking and privacy loss. The objector is correct that their home does not appear prominently on the Inset Map – it is somewhat obscured by the 'Settlement Boundary' and 'Preferred Housing Site' designations;

- With respect to surface water flooding, Anglian Water Services Limited 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. At the time of a planning application the layout of any scheme and its drainage proposals would be carefully scrutinised to ensure that no adverse impacts would be caused to existing nearby dwellings. The fact that existing properties to the site's east and south appear to be significantly lower than the site is likely to mean that particular care would need to be taken to avoid impacts. With respect to fluvial/coastal flooding, although its central and western parts are shown as Flood Zone 2 (no hazard and no depth), the majority of site Swi004 is shown as being within Flood Zone 1 (no hazard and no depth);

- Although the dwellings, 1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street are perceived as being separate

Officer Recommendation:

Not all of the objectors' concerns are considered to be valid. However, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

been forced to divert water from our property in summer storms, especially before the large greenhouse on the other side of The Drayton was thankfully dismantled some years ago.

I note that in conclusion to previous comments that the field has inexplicably become 'no risk' Flood Zone 1, rather than Flood Zone 2, correctly identifying a large central area of the proposed site in the original sustainability assessment. Anyone who has lived here for as long as us will know this field was flooded in 2007, and also back in the 1980's, and with extreme weather events becoming more frequent it may well contain a similarly large pond again in the near future. Flood Zone 2 here may not portend a serious risk of coastal and river flooding in the near future, but being lower lying land we are always at risk of surface water flooding. So any additional development could potentially generate very large volumes of additional surface water, and dramatically increase the risk for our lower lying property within Flood Zone 2.

I would also completely disagree with such a positive view for sustainability objective 8, 'to protect the quality and character of landscape and townscape'. Although this site is adjoined to the south of Swineshead it is within Drayton, and would allow development towards the heart of Drayton; one of the 3 hamlets within the parish that were supposed to be protected from such development, and a significant reason why we relocated to here so many years ago. Over the years we have lived here we have seen several properties replaced or renovated, including our own, but the character of this scattered hamlet within the countryside has been largely preserved, with most planning applications in recent years for any additional houses in Drayton being refused on appeal to the planning inspectorate; significantly on the

to Swineshead, it is not accepted that this is the case for the dwellings that surround site Swi004. It is considered that development of site Swi004 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - the site does not have an open countryside character, as it is surrounded by existing (sometimes scattered) development on 3 sides, & consequently visual impacts would be relatively limited. It would, however, extend the village towards the existing, outlying group of dwellings (1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street);

- Western Power indicates that no buildings can be erected within 7m (horizontally or vertically) of the higher level power-lines which are carried on metal pylons and cross the site in a roughly east-west direction. Furthermore, Western Power indicates that it would prefer that no buildings at all should be erected below these power-lines because: in the unlikely event of failure, damage could be caused to buildings; and when circuits need to be refurbished, costs and disturbance would be increased - if the land below these power-lines were used as gardens, the refurbishing of circuits would still involve restricting people's use of their gardens for the duration of the works. Whilst these power-lines could be re-routed or placed underground, this would be at the developer's cost. Two other sets of power-lines (carried at a lower-level on wooden poles) cross eastern and northern parts of the site. Whilst Western Power has not indicated that these lines would be subject to the same issues as the higher-level lines, they would nonetheless have implications for the layout of dwellings on the site.

grounds of spoiling this character.

Even if you choose to ignore the potential flooding risk at this stage and the issues regarding preserving the value of the hamlet's separation and character, then how could the only proposed site with high voltage national grid lines dissecting it become a preferred site? They might not be injurious to health, but I doubt Western Power would allow future development under their lines, or within a significant distance either side, so it will add significant restrictions to any potential development, in addition to working around the sewage pipe line that dissects the field in the opposing direction and also the 2 sets of 'peripheral' low voltage lines across the site.

I know this site has the attraction in accessibility to the main road into Swineshead, but I hope this singular advantage does not hold sway over the other significant negatives, especially for us and our neighbours.

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

ID1: 212 comment_author: Mrs S Clarke

comment content:

SWI004.

My concerns are the electricity supply at present. If anyone has a shower our lights dim so as you can hardly see in the property and sometimes the TV turns off as the power is too low. If our neighbour is using the power washer our lights dim, computers turn off and we can hardly see and likewise we do the same to other people, so if more properties were added to the supply we feel it would not cope.

The road floods from surface water when we have a downpour so would the drains cope.

It is already hard to get a place at the school.

Officer Comment:

The objector raises three issues concerning infrastructure impacts. No specific information is available concerning the area's electrical supply but, if there are issues, these would need to be addressed at the time of a planning application. With respect to surface water flooding, Anglian Water Services Limited 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. At the time of a planning application the layout of any scheme and its drainage proposals would be carefully scrutinised to ensure that no adverse impacts would be caused to existing nearby highways. The County Education Department has commented that there is no capacity currently available at Swineshead St Mary's Church of England Primary School. Four additional classrooms would be required to extend the school by 0.5FE to 2FE, and a shortage of land on the existing site would require the provision of additional playing field land. 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

Officer Recommendation:

Not all of the objectors' concerns are considered to be valid. However, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 213 comment_author: Sarah Walker

comment content:

I have already voiced my objections to the preferred site in Swineshead SWi004 but as it has now been listed as a preferred site I wish to add further objections. Firstly since finding out that this site has gone forward as a preferred site I have canvassed my neighbours most of whom (and one in particular) would be severely affected by the building on this land in one way or another, either from loss of view/privacy, noise increase or flood risk. I must say I was sorry I had not done this earlier but I assumed that most people would have knowledge of this but not everybody had access to a social media account and it seems that this was only advertised through the internet! Therefore most of my neighbours did not even know this was happening. I feel that a postal information leaflet would have been more helpful as well. Anyway I have further researched the land to the rear of my house (SWi004) and my further objections are these :-

The Boston Borough Local Plan from 1999 states :-

G9 APART FROM PROPOSALS ASSOCIATED WITH AGRICULTURE OR FORESTRY, PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT ON THE BEST AND MOST VERSATILE AGRICULTURAL LAND UNLESS THERE IS A STRONG CASE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT WHICH OVERRIDES THE NEED TO PROTECT SUCH LAND. WHERE DEVELOPMENT IS PERMITTED ON THE BEST AND MOST VERSATILE LAND IT SHOULD, WHERE POSSIBLE, USE THE LOWEST GRADE OF LAND SUITABLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT.

