

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Preferred Options Consultation May 2013

**Chapter\_Name:** 08 Environment

**Response\_Number:** 31

**Persons\_Name:** Paul Tame

**Representing\_Who?:** NFU

**Respondents\_Comments:**

**Officer\_Response:**

**Officer\_Recommendation:**

We support Option A to produce a policy approach that supports renewable and low carbon energy development. The UK must meet the EU's Renewables Directive target of 15% of energy being from renewable resources by 2020. Currently the UK has 4% of its energy from Renewables. Without a surge in Renewables we have no hope of meeting this statutory requirement, signed up and entered into by the previous Government.

On page 209 we hope that the policy to reduce travel will not adversely impact on new development to help the rural economy and agriculture, and agree with the support for Renewables later on in the policy in paragraph 8.30.2. Farming can provide many renewable sources of energy in a sustainable manner and has too often been hampered by overly restrictive planning policies.

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	72	Persons_Name:	Natural England	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Natural England supports Option A which aims to produce a policy approach that seeks to protect and, where possible, enhance the natural environment. We consider that this will provide the opportunity to be more locally focussed on the protection of the natural environment rather than Option B which would rely only on the NPPF. In particular it will offer opportunities to enhance local green infrastructure networks.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	73	Persons_Name:	Natural England	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Natural England supports Option A and considers that this is a positive approach to this topic.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

74

Persons\_Name:

Natural England

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Natural England supports Option A as it provides an opportunity to promote locally derived design which will assist in encouraging local distinctiveness

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	75	Persons_Name:	Natural England	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>Preferred Policy Approach - Environment</p> <p>Natural England welcomes this policy and considers that it plans positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of biodiversity. We would suggest however that the policy could be strengthened in the following ways:</p> <p>By incorporating in the first sentence of the policy the aim of overall net gain of biodiversity. This would reflect the advice set out in paragraph 9 of the NPPF of “Moving from a net loss of biodiversity to achieving net gains for nature.”</p> <p>The policy would also benefit from the inclusion of an additional point on ecological networks. This would again reflect the advice set out in NPPF (paragraph 109) “contributing to the Government’s commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures”.</p> <p>We would suggest that landscape character is given a greater emphasis in the policy wording as at present it is only concerned in the context of historic landscape. Ideally the policy should aim to protect and enhance local landscape character and to follow the advice set out in the Boston and South Holland Landscape Character Assessments.</p> <p>Whilst we welcome the inclusion of Green Infrastructure (GI) within this policy we would suggest that either there is more detailed wording within this policy or that there is a separate policy on this topic. We promote the idea that GI should be provided as an integral part of all new development, alongside other infrastructure such as utilities and transport networks and we consider that there should be policy wording that achieves this in order to provide a wide range of benefits for people and the natural environment together. We would suggest that there should be policy</p>	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>		

wording which establishes that development should not be permitted that may result in the loss or harm to existing GI.

The Policy wording should also encourage new improved GI where:

it is consistent with the Wash and Fens Green Infrastructure Plan;

provides increased public access for quiet recreation including provision for biodiversity;

achieves Natural England's Accessible Natural Green space Standards (ANGSt) which will improve accessibility, naturalness and connectivity of green spaces.

For your information we include the most recent wording of the ANGSt standard:

No person should live more than 300m from their nearest area of accessible natural green space of at least 2ha in size;

There should be at least one 20ha accessible natural green space within 2km from home;

There should be one 100ha accessible green space site within 5km;

There should be one 500ha accessible natural green space site within 10km;

At least 1ha of statutory Local Nature reserve should be provided per 1000 population.

Response_Number:	76	Persons_Name:	Natural England	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Preferred Policy Approach to Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Natural England generally supports this policy and particularly welcomes the provision for measures which will promote and enhance the resilience of ecosystems and biodiversity networks within and beyond the site. We also welcome the provision to prevent impact on local landscapes by renewable energy installations.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	77	Persons_Name:	Natural England	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Preferred Policy Approach to Design of Development Natural England supports this policy particularly the point that encourages the use of landscaping and the enhancement of biodiversity and green infrastructure.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	145	Persons_Name:	Mr J S Birkett	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>It is noted that that renewable energy plant is to be allowed where there is no adverse impact on, 'the surrounding landscape, skyline or built environment.' The problem is of course that there is no objective way of measuring such impact. One person will see appalling visual intrusion, despoiling the countryside; where another will see a thing of beauty, helping to save the planet. Best of luck with that one!</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>				

---

Response_Number:	177	Persons_Name:	Angela Atkinson	Representing_Who?:	Marine Management Organisation
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Within the environment policies there is no reference to coastal/marine protected areas (MPA's) although these are important along this stretch of coast e.g. The Wash RAMSAR site and SSSI. It is possible that development on-shore in such a tidal area as South East Lincs could affect the quality of the marine area. We would therefore suggest that consideration be given to including reference to MPAs within this part of the Plan.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>				

