

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

Post_title: 18: Gedney Hill

ID1: 263 **comment_author:** Longstaffs

comment_content:

We have studied the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Public Consultation on Preferred sites for development (July 2016), and would like to support the inclusion of the site Geh 017, as being one of the preferred sites in Gedney Hill. It is close to the centre of the village, and provides to form development to enclose the development of the village. It is a previously developed site and has road frontage to two boundaries, which would assist with a well designed development layout, with good access to roads, footpaths and local services. Overall, on behalf of our clients, we very much support the identification of site Geh 017, as a 'Preferred housing site' on the SELLP Inset Map for Gedney Hill.

Officer Comment:

In considering Geh015 elsewhere in this report it is considered that it more ably contributes towards a village sewerage works. The result of this is that the number of houses being provided is more than is being sort and therefore it is considered this site should be reduced to Geh004 and the housing numbers re-allocated to Geh015. In addition the SA suggests that Geh017 could have an adverse affect on the listed mill, although this impact could be prevented by careful design and layout, where as Geh015 has no impact. Geh004 is likely to have a negative effect on the mill, but it is a smaller site than Geh017.

Officer Recommendation:

It is considered that site Geh017 is not a suitable Potential Housing Site in Gedney Hill, and that it should be replaced with Geh004

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

ID1: 264 comment_author: Mr M Ryan

comment content:

SITE Geh015 - additional land for further residential housing development in Gedney Hill.

The proposed residential development boundary for Gedney Hill abuts this site to the north-east, south-east, and north-west (Geh003). Currently the site is farmed in conjunction with the proposed site to the north-east. This site is predominantly land-locked.

A comprehensive development scheme was proposed several years ago which included the site, with the main benefit for Gedney Hill would be for a public foul sewerage scheme would be needed to serve this centre village location.

Any additional residential units in Gedney Hill will help to sustain the remaining village facilities.

A pre-application enquiry has been put forward to South Holland District Council Planning Department.

This response to the Local Plan consultation is that the owner of the site is making the land available for development as a 'windfall' site to help satisfy the future housing needs for South Holland, if the adjacent proposed site is acceptable this parcel of land will make for a more comprehensive scheme in the centre of this rural village.

Officer Comment:

1. This site has the same Sustainability Appraisal score as the adjacent site, Geh003, which has been chosen as a 'Housing Site'. It has a narrow access to West Drove South but would be best developed with Geh003. The SHLAA identifies this site as undevelopable because considered in isolation, the site is unsuitable due to adverse environmental impacts. However, if it were developed in conjunction with site Geh003, these impacts would be overcome but the amount of housing would be more than is being sort.
2. Geh017 is an extension of Geh004. If Geh017 was reduced down to Geh004, to maintain frontage development, and Geh015 was allocated instead, the overall housing figure for Gedney Hill would be one less. Also the SA suggests that Geh017 could have an adverse affect on the listed mill, although this impact could be prevented by careful design and layout, where as Geh015 has no impact. Geh004 is likely to have a negative effect on the mill, but it is a smaller site than Geh017.
3. In addition the allocation of this site with Geh003 will either make connecting the combined site to an existing sewerage works easier or help provide a larger housing scheme that could, if suitable to Anglian Water's requirements, provide a sewerage scheme that could form the basis of a village sewerage works.
4. The County Archaeologist has advised on the adjacent site Geh003 that it is in a significant Iron Age Romano British landscape and further information may be required dependant on the development.

Officer Recommendation:

This site has the same Sustainability Score and flood zone and flood risk as Geh003 and therefore it is not possible to take a different view upon it. The reason it was not put forward in July was owing to it providing more dwellings than was being sort in Gedney Hill. This can be avoided if Geh017 is reduced in size to Geh004 and it is considered that this should be the approach. A combined site with Geh003 can help towards providing a village sewerage works. Therefore Geh015 should be selected as a Housing Allocation.

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

ID1: 265 comment_author: Christine Cave

comment content:

1. I own the proposed housing sites Geh006 and Geh007; and was the owner of Gedney Hill's Sycamore Farm from 1967 to late 2012. I would like to comment as follows on the 'South East Lincolnshire Local Plan: Housing Paper Gedney Hill, July 2016'.

2. Although the sites are designated as being in flood zones 2 and 3a respectively I would point out that: Sycamore Farm and its fields have never flooded in the 45 years I lived there.

South Holland District Council granted planning permission for the houses in Sycamore View, so were clearly satisfied on the flooding issue.

The council has since granted planning permission for several houses opposite Sycamore Farm on the east side of Station Road (B1166), so, again, must have been satisfied re the flooding issue.