Explanation

3.16 Paragraph 2.17 of PPG7 makes it clear that agricultural land of grades 1, 2 and 3a is the best and

Officer Comment:

- Site SWi004 is classified as Grade 1 agricultural land, but this is equally true of all alternative greenfield sites around Swineshead. It is accepted that it would be preferable for Swineshead's housing needs to be met on previously-developed land or on lower grade agricultural land, but such sites are simply not available in sufficient numbers in and around Swineshead;
- It is correct that the Environment Agency's Flood Map shows some properties that border onto site SWi004 as being within Flood Zone 2. The Flood Map also shows central and western parts of site SWi004 as Flood Zone 2, but the majority of the site is shown as being within Flood Zone 1. Importantly, the Boston Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (October 2010) shows the site as exposed to no hazard in 2115, and Environment Agency data on flood depth in 2115 shows 'no depth'. In terms of surface water flooding, Anglian Water Services Limited 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. At the time of a planning application the layout of any scheme and its drainage proposals would be carefully scrutinised to ensure that no adverse impacts would be caused to existing nearby dwellings;
- Policy set out in the adopted Boston Borough Local Plan (April 1999) indicates that planning permission should not be granted for the residential development of site SWi004, nor for other land shown as being in the 'countryside'. However, one of the tasks of the emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan is to

Officer Recommendation:

Not all of the objectors' concerns are considered to be valid. However, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

most versatile land in the country, and that it is a national resource for the future. Because of its special importance, considerable weight should be given to the protection of this land from development.

3.17 In Boston Borough, virtually all the agricultural land is shown on MAFF's Agricultural Land Classification Maps as being of grades 1 or 2, and most development will therefore involve the loss of 'best and most versatile' land. However, the Borough Council will be concerned to ensure that, where possible, land of the lowest possible grade is used, and that land is not wastefully developed.

SWi004 is grade 1 agricultural land and although the plan was from 1999 surely we must still be looking at protecting the best growing land we have! If we build all these houses for people where will we grow the food to feed them?.

I have studied the flood risk map for the area and although it was come out at flood risk 1 there are some surrounding plots of land that have come out at flood risk 2 ; this is after they have paid for a full flood risk assessment. My concern is that if some of the surrounding plots are 2 why then would SWi004 be 1 ; I have seen the field (SWi004) waterlogged during periods of heavy rain on several occasions my fear would be that if this field is built up and built on where will that excess water then go to.

My neighbours at Bluebell Cottage and Ivy Cottage I feel would be at particular risk of secondary flooding from any development.

When I first moved here 7 yrs ago I was told by my solicitor who had conducted local land searches that there would never be any development in Drayton as it was outside the village envelope, was a Hamlet (settlement) and that it was a scattered development. In fact over the years I have seen many applications for

reconsider this policy and, as part of that process, has proposed that site Swi004 should be identified as a 'Preferred Housing Site'. The fact that one Local Plan seeks to prevent the development of a particular area of land does not mean that all subsequent Plans will take the same view of that land. Although the dwellings, 1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street are perceived as being separate to Swineshead, it is not accepted that this is the case for the dwellings that surround site Swi004. It is considered that development of site Swi004 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - the site does not have an open countryside character, as it is surrounded by existing (sometimes scattered) development on 3 sides, & consequently visual impacts would be relatively limited; - Western Power indicates that no buildings can be erected within 7m (horizontally or vertically) of the higher level power-lines which are carried on metal pylons and cross the site in a roughly east-west direction. Furthermore, Western Power indicates that it would prefer that no buildings at all should be erected below these power-lines because: in the unlikely event of failure, damage could be caused to buildings; and when circuits need to be refurbished, costs and disturbance would be increased - if the land below these power-lines were used as gardens, the refurbishing of circuits would still involve restricting people's use of their gardens for the duration of the works. Whilst these power-lines could be re-routed or placed underground, this would be at the developer's cost. Two other sets of power-lines (carried at a lower-level on wooden poles) cross eastern and northern parts of the site. Whilst Western Power has not indicated that these lines would be subject to the same issues as the higher-level lines, they would nonetheless have implications for the layout of dwellings on the site.

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

building within the Drayton being refused on the grounds of not wanting to spoil the character of the area.

Drayton is of historical importance and is now being 'lumped in' with Swineshead (because it suits) but all the history books list it separate from Swineshead :- Swineshead itself is not mentioned in the Domesday Book, but other settlements within the parish, Stenning and Drayton both have entries.

I have also spoke with Western Power re the power lines, and although you state there are no risks to health from living under them quite clearly there is an issue with them as Western Power state there would be no permission given for ANY BUILDING underneath the power lines and 9m either side of the power lines. In fact they stated that the lines are due to be renewed in a few years so this would be even more of a problem to any potential developer.

There is also a wayleave on the land for access to the smaller electricity pole on the boundary of the field which has a breaker on it. This has to be accessed by the electricity company generally with a cherry picker! All this would leave a massive area of the field that would be undevelopable and surely would reduce the numbers of houses that could be built.

I again will reiterate my concerns re the infrastructure of the surrounding roads if this development (SW4) was allowed. The surrounding roads (apart from the main rd into the village) are single track or not suitable for HGV minor roads and already the traffic on them has increased substantially since I moved here, partly due to the increase of the business Kia Motors. If more houses were to be built here then I would fear for the safety of the residents on the roads.

I have also grave concerns about the sewerage capacity at the pumping station which I described before.

- The Highway Authority has considered the implications of the potential development of this site and has commented that vehicular access could come from South Street only, and that this road would be suitable to serve the site. They do not agree with the objector that the site's development would threaten highway safety. Anglian Water Services Ltd has considered the implications of the potential development of this site and acknowledges that infrastructure upgrades will be needed to serve the site.

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

United Utility's are frequently there due to blockages and I have seen them change the pump twice after it burning out !.how would it cope with more houses? I hope that further consideration is given to the suitability of this site and further relevant questions are asked of the utility companies so a correct and informed decision is made and not one made on assumptions.

ID1:	214	comment_author:	Clive Moon
comment_content:	I wish to oppose SWI004 We moved here 6 years ago, because it is such a beautiful Hamlet, and I was informed that Drayton went back to the doomsday book, and because of its historical importance would never be built around. By extending the Swineshead envelope further south it would be a massive intrusion into the character of this attractive hamlet. I also believe that this proposal would undoubtedly increase the flood risk of this road, which already struggles with heavy rainfalls.	Officer Comment:	Although the dwellings, 1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street are perceived as being separate to Swineshead, it is not accepted that this is the case for the dwellings that surround site Swi004. It is considered that development of site Swi004 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - the site does not have an open countryside character, as it is surrounded by existing (sometimes scattered) development on 3 sides, & consequently visual impacts would be relatively limited. It would, however, extend the village towards the existing, outlying group of dwellings (1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street). In terms of surface water flooding, Anglian Water Services Limited 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. At the time of a planning application the layout of any scheme and its drainage proposals would be carefully scrutinised to ensure that no adverse impacts would be caused to existing nearby highways.
		Officer Recommendation:	Not all of the objectors' concerns are considered to be valid. However, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 215 comment_author: Lyn Sansom

comment content:

Swi004.