---

Response_Number:	178	Persons_Name:	Angela Atkinson	Representing_Who?:	Marine Management Organisation
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
There are references to both Carbon Capture and Storage and infrastructure for renewable energy in supporting text, however it is unclear whether offshore renewable energy will be considered by the local authorities involved, and provisions made on-land for these. We would suggest reference be made to the Marine Policy Statement within the climate change policy as there is a large amount of policy direction given in this national document with relation to renewable energy	The reference to Carbon Capture and Storage and infrastructure for energy is made in the "Housing Growth and Flood Risk" chapter in table 4.2 which relates to flood risk vulnerability classification. We can only consider the onshore elements of an offshore renewable energy scheme. The Climate Change and Renewable & Low Carbon Energy Policy will cover such proposals and the justification for the policy will refer to national documents such as the NPPF, the Marine Policy Statement and the National Planning Statements.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		
	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.				

Response_Number:	221	Persons_Name:	Elizabeth Biott	Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
It should be noted that the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Partnership is now the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership so it might be more appropriate to say 'The BAP was produced by the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Partnership (now the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership) and seeks to improve a series of habitats and species which are locally important.'	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).		
	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.				



Response_Number:	222	Persons_Name:	Elizabeth Biott	Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust does not agree that Option B for the natural environment, outlined in paragraph 8.6.4, is a reasonable option. We feel that Option B to not produce a policy approach to the natural environment but to rely on national guidance in the NPPF is an unreasonable approach because the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged.</li> <li>•Set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>The NPPF also states that planning policies should promote the preservation, restoration and re-creation of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species populations, linked to national and local targets, and identify suitable indicators for monitoring biodiversity in the plan.</p> <p>Clearly, from the statements made in the NPPF in relation to the natural environment it would not be a reasonable option to rely on guidance in the NPPF alone. Given that we do not agree with Option B the Trust strongly supports the decision to choose Option A as the preferred option.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is accepted that option B should be considered as an unreasonable option.</p>		<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>		

Response\_Number: 223

Persons\_Name: Elizabeth Biott

Representing\_Who?: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Respondents\_Comments:

The focus of this policy should be on the protection of the environment and ensuring that development does not adversely impact on the environment. The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust would not consider it appropriate therefore for this policy to encourage development. However, the Trust considers that the policy approach strikes an appropriate balance between protecting the environment and indicating when development proposals would be acceptable.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number: 224

Persons\_Name: Elizabeth Biott

Representing\_Who?: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Respondents\_Comments:

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the Council's commitment to adopt an approach that protects biodiversity and maximises opportunities for the restoration, enhancement and connection of natural habitats and green infrastructure networks. It is vitally important that habitats are not only protected but also enhanced and that efforts are made to restore habitats to buffer, extend and link existing habitats across the landscape in line with the aspirations of the Natural Environment White Paper. In addition to legally protected species those species listed on the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 Section 41 list as species of principal importance should also be safeguarded.

Existing designated sites of nature conservation and geological interest such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites and Local Geological Sites should be protected and enhanced. The National Planning Policy Framework states that 'Local planning authorities should set criteria based policies against which proposals for any development on or affecting protected wildlife or geodiversity sites or landscape areas will be judged' (paragraph 113). We would recommend that sites that are found to meet Local Wildlife Site criteria following an ecological survey or habitats of principal importance (Section 41, NERC Act 2006) should also be protected from development.

Sites of nature conservation interest and other areas of natural green space should be buffered, extended and linked across the landscape to enable species and habitats to adapt to climate change. As previously mentioned under Question 15, enlarging and linking habitats to reduce fragmentation is important to

Officer\_Response:

These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

provide habitats and species the opportunity to migrate across the landscape in the face of climate change. This is the basis of the Living Landscapes approach advocated by the Wildlife Trusts. A Living Landscapes scheme in South East Lincolnshire is the South Lincolnshire Fenlands ([www.lincsfenlands.org.uk](http://www.lincsfenlands.org.uk)). The South Lincolnshire Fenlands Partnership aims to restore and re-create up to 800 hectares of Lincolnshire's lost wild fenlands between Bourne and Market Deeping. This Living Landscape scheme therefore occurs within both South East Lincolnshire and South Kesteven. The Fens for the Future Partnership aims to make the Fens one of the main UK landscape-scale wetland complexes by 2020, within a matrix of sustainable agriculture. A Fens for the Future report published in June 2012 outlines a strategic plan for Fenland and can be downloaded from the South Lincolnshire Fenlands website. The Fens for the Future Partnership is working with the Fens Waterways Link Project to increase and diversify the Fenland economy through the recreation and tourism sectors.

Paragraph 114 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that Local Planning Authorities should "set out a strategic approach in their Local Plans, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure". To minimise impacts on biodiversity and geodiversity paragraph 117 of the NPPF states that planning policies should "plan for biodiversity at a landscape-scale across local authority boundaries". In the Natural Environment White Paper the Government set out its vision for Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs). NIAs are large areas that will deliver a step change in nature conservation by taking a landscape scale approach. They should be created wherever the opportunities or benefits are greatest.