3. Sites Geh006 and Geh007 can be easily accessed from Station Road via Sycamore View; space was specifically left when Sycamore View was created. The county council have adopted Sycamore View, and the junction with Station Road is suitably designed with excellent visibility in all directions. An earlier consultation, in January 2016, described both sites as having no connection with the public highway; this was incorrect. It also described the sites' capacity as totalling 27 dwellings. But a fewer number may be more practical. A few houses on these sites would fit in well with their surroundings and the established residential area of Sycamore View; not encroach further North West than the bungalow adjacent to Sycamore Farmhouse; and the development's scale

Officer Comment:

The sites that were shown in the January consultation have similar Sustainability Appraisal scores and the judgements to separate them for the July consultation are fine. Indeed some of the points that separate sites are soluble, such as bus stops. However, we are required to choose sites with the sequentially best flood risk. The chosen sites are in flood zone 1 and these two sites are in flood zone 2 and 3.

Officer Recommendation:

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 sites Geh006 and 007 should not be taken forward as a Housing Allocation.

would be in keeping with the village's role and function.

4. The immediate area to my two sites has a range of housing types/tenures, including Sycamore View and the social housing opposite Sycamore Farmhouse, and my sites' development would support this mix.

5. The Sycamore View houses have the benefit of a biotech system which has extra unused capacity. Sites Geh006 and Geh007 have substantial surface water drainage as they are alongside the Drainage Board Water Course and this would help to provide surface water runoff. This may well have to be the drain used by other suggested sites.

6. Development of the sites would not result in the loss of any trees whereas this looks likely to be the case with Geh003 and its 8 trees with preservation orders. Replacement or additional trees elsewhere would be no substitute for such long established trees.

7. Proximity to bus stops features in the Housing Paper as a criterion. H5.12 states that Geh006 is not as close to a bus stop as Geh004. Similarly 5.15 states that Geh007 is not as close to a bus stop as Geh004 and Geh017. However, this misses the point that buses in Gedney Hill can stop on request and not just at actual bus stops. In fact there are no actual bus stops, see 9 below!

8. Although the 49 bus between Sutton St Edmund and Spalding does not have a bus stop at the route's nearest point to Geh006/Geh007 the junction of Hillgate and Highstock Lane buses will stop there upon request; this is quite common practice on rural bus routes. This means the bus route is only one-eighth of a mile from

sites Geh006/Geh007.

9. Although Google Earth shows official bus stops, also, remarkably, the long gap between stops in the centre of the village where the shop is, there are no actual bus stop signs in Gedney Hill, just some bus shelters.

10. Furthermore the county council operates 'on demand' CallConnect bus services, see <http://www.lincsinterconnect.com/selectlocation.phtml> these cover Gedney Hill and again may pick up and set down people wherever convenient rather than just at actual bus stops. This also applies to school buses.

11. So the measure of proximity to a bus stop is flawed in this context, and should be proximity to a bus service. So, the conclusions (5.11.2, 5.14.3 and 5.15) on proximity to bus stops are very misleading, indeed are incorrect, and sites Geh006/Geh007 should be reappraised on this criterion.

12. In any case bus stops could always be created if demand to use buses increased. Thus if demand from sites Geh006 and/or Geh007 increased local bus use then stops could be sited at the Hillgate/Highstock Lane junction. Or, as there are no bus stops serving the one village shop, a pair of stops could easily be sited in Hillgate between the shop and Highstock Lane.

13. Finally sites Geh006/Geh007 are very central to the village's amenities and much nearer the village shop (a combined shop, bakers and post office), less than a quarter of a mile away, than Geh017, which is over half a mile away.

14. I do hope that you will take on board the above

comments as Geh006 and Geh007 already have their (county council approved) access point from Station Road plus street lighting in Sycamore View and a relatively small housing development here would fit in with the surrounding area, and be very convenient for buses and the village shop.

15. To sum up, Geh006 and Geh007:

- Have never flooded when I lived at Sycamore Farm 1967 2012. Furthermore, two planning applications for housing have been permitted nearby in the last 20 years.
 - Are close to a Drainage Board main drain.
 - Would 'fit in' with nearby housing, in contrast to much larger sites which might not complement the village's atmosphere.
 - Could be a significantly smaller development than Geh003 and Geh017, and so would not materially affect the village's total.
 - Benefit from a readymade, approved, safe, lit, council adopted junction with the B1166.
 - Are very convenient for the village shop.
 - Are very convenient for buses.
-

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

ID1: 266 comment_author: Mr R Congreve

comment content:

As owners we continue to confirm site Geh003 as being available. We currently have interested developers and will be moving forward to secure planning permissions. The previous comments are repeated for the location and the additional comments are noted. It is confirmed this site will be made available and it is hoped the site provides a mixture of needed housing while providing a visually attractive addition to this traditional village. It will continue to support the surrounding settlements.

Officer Comment:

The support is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

There are two options for providing a sewage works. The first is, following a successful Section 101A application, Anglian Water providing one for existing properties and this site connecting to the new sewerage works if it is constructed afterwards. This would not be before 2020 as the AW sewerage works scheme is fully committed until then. The second option is for this site to provide its own sewerage scheme, which if it is suitable for Anglian Water's requirements can be used as a basis for a scheme for the village. It is considered that site Geh003 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Gedney Hill, and that it should be taken forward as a Housing Allocation because it is centrally located within the village.