I support totally the points made in the previous comments and wish to add a few of my own.

1) I live on the opposite side of the single track lane to the rear of Bluebell Cottage. Whenever there is heavy rain, my enclosed garden and the road in front of my premises become very waterlogged, my concern is that should the proposed buildings on SWi004 go ahead the problem would be exacerbated.

2) When I purchased my premises, I too was informed by my solicitor and Boston Council that Drayton was a hamlet outside the village envelope and no development would be allowed. Has the envelope suddenly been stretched?

3) My neighbour, who moved in approximately two years ago, has two young children. They have to be transported to Donnington as Swineshead School was unable to accommodate them. Where are the extra children going to be educated?

4) One more point with regards to the Power Lines; no scaffolding company will erect their scaffold in the vicinity of power lines.

I too feel that more relevant questions need to be asked.

Officer Comment:

1. In terms of surface water flooding, Anglian Water Services Limited 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. At the time of a planning application the layout of any scheme and its drainage proposals would be carefully scrutinised to ensure that no adverse impacts would be caused to existing nearby dwellings or highways;

2. Policy set out in the adopted Boston Borough Local Plan (April 1999) indicates that planning permission should not be granted for the residential development of site Swi004, nor for other land shown as being in the 'countryside'. However, one of the tasks of the emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan is to reconsider this policy and, as part of that process, has proposed that site Swi004 should be identified as a 'Preferred Housing Site'. The fact that one Local Plan seeks to prevent the development of a particular area of land does not mean that all subsequent Plans will take the same view of that land;

3. The County Education Department has commented that there is no capacity currently available at Swineshead St Mary's Church of England Primary School. Four additional classrooms would be required to extend the school by 0.5FE to 2FE, and a shortage of land on the existing site would require the provision of additional playing field land. 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

Officer Recommendation:

Not all of the objectors' concerns are considered to be valid. However, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

versions of the Plan;

4. Western Power indicates that no buildings can be erected within 7m (horizontally or vertically) of the higher level power-lines which are carried on metal pylons and cross the site in a roughly east-west direction. Furthermore, Western Power indicates that it would prefer that no buildings at all should be erected below these power-lines because: in the unlikely event of failure, damage could be caused to buildings; and when circuits need to be refurbished, costs and disturbance would be increased - if the land below these power-lines were used as gardens, the refurbishing of circuits would still involve restricting people's use of their gardens for the duration of the works. Whilst these power-lines could be re-routed or placed underground, this would be at the developer's cost. Two other sets of power-lines (carried at a lower-level on wooden poles) cross eastern and northern parts of the site. Whilst Western Power has not indicated that these lines would be subject to the same issues as the higher-level lines, they would nonetheless have implications for the layout of dwellings on the site.

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

ID1: 216 comment_author: Mrs Desley Sherwin

comment content:

The proposals relating to the North End of Swineshead are inconsistent and contradictory. It is stated that the village can accommodate a pace of growth averaging 16 dwellings per year over a 25 year period without harm to community cohesions; but the stated preferred housing sites at Swi004/015/018/037/038 propose a much faster construction rate over a much shorter period. Ashdown have already applied to build 63 houses on site Swi038, but according to your table, construction will not commence for 5 years? Highways have no concerns about traffic impact at a rate of 16 dwellings per year, but the suggestion is that this rate is not realistic or accurate unless Planning permission limits the pace and rate of construction. Is this really their intention?

If these sites are approved, surely than the result can only be irreversible harm to community cohesion? There is insufficient consideration of the damage that will be done to the village without imperative significant investment in infrastructure: school places, healthcare provision, water/sewage. Without any further retail provision, the huge and sudden influx of new residents largely proposed to be concentrated at North End will result in vastly increased traffic to the one convenience shop, with limited parking provision. This proposal is disastrous for the character of the village, irreversibly proposing the creation of a second village centre at North End, sites on largely first grade agricultural land with no consideration for wildlife or the environment, and significantly increasing the density of housing on what currently is low density linear development.

It is suggested that the draft Plan proposals for

Officer Comment:

It is not expected that 16 new dwellings will be built each year during the Plan period – some years more dwellings are likely to be built, whilst in other years, fewer will be built. However, the average over the Plan period is intended to be 16 per year. The trajectory at the end of the Housing Paper – Swineshead (July 2016) estimated that 50 dwellings would be built on site Swi038 in years 6-10 of the Local Plan period (i.e. between 2016/17 and 2020/21. As at October 2016, planning permission had not been granted for the development of 63 dwellings on part of site Swi038 but, if it is granted shortly, it is considered that this would suggest that there is a reasonable chance that the trajectory's assumptions could prove to be accurate. The County Highway Authority's views on the sites are not predicated on development coming forward at 16 dwellings per year – they have considered the ability of the local road network to absorb the sites in their entirety;

It is not agreed that the development of sites Swi015, Swi018 and Swi038 would harm community cohesion. It is, however, accepted that improvements will be needed to existing infrastructure in order to accommodate this growth. [The County Education Department has commented that there is no capacity currently available at Swineshead St Mary's Church of England Primary School. Four additional classrooms would be required to extend the school by 0.5FE to 2FE, and a shortage of land on the existing site would require the provision of additional playing field land. The CCG has commented that currently there is some capacity at the local GP surgeries to accommodate additional

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that the comments call into question the sites' suitability. Consequently, it is considered that sites Swi015, Swi018 and Swi038 should be taken forward as 'Housing Allocations'.

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

Swineshead are wholly inappropriate; no planning approvals should be made in respect of these so-called 'preferred sites' until the Inspector has had the opportunity to consider and reject them. The whole scheme relating to Swineshead should be considered on planning merit and genuine/realistic need.

patients, however County wide there is an increasing shortage of GPs, nurses and other healthcare staff which could affect future capacity should demand increase. Anglian Water Services Ltd acknowledges that upgrades will be needed to the foul sewerage and water supply networks.] The Local Plan will need to demonstrate how these 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. It is considered that (given that Swineshead is approximately 2.5km in length and given that its services and facilities are not all concentrated in one part of the village) additional vehicular trips to the village's services and facilities would be generated, wherever potential development sites are located. It is not accepted that the village's character will be harmed by the sites' development (although the site is highly visible and its development would greatly change the area's character, the site currently does not have an open countryside character, given that there is existing development to its north, east and south-east) nor by the collective impacts of the three sites proposed at North End. The sites are predominantly classified as Grade 1 agricultural land, but this is equally true of all alternative greenfield sites around Swineshead. It is accepted that it would be preferable for Swineshead's housing needs to be met on previously-developed land or on lower grade agricultural land, but such sites are simply not available in sufficient numbers in and around Swineshead

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

ID1: 217 comment_author: Christine Beckett

comment content:

It is with horror that I realised that this site having somehow become a "preferred site" for development. My partner and I moved into Homeland barn when it was completed five years ago. we paid for extensive land search and research and was assured that this area The Drayton was protected against further development

Any development here would have a massive impact on all who live in this quiet friendly hamlet.