The Government has set out a role for Local Nature Partnerships (LNP) to help establish new, locally determined NIAs. However, it will be for Local Planning Authorities to decide how to recognise an NIA in their Local Plan. Where NIAs are established we would wish to see these included in, and supported by, the Local Plan. Defra published criteria in September 2012 to help Local Authorities, LNPs and others to apply to help identify NIAs. The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust would welcome the opportunity to participate in this process.

---

Response\_Number: 225

Persons\_Name: Elizabeth Biott

Representing\_Who?: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer\_Recommendation:

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the considerations given in the first part of this policy, in particular the requirement for the incorporation of measures which promote and enhance the resilience of ecosystems and biodiversity networks within and beyond the site. Enlarging and linking habitats through the protection and provision of green infrastructure is important to reduce fragmentation and therefore provide habitats and species the opportunity to migrate across the landscape in the face of climate change. Climate change is a serious threat to biodiversity and therefore careful attention must be paid to planning for climate change. Wildlife and local ecosystems will be placed under greater pressure and strategies should be put in place to allow adaptation. Green corridors and large scale habitat recreation will become increasingly important to allow space for species and habitats to migrate in response to the stresses caused by climate change. This will require action to buffer, extend and link areas of existing value for wildlife across the landscape. This is the basis of the Living Landscapes approach advocated nationally by the Wildlife Trusts.

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the requirement for proposals to demonstrate the efficient use of water and to incorporate Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). Certain elements of SUDS such as ponds can benefit both people and biodiversity by reducing the risk of flooding and providing a wildlife resource contributing to green infrastructure, providing they are designed with this in mind at the outset.

Response\_Number:

226

Persons\_Name:

Elizabeth Biott

Representing\_Who?:

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Respondents\_Comments:

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the requirement that developments should only be permitted if they would not have significant adverse impacts on nature conservation considerations. As with any development renewable energy developments should be sited in appropriate locations to ensure that they do not have adverse impacts on protected or important habitats or species.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number: 227

Persons\_Name: Elizabeth Biott

Representing\_Who?: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Respondents\_Comments:

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the need for development to demonstrate how it would enhance biodiversity and green infrastructure. New developments should seek to enhance the biodiversity of the area and provide a network of natural green space within the green infrastructure of the site. We would recommend that wildlife is 'designed in' to developments from an early stage. Wildlife enhancements should contribute to targets in the UK and Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plans and developers should seek to produce a net gain in biodiversity. It is important that natural green space is available for both people and wildlife. Sufficient natural green space should be accessible to residents to meet Natural England's Accessible Natural Green space Standards.

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust would recommend that housing developments should be required to meet Level 6 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Whilst the Trust welcomes the promotion of energy efficient housing to help reduce carbon emissions it should be noted that these developments provide fewer opportunities for wildlife such as bats and nesting birds (e.g. swifts). This is due to roof spaces being made airtight and therefore inaccessible for roosting or nesting. It is therefore important to proactively include features for these species within developments from the design stages. We would therefore recommend that the Councils require developers to incorporate features for bats and birds in new buildings.

Officer\_Response:

The requirement for development to exceed current Building Regulation standards has not been considered through the Preferred Options Document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.



Response_Number:	230	Persons_Name:	Elizabeth Biott	Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
In section 8.2 Evidence Base for the environment we would recommend that there is reference to the Local Wildlife Sites that have been designated in South East Lincolnshire and the LWS survey work that has taken place within Boston Borough and South Holland over the last few years to develop a sound evidence base.	Notwithstanding the lack of reference to LWS in the evidence base these areas have been taken into consideration in preparing the Environment chapter.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response_Number:	266	Persons_Name:	Mr R Smith	Representing_Who?:	Pedals
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
We agree that there is a need for guidance on the lines set out, but with changes as explained in our answer to Question 70.	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).		

---

Response_Number:	267	Persons_Name:	Mr R Smith	Representing_Who?:	Pedals
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Comment 1		These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).	
<p>The list of considerations to be demonstrated in development proposals is comprehensive. However not all the items in the list will be applicable to each and every development proposal. The consideration "accessibility by a choice of travel modes ... .." concludes with the words "where appropriate", implying that it is of less importance than the other considerations, to which the words "where appropriate" have not been added.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>			
<p>Either the words "where appropriate" should be added to each item in the list of considerations or, preferably, they should be omitted from the one item where they appear.</p>					
Comment 2					
<p>A further consideration should be added to the list, namely</p>					
<p>" • the provision of facilities for the storage and parking of bicycles"</p>					
<p>We refer you to the advice note agreed by officers of South Holland District Council and Lincolnshire County Council which we submitted as Document 3 with our letter dated 22 April 2012 addressed to Mr Christopher Holliday. The contents of that document deserve to be reflected in this part of the Strategy and Policies DPD.</p>					