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

ID1: 267 comment_author: Environment Agency

comment content:

(Geh003 & Geh017)

Comment - we have concerns regarding the capacity to treat foul sewage within this settlement. We are aware that there are no mains drainage facilities under the jurisdiction of Anglian Water Services and that the District Council is the permit holder for 4 permitted discharges in the settlement. Based on the limited information we have available regarding these permit discharges, we believe that there is not sufficient capacity available to accommodate effluent from an additional 130 dwellings. The Council may need to upgrade some of the existing treatment plants and apply for variations of the current discharge permits. 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.

Officer Comment:

Geh003

1. The owner has been written to regarding the EA comments and has replied:

- Referring to the area of land in the new proposed plan of which I am a joint owner. We do realise the size of any proposed development would need a drainage system over and above anything currently available in the village. As a resident I rely on septic tank drainage as do many other home owners in the village. It is taken that this would not be acceptable for the number of homes suggested to our area of land. At this time we do not have a firm developer on board but rest assured we would make any interested parties aware of the concerns from Environment Agency and Anglian Water. It may be as plans progress there could be a link up with the suggested Millfield development for a project to serve both areas plus some of the existing village centre properties. If the recent application on Highstock Lane is successful it may change any future plans that we or Millfield are able to progress. Similarly the Highstock Lane project could be a link to assist the village centre also.

- Anglian Water have advised:

- o a public sewer can be requested under Section 101A of the Water Industry Act (WIA) 1991 where an existing domestic sewerage system (which is not connected to the public sewer) is creating problems affecting the environment or amenity and the provision of a public sewer is the most suitable solution. Where this is the case Anglian Water would bear the costs of installation. Please be aware that successful applications are put into our first time sewerage programme which is now full for our 2015-2020 funding period, so public sewerage

Officer Recommendation:

Geh003

There are two options for providing a sewage works. The first is, following a successful Section 101A application, Anglian Water providing one for existing properties and this site connecting to the new sewerage works if it is constructed afterwards. This would not be before 2020 as the AW sewerage works scheme is fully committed until then. The second option is for this site to provide its own sewerage scheme, which if it is suitable for Anglian Water's requirements can be used as a basis for a scheme for the village. It is considered that site Geh003 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Gedney Hill, and that it should be taken forward as a Housing Allocation because it is centrally located within the village.

Geh017

It is considered that site Geh017 is not a suitable Potential Housing Site in Gedney Hill, and that it should be replaced with Geh004.

should not be anticipated in the short term.

On South Holland District Council and/or residents can make a S101a application for existing properties if there is an environmental issue with the private system discharge. However for new infrastructure to be provided by Anglian Water as set above it would require an application to be approved. As set above where this to be the case any infrastructure would be delivered outside of the current funding period.

The alternative is for the landowner/developer to develop a private network and treatment facility and solely for the new development. Where infrastructure is provided by a developer they can apply to Anglian Water to adopt the infrastructure provided in accordance with the requirements of the WIA 1991. We would only consider the adoption of any infrastructure if it met our adoptable standards.

- The Environment Agency has also suggested SHDC submit a Section 101A application owing to ongoing issues with sewerage treatment plants serving council housing. This has being put to SHDC who agree to enable the community to grow a Section 101A public sewer application would be desirable.

- The County Archaeologist has advised the site is in a significant Iron Age Romano British landscape and further information may be required dependant on the development.

Geh017

In considering Geh015 elsewhere in this report it is considered that it more ably contributes towards a village sewerage works. The result of this is that the number of houses being provided is more than is being sort and therefore it is considered this site should be reduced to Geh004 and the housing numbers re-allocated to Geh015. In addition the SA suggests that

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

Geh017 could have an adverse affect on the listed mill, although this impact could be prevented by careful design and layout, where as Geh015 has no impact. Geh004 is likely to have a negative effect on the mill, but it is a smaller site than Geh017.

ID1:	268	comment_author:	Anglian Water	
comment_content:	Officer Comment:			Officer Recommendation:
All of the proposed housing allocations in this area are expected to require improvements to the existing water supply network to enable development to come forward on these sites. Please refer to the enclosed spreadsheet for detailed comments relating to these sites.		The comments are noted and have been placed in the Housing Paper so developers and residents are aware of the issues.		No change to the approach is required.

ID1:	269	comment_author:	Longstaffs	
comment_content:	Officer Comment:			Officer Recommendation:
Site Geh 005, Land at Gedney Hill We note from the Housing Paper that site Geh 005 has not been selected as a 'Preferred housing site', on Flood Risk and locational grounds. We wish to now advise that the site has had developer interest for some time and a planning application is in the course of submission. We consider that the site should be included in the Local Plan as a 'Preferred site', to provide for choice, and to allow for small developer type developments to be carried out.		This site was rejected owing to it being one of the worst sites for flood risk, being on flood zone 3a, and also being further from a bus stop than other sites, although this issue is disputed by another site owner below. If an application is submitted it will be considered against current and emerging planning policy.		The site is more peripheral than other sites and should not be a Housing Allocation.