The field Grade 1 arable land would benefit all left as it is. To build on grade 1 arable land is a travesty. Also your comment on the field being a "No risk" of flooding is untrue as in extreme rainfall the area can at this moment in time just cope but further development would cause flooding to all properties in the Drayton. The field area marked as Sw004 is flood zone 2 and was severely flooded in 2007. We will always be at risk of surface flooding and this risk will increase if the field is developed

I disagree with the statement "to protect the quality and character of landscape and townscape. Although we are adjoined to the south of Swineshead we are a separate hamlet of significant interest being mentioned in the Domesday Book and I consider that to spoil this would be a serious mistake .

Further more I would question as to whether Western Power would allow development under the high voltage national grid lines

I ask you to reconsider your decision to mark this site as preferred No 1 for the reasons I have mentioned and for the sake of my neighbours in the Drayton

Officer Comment:

Policy set out in the adopted Boston Borough Local Plan (April 1999) indicates that planning permission should not be granted for the residential development of site Swi004, nor for other land shown as being in the 'countryside'. However, one of the tasks of the emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan is to reconsider this policy and, as part of that process, has proposed that site Swi004 should be identified as a 'Preferred Housing Site'. The fact that one Local Plan seeks to prevent the development of a particular area of land does not mean that all subsequent Plans will take the same view of that land

- It is inevitable that the development of this site would change the outlook of existing nearby dwellings. Whilst this would also be true of alternative sites, because some homes are located very close the site's boundaries, there is the potential for impacts to be relatively severe. However, at the time of a planning application the layout and design of any scheme would be carefully scrutinised to minimise overlooking and privacy loss;
- Site Swi004 is classified as Grade 1 agricultural land, but this is equally true of all alternative greenfield sites around Swineshead. It is accepted that it would be preferable for Swineshead's housing needs to be met on previously-developed land or on lower grade agricultural land, but such sites are simply not available in sufficient numbers in and around Swineshead;
- With respect to fluvial/coastal flooding, although its central and western parts are shown as Flood Zone 2 (no hazard and no depth), the majority of site Swi004 is shown as being within Flood Zone 1 (no hazard and no depth). With respect to surface water flooding, Anglian

Officer Recommendation:

Not all of the objectors' concerns are considered to be valid. However, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Water Services Limited 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. At the time of a planning application the layout of any scheme and its drainage proposals would be carefully scrutinised to ensure that no adverse impacts would be caused to existing nearby dwellings;

- Although the dwellings, 1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street are perceived as being separate to Swineshead, it is not accepted that this is the case for the dwellings that surround site Swi004. It is considered that development of site Swi004 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - the site does not have an open countryside character, as it is surrounded by existing (sometimes scattered) development on 3 sides, & consequently visual impacts would be relatively limited. It would, however, extend the village towards the existing, outlying group of dwellings (1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street);

- Western Power indicates that no buildings can be erected within 7m (horizontally or vertically) of the higher level power-lines which are carried on metal pylons and cross the site in a roughly east-west direction. Furthermore, Western Power indicates that it would prefer that no buildings at all should be erected below these power-lines because: in the unlikely event of failure, damage could be caused to buildings; and when circuits need to be refurbished, costs and disturbance would be increased - if the land below these power-lines were used as gardens, the refurbishing of circuits would still involve restricting people's use of their gardens for the duration of the works. Whilst these

power-lines could be re-routed or placed underground, this would be at the developer's cost. Two other sets of power-lines (carried at a lower-level on wooden poles) cross eastern and northern parts of the site. Whilst Western Power has not indicated that these lines would be subject to the same issues as the higher-level lines, they would nonetheless have implications for the layout of dwellings on the site.

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

ID1: 218 comment_author: K McNicol

comment content:

Preferred Site SWi004

I would also like to add my comments to that of my neighbours. We have recently moved to this hamlet 'The Drayton' and after having solicitors surveys were informed that no planning permission would be granted within this hamlet. As mentioned this land is not part of Swineshead and will have a detrimental affect for the Drayton hamlet. I am extremely unhappy that suddenly this has now been changed to suit the needs of theses plans. What's changed then?

We already have a drainage pond that fills significantly when there is a large amount of rainfall. Building on this site will only increase the amount of surface water and will affect the housing on the Drayton. I am absolutely horrified that this is not even an issue. Should I assume again that this will be another stipulation for the developer to fix?

As mentioned in my neighbours comments above we moved here 2 years ago with 2 young children and were unable to locally educate them due to the oversubscribed primary school. My children are not the only ones from Swineshead being taken to another village to be schooled in, so this is a major issue for the local authority. Taxpayers money being spent on sending children to another school because the local school cannot cope and now you want to add more children. Maybe this should be come out of the developers pocket? With the amount of affordable homes being discussed where will these young families send their children to be educated? Swineshead do not

Officer Comment:

Policy set out in the adopted Boston Borough Local Plan (April 1999) indicates that planning permission should not be granted for the residential development of site SWi004, nor for other land shown as being in the 'countryside'. However, one of the tasks of the emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan is to reconsider this policy and, as part of that process, has proposed that site SWi004 should be identified as a 'Preferred Housing Site'. The fact that one Local Plan seeks to prevent the development of a particular area of land does not mean that all subsequent Plans will take the same view of that land. Although the dwellings, 1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street are perceived as being separate to Swineshead, it is not accepted that this is the case for the dwellings that surround site SWi004. It is considered that development of site SWi004 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - the site does not have an open countryside character, as it is surrounded by existing (sometimes scattered) development on 3 sides, & consequently visual impacts would be relatively limited. It would, however, extend the village towards the existing, outlying group of dwellings (1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street) - Anglian Water Services Limited 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. At the time of a planning application the layout of any scheme and its drainage proposals would be carefully scrutinised to ensure that no adverse

Officer Recommendation:

Not all of the objectors' concerns are considered to be valid. However, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

have the facilities to cope with these proposed dwellings.

I am worried for the safety of my children as the vehicles power through the drayton especially when other routes are unavailable. We frequently do not have full access out of the road due to Kia motors deliveries and awful parking. The A52 junction into the Drayton is on a blind bend and in the 2 years I have been here have seen many road accidents and some fatalities due to the excessive speeding from motorists, the slow down signage d s NOT WORK!!!! . This junction would need serious redesign and be part of the infrastructure any developer would need to put in place. I've also had one of our domestic animals been hit by a car - More houses, more cars who else will be next to be hit, my children?