Response_Number:	304	Persons_Name:	Phillip Greswell	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>CLIMATE CHANGE will become a major issue as well as security of resources to keep the lights on. I think everywhere that alternative technologies must be encouraged and a document as to how this might be achieved should be produced.</p> <p>THE LOCALISM ACT. Local people must be involved because Economy and Climate Change issues affect them and they are the ones that can make things happen if given the opportunity.</p> <p>Subject to the question of security, communities should be encouraged and assisted with the development of solar panel farms. Also give support to communities to retain their local services.</p>	Officer_Response:	Comments noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	307	Persons_Name:	Phillip Greswell	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>There should be much more tree cover and a move to a more wooded landscape to help combat climate change, such as very wet or very hot periods predicted. And timber or wood produced which could be managed and burnt, through old methods such as coppicing, pollarding and so on. If this were done, wood burning stoves would seem an option worth considering rather than relying solely on gas for our electricity to heat the home and supplementing oil for central heating and so on.</p>	Officer_Response:	These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Planting trees does not require planning permission and there are examples of new planting in Boston Borough and South Holland District. The Environment policy supports proposals where the principal objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity. This will help the ecosystem become more resilient to climate change and in the case of more woodland will help ameliorate temperatures.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	449	Persons_Name:	Mr A Hammersley	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>I feel that the intention in clause 8.4.2 is a retrograde step in the Environmental protection afforded to the citizens covered by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. (SELP) I also feel that it is not conducive to the Government's view as outlined in the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF 2012) Under clause 154 of the NPPF 2012 the Government states: "Local Plans should set out the opportunities and clear policies of what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide indication of how decision maker should react to a Development Proposal should be included in the plan".</p>	<p>These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>		
<p>The current South Holland District Council Local Plan has such a policy namely clause SG13-Pollution and Contamination, This policy states that: Planning permission will only be permitted for development proposals which:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 Do not cause unacceptable levels of pollution of the surrounding area by noise, light, toxic or offensive odour, airborne pollutants, or by the release of waste products;</li> <li>2 provide, as necessary, appropriate treatment of land to clean up pollution and contamination.</li> </ol> <p>I recommend that the SHDC Local Plan clause SG13 should be retained and strengthened with the addition of the words 'and any residential property' inserted after the word 'area' and that the definition of pollution should be upgraded as Annex 2 Glossary NPPF 2012.</p>					
<p>I would like this recommendation adopted as I feel that the protection against pollution and contamination offered in the SELP plan is inadequate as it now stands.</p>					

Response_Number:	570	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	571	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The balance is acceptable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

---

Response_Number:	572	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	573	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
It is agreed that it is appropriate to include a policy relating to climate change.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	574	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The considerations are satisfactory.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	575	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	576	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach set out is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	577	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
<p>There is a need to define the factors in the policy, but the sentence "Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness" is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>All schemes are required to demonstrate how they reflect local distinctiveness and it is not clear why contemporary design is singled out for special attention, particularly where such design is not always associated with reflecting local character.</p>		<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>	

---



Response_Number:	578	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:	The sentence "Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness" should be deleted.	Officer_Response:	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).
Response_Number:	623	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is supported.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	624	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The balance is acceptable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	625	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	626	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
It is agreed that it is appropriate to include a policy relating to climate change.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	627	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The considerations are satisfactory.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	628	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	629	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach set out is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	630	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:	<p>There is a need to define the factors in the policy, but the sentence “Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness” is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>All schemes are required to demonstrate how they reflect local distinctiveness and it is not clear why contemporary design is singled out for special attention, particularly where such design is not always associated with reflecting local character.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>

Response_Number:	631	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:	<p>The sentence “Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness” should be deleted.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>

Response\_Number:

676

Persons\_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

I am broadly in agreement with this section. Option A is appropriate.

Views of Boston Stump should be protected at all times and the open character of the Fens retained.

Development should be designed to complement the unique local identity of the area.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	702	Persons_Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge	Representing_Who?:	English Heritage
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>We agree with paragraphs 8.12.1 and 8.12.2 that the Local Plan should actively seek to protect the historic environment. Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: “local planning authorities should set out in their Local Plan a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment”. The NPPF also states that local plans should include strategic policies to deliver the protection and enhancement of the historic environment (paragraph 156) and should identify land where development is inappropriate because of its environmental or historic significance (paragraph 157). The Local Plan as a whole should be able to demonstrate that it sets out a positive strategy for the historic environment. This means that, on balance, the Plan has a positive effect on the historic environment and heritage assets. Different sections of the Plan should form part of the overall positive strategy, such as proposals for housing or employment development. Our comments relating to town centres (see above) argue for a greater strategic approach to regeneration that should contribute to the positive strategy. Policies throughout the document should help deliver the conservation of the historic environment with appropriate references where necessary.</p>	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>		

Response\_Number: 703

Persons\_Name: Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?: English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer\_Recommendation:

We welcome a policy that contains specific references to the historic environment. However, the current wording (i.e. The bottom three paragraphs on page 207) take a rather generic approach and do not in themselves constitute a positive strategy to the historic environment. The wording also focuses mainly on built heritage matters, with little reference to archaeology or historic parks, gardens and landscapes. There is only reference to proposals not impacting on “historic or architectural interest” (final sentence of first heritage paragraph), which does not pick up on archaeological interest, or the concepts of significance and harm (see NPPF, including the glossary). The 1996 Boston Local Plan identified zones of archaeological potential, which were repeated in the 2006 Interim Plan (it does not appear that the 2006 South Holland Local Plan had such zones). The loss of such zones, if this is the preferred approach, would need proper justification, but may not be something we can support. On a related note, we are concerned about the loss of saved policies relating to the historic environment. Paragraph 1.6.1 states that a number will be superseded by the Strategy and Policies DPD, but it is not clear which ones will be lost. There are a number of saved policies in the 1996 Boston Local Plan that are relevant to the historic environment, including Policies C7 (development of sites adjacent to River Witham), C8 (Stump views) and C13-C15 (relating to Wormgate). In the 2006 South Holland Local Plan, relevant saved policies including EN11 (security shutters) and EC14 (land rear of White Hart, Spalding). It may be the case that the final draft of the Strategy and Policies DPD will contain adequate replacements for these saved policies, with the Wormgate policies forming the basis for a more strategic approach to Boston town centre as advocated in our response to Q56 above. However, if this is not

These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).



the case, we would expect policies to be retained for the Site Allocation DPD or their deletion clearly justified.

---

Response\_Number: 704

Persons\_Name: Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?: English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer\_Recommendation:

We encourage the Local Plan, including the Strategy and Policies DPD, to take a more locally specific approach to the historic environment, with a positive strategy that reflects the heritage assets within South East Lincolnshire. This could include the identification of features and characteristics that are distinctive within the plan area and recognition of key assets within the policy and supporting text. There should be greater reference to archaeology within the policy and the councils' should consider whether zones of archaeological potential should be identified across South East Lincolnshire (using the advice of the councils' archaeological advisers). The policy should also make reference to the full range of undesignated heritage assets (not just unlisted buildings), which would include archaeology as well as historic parks and landscapes. Separating the Environment policy into separate policies on the natural environment and historic environment might be advantageous to avoid an overly long policy and to demonstrate that each topic matters in its own right. The policy and supporting text could also set out a more explicit strategy for the historic environment that is positive and proactive as required by the NPPF (paragraph 126). Such a strategy could include the following (and also form part of a future SPD):

- to maintain an up to date (e.g. Within the last 5 years) set of conservation area appraisals,
- to review other areas for potential conservation area designation,
- to consider removal of permitted development rights for conservation areas
- to address heritage assets currently on the national and county Heritage at Risk registers,
- to administer grant aid to enhance the historic environment (e.g. Through public realm and/or shop

These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

front improvements; South East Lincolnshire already has a good record on this, and future opportunities should continue to be pursued).

- to introduce and maintain a local list of buildings, parks, gardens and other heritage assets

- to carry out historic characterisation work within the plan area to inform planning allocations and decisions

An up to date evidence base on the historic environment is a requirement of the NPPF (paragraph 169) and will help with the formulation of policies and a positive strategy. The South East Lincolnshire area already benefits from a number of existing sources of evidence, including the Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record, the Lincolnshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project, as well as the Boston Town and Rural Historic Environment Baseline Studies (the latter are not mentioned in the evidence base on the South East Lincolnshire website). There are also conservation area appraisals for some of South East Lincolnshire's conservation areas. It should also be noted that English Heritage have commenced work on an Informed Conservation book on the town of Boston, in recognition of its outstanding historic environment. This book, which should be published later in 2014, will provide greater detail on what makes Boston distinctive and should be of assistance with the plan and decision-making process.

---

Response_Number:	705	Persons_Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge	Representing_Who?:	English Heritage
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>We welcome the references to the historic environment in the list of bullet points, although query what is meant by “no significant adverse impact” in the preceding paragraph. This suggests that adverse impacts that are less than significant will always been acceptable, which may not be consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Paragraphs 132 to 134 of the NPPF argues that substantial harm should be outweighed by substantial public benefits, and even less than substantial harm should be weighed against public benefits. We welcome the reference to the visual dominance of St Botolph’s Church tower in the final bullet point, although it is dominant over the skyline of the wider countryside and not just Boston. Furthermore, whilst St Botolph’s is the most dominant church tower or spire, there are many other churches in South East Lincolnshire whose tower or spire form a dominant feature in the surrounding landscape. Retaining this dominance should be a requirement for all types of development, not just those associated with renewable energy, and it may be more appropriate to state this requirement in the (historic) environment policy (which would help with the positive and locally distinctive strategy for the historic environment).</p>	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>		

Response_Number:	706	Persons_Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge	Representing_Who?:	English Heritage
Respondents_Comments:	The final bullet point should be reworded as follows (and potentially moved into the Environment policy): “maintaining the visual dominance of St Botolph's and other church towers and spires over skyline of the surrounding landscape”	Officer_Response:	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