In this preferred site there is not a mention of the fact that we cope with frequent power cuts and brown outs on the drayton. Adding more houses to the already oversubscribed eletrical infrastructure will only make matters worse.

Already water pressure is comically low here and more houses tapping into the existing water infrastructure will reduce water pressure even further.

Yet again I will state the preferred option SWi004 has not taken into account all our above comments regarding flood risk, infrastructure and safety.

impacts would be caused to existing nearby dwellings;

- The County Education Department has commented that there is no capacity currently available at Swineshead St Mary's Church of England Primary School. Four additional classrooms would be required to extend the school by 0.5FE to 2FE, and a shortage of land on the existing site would require the provision of additional playing field land. 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;

- The Highway Authority has considered the implications of the potential development of this site and has commented that vehicular access could come from South Street only, and that this road would be suitable to serve the site. They do not agree with the objector that the site's development would threaten highway safety;

- No specific information is available concerning the area's electrical supply but, if there are issues, these would need to be addressed at the time of a planning application. Anglian Water Services Ltd has considered the implications of the potential development of this site and acknowledges that upgrades will be needed to the water supply network to serve the site.

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

ID1:

219

comment_author:

Mr Maw

comment_content:

The conclusions to comments received seem to be largely satisfactory.

Officer Comment:

The comment is noted.

Officer Recommendation:

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

ID1:

220

comment_author:

Mrs Ena Florence

comment_content:

I went to the meeting at Swineshead Village Hall on the 22nd July 2016. I go along with everything I read and was informed about.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed.

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: 221 comment_author: Mr and Mrs C Curtis

comment content:

Swi004 - this is an obvious choice, being a small site with excellent direct access onto South Street, and joins neatly onto the end of the existing development. However, this site should not exceed 20dph.

Swi037 - an obvious fill-in site, perfect for development having good direct access onto High Street, and joins existing boundaries keeping it neatly in line.

Swi038 - this site having good direct access is an excellent choice being mostly hidden behind existing properties.

Swi015 - the development of Swi038 makes this site an excellent choice keeping in line with Swi038 and the business park making a neat straight boundary. The location of this site could allow for a higher density of perhaps 25dph, so providing more affordable homes. the western boundary of this site should be trees/hedging.

Swi018 - this site is a good choice being a small development fitting in neatly behind existing properties.

All these preferred sites are excellent choices having direct access keeping inconvenience to local residents to the minimum, all are no flood risk and by joining these sites onto existing boundaries the full required amount of dwellings is achieved without extending the existing boundary lines. Excellent planning! We fully support the selection of all these preferred sites.

Officer Comment:

Swi004 - The support is welcomed.

Swi037 - The support is welcomed.

Swi038 - The support is welcomed.

Swi015 - The support is welcomed.

Swi018 - The support is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

Swi004 - Although the consultee does not oppose the site's allocation, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Swi037 - It is not considered that the comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Swi037 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Swi038 - It is not considered that the comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Swi038 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Swi015 - It is not considered that the comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Swi015 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Swi018 - It is not considered that the comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Swi018 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 222 comment_author: Mr D Dawson

comment content:

Swi004:

I wish to register my concern that this site has become a preferred site and would oppose any such development. My reasons for this in no particular order are as follows:-

The Drayton is a small hamlet within the parish of Swineshead and was at least, if not still, outside the village envelope. The Drayton is made up of scattered dwellings and I feel that the development of this site would spoil the character of this quiet hamlet.

The proposed site is grade 1 agricultural land and to use it for housing would surely be a waste of a vital resource that would be better used to grow food.

I understand that this site is categorised as Flood Risk 1, my concern is that I have seen this field waterlogged on more than one occasion so surely development of this site would only exacerbate this problem. A couple of my neighbour's properties stand below the current level of the proposed site and could be seriously affected by any further surface water flooding of this site.

I am also advised that a main sewer pumping line crosses this site and I would question whether any houses should be built over it. If not, then this would reduce the number of dwellings that could be built on this site which again would be a waste of grade 1 agricultural land. I am also aware that the pumping station adjacent to the site struggles to cope now so the addition of further sewage from this development

Officer Comment:

- Although the dwellings 1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street are perceived as being separate to Swineshead, it is not accepted that this is the case for the dwellings that surround site Swi004. It is considered that development of site Swi004 would not have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - the site does not have an open countryside character, as it is surrounded by existing (sometimes scattered) development on 3 sides, & consequently visual impacts would be relatively limited. It would, however, extend the village towards the existing, outlying group of dwellings (1-18 South Street and Magnolia, South Street);

- Site Swi004 is classified as Grade 1 agricultural land, but this is equally true of all alternative greenfield sites around Swineshead. It is accepted that it would be preferable for Swineshead's housing needs to be met on previously-developed land or on lower grade agricultural land, but such sites are simply not available in sufficient numbers in and around Swineshead;

- With respect to fluvial/coastal flooding, although its central and western parts are shown as Flood Zone 2 (no hazard and no depth), the majority of site Swi004 is shown as being within Flood Zone 1 (no hazard and no depth). With respect to surface water flooding, Anglian Water Services Limited 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. At the time of a planning application the layout of any scheme and its drainage proposals would be

Officer Recommendation:

Not all of the objectors' concerns are considered to be valid. However, the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs. This combination of issues raises doubts about the likely viability of development on this site, and consequently it is considered inappropriate to be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

would only make matters worse.

The site is also crossed by both high and low voltage power lines and I understand that new developments need to take account of the statutory safety clearances required. Again this will surely have an affect on the number of dwellings that could be built on such a valuable piece of agricultural land.

The main road into the village may be suitable to serve the development of this site but the surrounding roads are only single track/minor roads and would become more hazardous than they already are if this development was to go ahead.

My final concern is whether the Drs surgery and the school can cope with any further additional dwellings as it is already difficult to get an appointment at the surgery and I am aware of children already within the village that have to attend primary schools in other villages.

I hope that my above objections and those of my neighbours are given the careful consideration they deserve as we will be the ones most affected if this development is allowed to proceed.

carefully scrutinised to ensure that no adverse impacts would be caused to existing nearby dwellings;

- The objector is correct that the site is crossed by a sewer pipe, and that this will need to be taken into account in drawing up a layout. It is not, however, accepted that this threatens the site's viability. Anglian Water Services Ltd has considered the implications of the potential development of this site and acknowledges that upgrades will be needed to the foul sewerage network to serve the site;

- Western Power indicates that no buildings can be erected within 7m (horizontally or vertically) of the higher level power-lines which are carried on metal pylons and cross the site in a roughly east-west direction. Furthermore, Western Power indicates that it would prefer that no buildings at all should be erected below these power-lines because: in the unlikely event of failure, damage could be caused to buildings; and when circuits need to be refurbished, costs and disturbance would be increased - if the land below these power-lines were used as gardens, the refurbishing of circuits would still involve restricting people's use of their gardens for the duration of the works. Whilst these power-lines could be re-routed or placed underground, this would be at the developer's cost. Two other sets of power-lines (carried at a lower-level on wooden poles) cross eastern and northern parts of the site. Whilst Western Power has not indicated that these lines would be subject to the same issues as the higher-level lines, they would nonetheless have implications for the layout of dwellings on the site.

- The Highway Authority has considered the implications of the potential development of this site and has commented that vehicular access could come from South Street only, and that this road would be suitable to serve the site. They do not agree with the

objector that the site's development would threaten highway safety;

- The County Education Department has commented that there is no capacity currently available at Swineshead St Mary's Church of England Primary School. Four additional classrooms would be required to extend the school by 0.5FE to 2FE, and a shortage of land on the existing site would require the provision of additional playing field land. The CCG has commented that currently there is some capacity at the local GP surgeries to accommodate additional patients, however County wide there is an increasing shortage of GPs, nurses and other healthcare staff which could affect future capacity should demand increase. 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

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

ID1: 223 comment_author: Pink Planning

comment content:

We write on behalf of our clients in relation to their landholding at Rush Farm, Swineshead. This site is located on the western side of the village and totals 3.09ha. [The location of the site is shown on a map provided by email]

Objection is raised in respect of the failure to give adequate consideration to land at Rush Farm, Swineshead. Inspection of the documents 'SA Reports on sites - January 2016' and 'SA Reports on sites - July 2016' indicate that a total of 43 sites were appraised, however, land at Rush Farm does not appear to have been appraised at either stage. It is unclear whether the site was 'screened out' at an earlier time. The Council is required to assess all reasonable alternatives - as the site represents a logical extension to the preferred site ref. SWI038 it is clear that it should have been considered as a potential site option, with or without promotion by the landowner. It is considered for the reasons discussed in this report that the site is suitable, available and deliverable and should be allocated as an additional site for residential development within Swineshead. Not giving due consideration to the site would by definition render the plan unsound.

Site appraisal

The village of Swineshead is considered to be 'particularly suited to accommodating a significant level of housing growth' as it 'could evolve and perform more of a supporting role to surrounding communities'. Land at Rush Farm is a typical edge-of- village site with

Officer Comment:

It is not accepted that the process for selecting sites is flawed simply because this site has not hitherto been considered. The build up of evidence and knowledge of available sites has been over a number of years with several "calls for sites" and backed up with public consultations on growth scenarios, site options etc. To expect the plan making process to consider every site within and adjoining a settlement is unreasonable.

- Local Wildlife Site - the site is located within 9 metres of the Coles Lane Ponds Local Wildlife Site (LWS), and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust commented that "given the proximity of the housing site to the LWS there could potentially be adverse impacts on the LWS be it from light, visual, noise disturbance, additional visitor pressure and possibly impacts on the hydrology of the LWS. It would also isolate the site from the wider countryside. The same would apply to any development in close proximity to the LWS. This would not necessarily preclude development but if the site is allocated it needs to be clear in the Local Plan that impacts on the LWS need to be assessed and mitigation measures implemented to ensure that there are no adverse impacts on the LWS. Examples of mitigation could include things like including a substantial area of accessible natural greenspace within the development site to reduce visitor pressure on the LWS, including a green corridor as a buffer adjacent to the LWS and to connect to the wider countryside, and conditions relating to lighting within close proximity to the LWS etc." Although the Wildlife Trust does not argue that the proximity of the LWS would preclude the site's development, it is not considered appropriate to allocate the site without concrete evidence that any

Officer Recommendation:

The SHLAA classifies site Swi044 as being 'undevelopable', on the basis that: it may have adverse impacts upon a nearby Local Wildlife Site, and will increase pressure for further development that will have additional impacts upon the Local Wildlife Site; and an acceptable vehicular access cannot be identified. The above objection does not raise any issues that suggest that this assessment is inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Swi044 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

a semi-rural character and appearance. The site is in a sustainable location close to the village centre of Swineshead. The existing built framework adjoins the southern boundary of the site and the proposed site SWI038 lies

immediately to the north. The range of facilities and services on offer within the village are within walking and cycling distance of the site. There are no site, legal or ownership constraints that would prevent the development coming forward in an expedient manner.

At first glance the site is subject to two constraints: flood risk and nature conservation. However, when all relevant factors are taken into account it becomes clear that the site is not subject to flood risk (of any kind) and that development in proximity to Cole's Lane Ponds LWS is acceptable. These issues are discussed in more detail below.

Cole's Lane Ponds LWS

The site is located in relatively close proximity to Cole's Lane Ponds LWS, however, existing residential development already borders this designated site on two sides and SWI038 is proposed for allocation just to the north. It is not considered that the proximity of land at Rush Farm to this site should serve as a reason to discount it for potential development. If appropriate, the Council could seek to limit any new development closest to Cole's Lane Ponds LWS, for example, with the creation of a new area of Public Open Space.

It is Boston Borough Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (2010) that provides the most detailed and up-to-date information on flood risk within Swineshead. The SFRA is based on all sources of

possible harmful impacts can be successfully mitigated.

- Flood Risk – the Environment Agency advised that, in order to align with the process advocated in the NPPF, the identification of the most sequentially preferable sites to meet housing requirements should consider: EA Flood Zone first; flood hazard (2115) second; and flood depth (2115) last. It is not therefore agreed that the site selection process is flawed, nor that the Plan's approach to flood risk renders the Plan unsound. Site Swi044 is predominantly located within Flood Zone 3a (85% FZ3a, 11% FZ2, and 4% FZ1) and thus is not as sequentially preferable as alternative sites in Swineshead.

- Vehicular access- site Swi044 adjoins only one public highway (Coles Lane) and the Highway Authority indicates that this road is unsuitable to accommodate the additional vehicle movements that would be generated by the site's development. However, the objector indicates that they regard site Swi044 as an extension to site Swi038, and it is assumed that vehicular access is expected to be provided via site Swi038. The Highway Authority indicates that it would be feasible (with the agreement of the owner of Swi038) for that development to be extended into Swi044. However, southern parts of site Swi038 are currently the subject of a full planning application (reference B/16/0052) which does not provide for access into site Swi044. On the evidence currently available therefore, there is no certainty that an acceptable vehicular access can be provided to Swi044.

flooding and takes climate change into account. As such, it is the document that should be used in any application of the Sequential Test. From study of the two SA reports on sites, it appears that the Council has incorrectly relied upon the Environment Agency's high level flood maps when carrying out sustainability appraisals of the various site options. This significant flaw would unfortunately bring into question the 'soundness' of the Local Plan, in relation to the four tests of soundness outlined in paragraph 182 of the NPPF.