---

Response_Number:	707	Persons_Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge	Representing_Who?:	English Heritage
Respondents_Comments:	preferred policy approach ‘Design of New Development’? We broadly support the wording used in the draft policy, which contains a number of historic environment references. Some of the bullet points are not clear in terms of what development proposals are expected to do. The fifth bullet point, for example, is clear in terms of “respecting the density, scale etc”, but the third (regarding the reuse of historic buildings), seventh (treatment of facades etc) and tenth (the use of landmarks and views) are not clear. Simply inserting “(the) appropriate” in front of each of these bullet points would make clear that proposals have to safeguarding the existing built and historic environment. In the fourth bullet point, the phrase “built heritage” could be replaced with “heritage assets” to be more inclusive of all asset types.	Officer_Response:	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

---

---

Response_Number:	788	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	789	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The balance is acceptable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

---

Response_Number:	790	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	791	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
It is agreed that it is appropriate to include a policy relating to climate change.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	792	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The considerations are satisfactory.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	793	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---



Response_Number:	794	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach set out is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	795	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
<p>There is a need to define the factors in the policy, but the sentence "Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness" is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>All schemes are required to demonstrate how they reflect local distinctiveness and it is not clear why contemporary design is singled out for special attention, particularly where such design is not always associated with reflecting local character.</p>		<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>	

---

Response_Number:	796	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	The sentence "Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness" should be deleted.	Officer_Response:	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

Response_Number:	841	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is supported.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	842	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The balance is acceptable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	843	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	844	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
It is agreed that it is appropriate to include a policy relating to climate change.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	845	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The considerations are satisfactory.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	846	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	847	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach set out is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	848	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	<p>There is a need to define the factors in the policy, but the sentence “Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness” is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>All schemes are required to demonstrate how they reflect local distinctiveness and it is not clear why contemporary design is singled out for special attention, particularly where such design is not always associated with reflecting local character.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>

Response_Number:	849	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	<p>The sentence “Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness” should be deleted.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>

Response_Number:	898	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	899	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The balance is acceptable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	900	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	901	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
It is agreed that it is appropriate to include a policy relating to climate change.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---



Response_Number:	902	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The considerations are satisfactory.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	903	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	904	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach set out is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	905	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
<p>There is a need to define the factors in the policy, but the sentence "Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness" is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>All schemes are required to demonstrate how they reflect local distinctiveness and it is not clear why contemporary design is singled out for special attention, particularly where such design is not always associated with reflecting local character.</p>		<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>	

---

Response_Number:	906	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:	The sentence "Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness" should be deleted.	Officer_Response:	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).
Response_Number:	957	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is supported.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	958	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The balance is acceptable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	959	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	960	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:	It is agreed that it is appropriate to include a policy relating to climate change.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	961	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:	The considerations are satisfactory.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

---

Response_Number:	962	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	963	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach set out is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	964	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:	<p>There is a need to define the factors in the policy, but the sentence “Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness” is unnecessary and unwarranted.</p> <p>All schemes are required to demonstrate how they reflect local distinctiveness and it is not clear why contemporary design is singled out for special attention, particularly where such design is not always associated with reflecting local character.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>

Response_Number:	965	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:	<p>The sentence “Encouragement will be given to contemporary design that reflects local distinctiveness” should be deleted.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. There are local examples of buildings that make a distinctive contribution to the attractiveness of town centres that do not reflect local architecture, e.g. Kingstons Corner and Elsom House in Spalding. The sentence should be retained but "that reflects local distinctiveness" could be deleted.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>

Response_Number:	1012	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1013	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The balance is acceptable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---



---

Response_Number:	1014	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1015	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
It is agreed that it is appropriate to include a policy relating to climate change.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1016	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The considerations are satisfactory.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1017	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1071	Persons_Name:	Jenny Young	Representing_Who?:	Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire
Respondents_Comments:	Section 8.11 - undesignated archaeological remains and buildings of local interest recorded on the Historic Environment record are not referred to. When reading the sections it is not clearly defined that there is the presence of designated and undesignated remains.	Officer_Response:	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

---

Response_Number:	1136	Persons_Name:	Anne Casey	Representing_Who?:	RSPB
Respondents_Comments:	The RSPB's interest in this consultation is protection of designated sites, especially those of The Wash Special Protection Area, the protection, creation and enhancement of linkages across the landscape for wildlife and the protection of specific sites as well as the connection of both local communities and visitors to The Wash.  The Lawton Making Space for Nature report focussed on stepping stones, linkages and buffers to increase wildlife habitat and movement. Linkages have been highlighted in the Plan; however stepping stones and buffers on developments and corridors within developments to increase connectivity have not been addressed. In addition the question of how these linkages and corridors connect to adjacent areas has not been addressed.  Newly created urban areas should aim to be permeable to wildlife and provide nesting and feeding habitat for those animals that may live there.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