Whilst the Environment Agency's Flood Zone Map shows some parts of the Swineshead study area as falling in Zone 2 and Zone 3 (including Land at Rush Farm), the 'Relative Probability of Flooding Figure 2, Sheet 4' from the more detailed SFRA shows the whole of the study area to be at a low probability of flooding. The study goes on to advise that it is only the area on the lower eastern edge of the study area which may require slightly raised floor levels - development on the western side of Swineshead is not affected by flood risk (as indicated on the map excerpt overleaf). Therefore, all sites within Swineshead should have scored equally in terms of flood risk - and it is clear that they did not. The site selection process was therefore inherently flawed and the resulting plan is rendered unsound.

Conclusions

My client's land at Rush Farm in Swineshead represents an opportunity for a logical extension of the village, however, it has not been given adequate consideration as a site option. In not considering all reasonable alternative sites for residential development within

Swineshead, the Local Plan is unsound.

The allocation of land at Rush Farm, Swineshead for a modest amount of housing is considered to be essential to the delivery of a balanced portfolio of sites within this Main Service Centre. Its development will provide a logical use for an underused area of land and will contribute to the sustainable development of this Main Service Centre. The land is currently in agricultural use, but will be bounded by residential uses on two sides (existing and proposed development). In terms of location, its proximity to the centre of the village makes it one of the most sustainable site options available within the village. As discussed in this report, there are no known constraints to development. In accordance with the NPPF, the site is 'deliverable' as it is available now, offers a suitable location for development directly adjacent to the existing built area and is achievable.

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

ID1:

224

comment_author:

Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire

comment_content:

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

Swi004, 018, 015 & 038: likely that these 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 suitability of the 'Preferred Housing Sites' for allocation. It is therefore considered that sites Swi015, Swi018, Swi037 and Swi038 should be taken forward as 'Housing Allocations'. However, it is considered that there are sufficient doubts about site Swi004's achievability (viability) to mean that it should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation' - these doubts stem from the fact that the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs.

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

ID1:

225

comment_author:

Rollinson Planning Consultancy

comment_content:

Swi012 The Woods Nurseries Site:

The site, as identified on the enclosed plans (provided by email), should be taken forward as a proposed housing allocation in the Publication version of the Local Plan to be submitted to the Secretary of State. This site has been previously been identified as SW012 in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

This site was previously considered as being suitable for new housing in earlier iterations of the emerging Local Plan. It is acknowledged that this was on the basis that the site formed part of a wider site (SWI 036); nonetheless it was previously considered suitable for development. It appears that this is no longer the case solely as it is considered that developed in isolation the site will relate less well to the existing form of the village than if it was part of a more comprehensive proposal.

It is not disputed that a more comprehensive solution may be preferable. What is disputed are the conclusions drawn that the wider site would not having adverse environmental impacts (SHLAA) whereas the nursey site's development would have adverse impacts (SHLAA) such that it no longer warrants allocation as a housing site. It d s not logically follow that a smaller development would be unacceptable, even if it is less preferable.

It is our strong contention that the site can be developed satisfactorily and contribute to meeting

Officer Comment:

It is acknowledged that site Swi012: is located relatively close to the Market Place; is not constrained by 'bad neighbour' uses; has no intrinsic amenity value; is largely screened from public view; should be sufficiently distant from the Manwar Ings SAM to preserve the Monument's setting (subject to the views of the Borough Council's Consultatnt Architect); can be safely accessed; and can contribute towards meeting Swineshead's housing needs. However, the site would have a poor relationship to the village's existing built form – although it abuts the existing village to the west, on all other boundaries it meets the countryside only. As a consequence, it is considered that the site's development would appear incongruous, and poorly-related to the existing village.

Officer Recommendation:

The SHLAA classifies site Swi012 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 Swi012 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

both open market and affordable housing need in this sustainable settlement. In support of this we would ask that serious consideration is given to the following:

- The site lies immediately adjacent to the existing built up area, closer to the core of the village and the majority of its services and facilities (all of which can be easily accessed on foot) than most of the preferred sites;
- There are no amenity issues arising from adjoining land uses;
- The site has no intrinsic amenity value (SHLAA);
- There would be no adverse impacts on natural assets (SHLAA);
- It has been explicitly acknowledged in the SHLAA that the site is largely screened from public view;
- The site is a significant distance from the Manwar Ings Schedule Ancient Monument. In the report to the June JSPC it was noted in relation to SWI036 that the separation distance between the (larger) site and the Monument would still represent sufficient separation to preserve the Monument's setting; Logically, the same conclusion must be reached about this site.
- Whilst it is accepted that the site does not qualify as 'previously developed land', much of it is already covered by existing structures. By any ordinary definition, the eastern most part of the site is developed. It is reasonable to suggest that many villagers would prefer to see this site redeveloped than new development on what are currently prominent open fields on the majority of the preferred sites.
- The site can be satisfactorily and safely accessed. Discussions have been held with Mr. Jon Sharpe of the Highway Authority and it has confirmed that the proposed access to the south west of the site is suitable

to serve both the proposed new convenience store and the new housing;

- The site is sufficiently large to make a meaningful contribution to the provision of necessary new mixed tenure housing of both open market and affordable housing units (to be dispersed around the site to create an appropriate social mix) along with appropriate levels of public open space;

- The enclosed indicative layout shows clearly how the site can be developed sensitively, provide a suitable range and mix of house types and in a way which would provide important and significant new landscape buffers. There need be none of the hard urban edges which characterise some of the more recent developments in Swineshead;

- The indicative layout shows how the site could be developed incrementally with phase one of the development being undertaken on that part of the site that is already developed;

- The June report to the JSPC noted that the lack of a joint scheme for the wider site (SWI036) raises doubts about deliverability. It is contended that our work to date shows that development on this site is deliverable. The site is available and the layout shows how it can be delivered in an appropriate and acceptable manner.

In conclusion, we believe there is a very strong argument for raising the overall housing requirement for Swineshead in order to help ensure a robust Plan and the delivery of the housing requirement both within the Plan area and within Swineshead itself. Furthermore, we consider that the Nursery site is deliverable, available and suitable, that it can be developed in appropriate way without demonstrable harm and that it should be proposed as a proposed housing allocation in the Submission Draft of the Local

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

to be submitted to the Secretary of State.

ID1:	226	comment_author:	Derrick Nundy
comment_content:	<div>Officer Comment:</div> <div>Officer Recommendation:</div>		
It was pleasing to read that sites Swi036 and Swi039 are not being taken forward as 'Preferred Housing Sites'.		These sites were not taken forward as 'Preferred Housing Sites'.	No changes to the Plan are necessary in response to these comments.
<p>However, I was astounded by the comment in relation to Swi039 that "the Highway Authority" d s not share the consultees' concerns about traffic impacts". this comment, in the light of the CURRENT situation with regard to traffic in this area, and around the school, beggars belief: makes one wonder what planet these officials are on, and whether the department is fit for purpose. It would appear that there are no answers to the problem in the areas immediately around the school, and it is to be hoped therefore that the planners and environmental health will be consistent in the future (documentation I have read), when considering PERMANENT developments, as they have been in the past, and refer to the criteria of a recent refusal of a 'temporary matter', on objections by ONE person, as follows:- loss of amenity; noise; nuisance; impact on privacy. These four points are relevant to everyone living in the vicinity of Swi036 and Swi039 and consideration of these as development areas in Swineshead should now be FINAL and not re-visited in the future.</p>			

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

ID1: 227 comment_author: Anglian Water

comment_content:

All of the proposed housing allocations in this area are expected to require improvements to the existing water supply and foul sewerage networks to enable development to come forward on these sites. Please refer to the enclosed spreadsheet for detailed comments relating to these sites.

Officer Comment:

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

Officer Recommendation:

These comments do not call into question the suitability of the 'Preferred Housing Sites' for allocation. It is therefore considered that sites Swi015, Swi018, Swi037 and Swi038 should be taken forward as 'Housing Allocations'. However, it is considered that there are sufficient doubts about site Swi004's achievability (viability) to mean that it should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation' - these doubts stem from the fact that the layout of any residential scheme on this site would inevitably be constrained by the presence of a sewer pipe and electrical cables crossing the site, and the potential difficulty of protecting neighbours' amenities and preventing surface-water flooding to lower-lying neighbouring properties. It is considered that these issues have the potential to significantly reduce the site's capacity. At the same time, the presence of the electrical cables has the potential to reduce the value of any dwellings built or (if the cables are re-routed or placed underground) very significantly drive up development costs.

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

ID1: 228 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

Sites Swi 030/040 Land at Swineshead.
We have studied the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Public Consultation on Preferred sites for development (July 2016), and write to request reconsideration of the preferred housing sites for Swineshead, and to support the inclusion of the sites Swi030/040, as being more suitable sites for Preferred Housing sites in Swineshead, than those presently selected.

We note that a number of the Preferred sites are primarily in the north/west sector of the village. We note that these are located adjacent to a main Industrial area and there would be inevitable bad neighbour issues at this location. We note that site Swi 004 has been selected as a preferred site, and therefore this does support the principle that development in the south east of the village is acceptable.

We therefore wish to ask for a reconsideration of the preferred sites, and that these should be that the northern most sites should be substituted by sites Swi 030/040, for the following reasons:

1 Swi 030 has a footway along the whole length of the frontage from the A52 into the village. It is also immediately adjacent the developments of Cragg Close and Michael Moses Way.

2 Swi 040 is immediately adjacent to residential properties and is also adjacent to the village playing field. It could provide a good link to the school. Comments have been made about the unsuitable standard of Bullens Lane, but these can be addressed/improvements conditioned as part of a planning application, and the site's suitability should

Officer Comment:

Site Swi030 - It is acknowledged that site Swi030 is: linked to the village by a footpath; located close to the primary school; is not constrained by 'bad neighbour' uses; and located close to the Market Place. However, the site falls predominantly within Flood Zone 3a (0.83 hectares) rather than Flood Zone 2 (0.64 hectares) – but, even if it were entirely located within Flood Zone 2, it would still be sequentially less preferable than alternative sites within Swineshead. Furthermore, it is considered that the site's development would have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - the site is visually exposed and its development would significantly extend the village's built-up area into the countryside, to the detriment of the area's character.

Site Swi040 - It is acknowledged that site Swi040 is: adjacent to the playing field, which offers pedestrian access to the primary school; located close to the Market Place; and is not constrained by 'bad neighbour' uses. However, the site falls predominantly within Flood Zone 2 (2.57 hectares) rather than Flood Zone 1 (1.65 hectares) – it should also be noted that a significant part of the site (1.02 hectares) is located within Flood Zone 3a. It is therefore sequentially less preferable than alternative sites within Swineshead. Furthermore, the Highway Authority has commented that the roads serving this site would not be suitable to accommodate the additional traffic and pedestrian movements that would be generated. The section of Bullen's Lane between the site and South St is narrow and there are no footways, & there is no highway land to widen the carriageway or provide footways. Bullen's Lane is

Officer Recommendation:

Site Swi030 - The SHLAA classifies site Swi030 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 Swi030 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Site Swi040 - The SHLAA classifies site Swi040 as being 'undevelopable', and consequently it was not put forward 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 Swi040 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

not be judged on this ground, as part of the SHLAA.

3 We note that the consultation report states that the site Swi 015 is within Flood Zone 1, however, we have been asked to advise that from a review of the Environment Agency map for planning, a good part of that site is in Flood Zone 2. See attached EA Map extract for Swineshead.

4 We note that the consultation report states that the site Swi 030 is within Flood Zone 3a, however, we have been asked to advise that from a review of the Environment Agency map for planning, it is predominantly in Flood Zone 2.

5 Similarly, the consultation report states that the site Swi 040 is within Flood Zone 2, however, we have been asked to advise that from a review of the Environment Agency map for planning it is predominantly in Flood Zone 1.

Additionally, we re-iterate the benefits of the sites Swi 030/040 above others selected as more suitable:

- a. The sites are closer to the village centre, than sites selected at the far north end of the village.
- B. Site Swi 030 is a small field with existing residential development to two sides. There are no bad neighbour uses.
- C. Site Swi 040 is adjacent to existing residential development to two sides. There are no bad neighbour uses. It can be served by roads linking it to South Street.
- D. There is a public footpath running along the whole length of Abbey Road, past the south boundary of the site Swi 030, is a defined footway link to the village
- e. Swi 030 is within very close walking distance of the school, thus avoiding the presence of additional traffic around the school area in Abbey Road.
- F. Swi 040 could be developed in such a way as to allow residents to avoid using vehicles to get to the school.

generally narrow and of a low constructional standard.

The development of the site would also be expected to increase the frequency of vehicle movements along the section of Bullen's Lane that links to the A52 which is not wide enough for two-way vehicle movements.

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

ID1: 229 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

Site Swi 037 Land at Swineshead

We write on behalf of our above named client, and have studied the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Public Consultation on Preferred sites for development (July 2016).

Overall, on behalf of our client, we very much support the identification of site Swi037, as a 'Preferred housing site' for the village, within the Housing Paper. As stated, it is close to the village centre, and is therefore accessible to Swineshead's existing services/facilities, and is located adjacent to Swineshead's built-up area. There are no nearby 'bad neighbour' uses, and the site has no intrinsic amenity value. We note that the Highway Authority comments that High Street is suitable for the formation of a new junction to serve this site, and there appears to be suitable junction visibility and there is an existing frontage footway.

Officer Comment:

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 Swi037 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.