---

Response_Number:	1141	Persons_Name:	Anne Casey	Representing_Who?:	RSPB
Respondents_Comments:	8.10.1 Natural Environment The RSPB supports a local policy approach that takes account of the protection of designated sites and other reserves, such as the RSPB's reserves at Frampton and Freiston, which protect habitat and manage for climate change. We recommend that there is much more emphasis on the green infrastructure network that will assist wildlife but also connect people and nature. The RSPB would also like to see more of an emphasis on connecting both local communities and visitors to the Wash. The RSPB strongly suggests that there needs to be a Green Infrastructure Plan developed for the Plan area.	Officer_Response:	These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically the preferred policy approach to the 'Environment'. "The Wash and Fens Green Infrastructure Plan" has been taken into account in the Environment chapter.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1152	Persons_Name:	Louise McGuiness	Representing_Who?:	Herself & Spalding & Peterborough T
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Questions 61,62,63 The above proposal for the area contradicts these questions (the RFI), Spalding is historically known as a Market Town well known for the food industry Agricultural and Horticultural activities. We already have an industrial site to the east of the town. Coming from Boston Spalding looks like a place you would not want to stop at let alone live or work thanks to SHDC and the planning officers. The Council has not dealt with existing issues such as Smell from the abattoir, sewerage plant and illegal caravan sites in DSN. What faith do we have when we know if a planning application comes forward SHDC will accept regardless of any other policies it will conflict with or consultation responses.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1153	Persons_Name:	Louise McGuiness	Representing_Who?:	Herself & Spalding & Peterborough T
Respondents_Comments:	<p>In response to Q64, 65, 66, 67</p> <p>The re opening of Littleworth would contribute to this target for both SHDC and Peterborough yet it has been DROPPED from the local plan? Nor has there been any joint consultation with Peterborough. Please see attached feasibility study to support and answer this question in full.</p> <p>Wind Turbines are not effective in this area and are not working in most part. They are suitable to off shore not flat fen land. Our MP does not support Wind Turbines and made his views very clear when Minister. It is a shame the recent supposed land mark case was settled out of court which could have put an end to these.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>The consideration of a policy dedicated to the re-opening of Littleworth Station is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be dealt with accordingly in the next stage of the plan-making process. Paragraph 97 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to have policies that seek to maximise renewable and low carbon energy development while addressing adverse impacts.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.</p>

Response\_Number: 1262

Persons\_Name: Ms A Hewitson

Representing\_Who?: Environment Agency

Respondents\_Comments:

Q61 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 8.5 – 8.16 under Approach to the Natural Environment and Approach to the Historic Environment in the full consultation document? Please explain your view.

The issue of regeneration does not appear to feature in any of the Policy Approaches and we request that this issue, which we believe to be quite significant to areas of Boston town, is given further consideration. Having a strategic approach to promote the reuse of previously developed land, and secure remediation of contamination through the planning process, would be beneficial. We would also advocate the benefit of regenerating residential areas that are at risk of flooding with new flood resilient housing at a lower density, and with high quality green spaces that can also be multi functional providing amenity value, biodiversity and surface water management.

Officer\_Response:

The consideration of a policy dedicated to regeneration is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response\_Number: 1263

Persons\_Name: Ms A Hewitson

Representing\_Who?: Environment Agency

Respondents\_Comments:

Q63 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest?

We support the policy approach to the environment, which seeks to protect the natural environment and secure enhancements where possible. To assist you with supporting text for the policy we would suggest the inclusion of the following paragraphs for the Local Plan:

All new development must take into account the potential environmental impacts on people, buildings, land, air and water arising from the development itself and any former use of the site, including, in particular, adverse effects arising from pollution.

Land affected by contamination may pose an unacceptable risk to human health, the environment including groundwater, the built environment and economic activities, through its impacts on the users of the land, and on neighbouring users. Land contamination, or the possibility of it, is therefore a material planning consideration in taking decisions on individual planning applications.

Where development is proposed on a site which is known or has the potential to be affected by contamination, a preliminary risk assessment should be undertaken as the first stage in assessing the risk.

Preliminary risk assessments and any subsequent additional information should be carried out in accordance with the Environment Agency's Contaminated Land Report 11 (CLR 11) 'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination'. There is additional advice in the Environment Agency's "Guiding Principles for Land Contamination" documents.

New activities need to be deterred in certain areas based on their intrinsic hazard to groundwater. The

Officer\_Response:

These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

hazard may result from a combination of the activity type, its duration and the potential for failure of controls. Additionally, new developments should not pose an unacceptable risk of pollution to groundwater from sewage effluent, trade effluent or contaminated surface water. This also applies where the discharge will cause pollution by mobilising contaminants already in the ground.

The document detailed below highlights best practice and would make suitable references to support achievement of the policy:  
Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) available on the Environment Agency website

Response_Number:	1264	Persons_Name:	Ms A Hewitson	Representing_Who?:	Environment Agency
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
Q68 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 8.23 – 8.28 under Approach to the Design of New Development in the full consultation document? Please explain your view. We question whether all the potential options for appraisal have been identified for the consideration of the design related policy. In addition to the two options identified on design we suggest that you also consider having a „standards specific“ policy, i.e. requiring compliance with a specific level of the Code for Sustainable Homes, BREEAM etc.	The requirement for development to exceed current Building Regulation standards has not been considered through the Preferred Options Document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.		Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.		



Response\_Number: 1265

Persons\_Name: Ms A Hewitson

Representing\_Who?: Environment Agency

Respondents\_Comments:

Q70 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest?  
If consideration of a "standards specific" policy is not assessed as being appropriate, we would also request that an additional bullet point is added to this policy to read:

Minimising of the use of natural resources, such as water efficiency measures.

The supporting text should also set out the standards the Council's expect to be achieved in respect of this. To assist you with supporting text for the policy we would suggest the inclusion of the following paragraphs for the Local Plan:

New activities need to be deterred in certain areas based on their intrinsic hazard to groundwater. The hazard may result from a combination of the activity type, its duration and the potential for failure of controls. New developments should not pose an unacceptable risk of pollution to groundwater from sewage effluent, trade effluent or contaminated surface water. This also applies where the discharge will cause pollution by mobilising contaminants already in the ground.

The document detailed below highlights best practice and would make suitable references to support achievement of the policy:

Groundwater Protection: Principles and Practice (GP3) available on the Environment Agency website

Officer\_Response:

These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

Response\_Number: 1278

Persons\_Name: Mr P Coathup

Representing\_Who?: Lincolnshire County Council

Respondents\_Comments:

The Lincolnshire JPU proposes a positively-worded approach on climate change and renewable and low carbon energy subject to certain assessment criteria. LCC, in partnership with the JPU, is leading on a Landscape Character Assessment and Capacity Study for Renewable Energy Infrastructure which will provide local evidence for the suitability of wind farms, solar power arrays etc. and will be used to finalise the precise policy wording for this type of development. For both natural and historic environment there could be more emphasis on how they are integral to giving both residents and visitors a 'sense of place', and on positive enhancement being essential to maintaining the unique character of the area and its landscape: e.g. Landscape scale joining up of environmental initiatives. On the natural environment it is suggested that the document should refer to the White Paper the Natural Choice and the LCC Natural Environment Strategy. For historic environment there should be reference to the Lincolnshire Historic Landscape Characterisation and the policy needs to acknowledge the key role of the Historic Environment Record (HER), maintained by LCC, as outlined in the NPFF. Could Natural Environment and Historic Environment be split into two distinct policies as they are distinctive in their own right and should stand apart. (Amplification of Para. 28, 2nd sentence in Executive Councillor Briefing Note) 8.2.4 The Boston Rural and Urban Historic Environment Baseline Studies are an aid to interpreting evidence in the HER, they do not claim to be definitive as the nature of archaeological at least is that as more is known it is added to the HER which is a dynamic evidence base whereas the BRUHEBS is analysis at a given point in time. The lack of understanding and knowledge is a basis from which all areas start and the

Officer\_Response:

These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

policies produced by Las are meant to address this where they can – hence the NPPF and its guidance outline a procedure whereby any developer must investigate the historic environment that will be impacted by proposed development and produce a justification/mitigation statement with his planning application – as outlined by NPPF. Any gained knowledge resulting from his work has to be deposited in the HER to enhance future knowledge

8.11.1 . The terms 'significant number', 'average' and 'above average' should be backed up by the numbers at risk. There are a defined number of assets on the HER – Mark Bennett at LCC can provide figures.

The evidence base should also mention the Lincolnshire Historic Landscape Characterisation which both Districts supported, and reports for both areas are available.

Page 209: Climate Change Preferred Option

Reference is made in the policy to "soil moisture decreases in summer and autumn" it might also be worth considering the opposite to this i.e. Rapid increase in soil moisture can also cause significant damage to buildings.

Response_Number:	1344	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 61 – Yes	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1345	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 62 – Yes, but does the built environment require more emphasis?	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	1346	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Question 63</p> <p>8.3.1 – Bullet Point 2 – Strengthen. Add at end: “and, where possible, its enhancement”</p> <p>Pages 207-8, Blue Box, Para 3, bullet point 1 – Simplify wording. Replace “they cannot be located on” by “there are no”</p> <p>Pages 207-8, Blue Box, Para 5, first sentence – After “monuments” insert “street patterns, streetscapes.”</p> <p>Pages 207-8, Blue Box, Para 7, last sentence – Strengthen. Delete “in appropriate cases”</p> <p>Pages 207-8, Blue Box, Para 8 – Needs a reference to visual intrusion (surely a form of pollution). More generally, there is the whole question of advertising, which the document ignores.</p> <p>Pages 207-8, Blue Box, Para 8, bullet point 1 – After “natural” insert “and built”.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

---

Response_Number:	1347	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 64 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1348	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 65 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1349	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>Question 66 – P. 209, Blue Box, Second half – In our view, wind turbines and the local landscape are irreconcilable. The vast level sweep of the land to the horizon, the huge overarching skies, and the distant church spire or tower rising from a cluster of trees: this is essential character. Any vertical draws attention to itself, wind turbines all the more so by virtue of their sheer height, their mass-produced industrialised nature and their incessant, fidgety movement. They dominate, drawing the eye to the virtual exclusion of everything else and are thus visually destructive. Only if situated close to already existing large industrial installations, such as the Spalding and Sutton Bridge power stations, could they lose some of their alien intrusiveness. It seems to us virtually impossible both to respect the essential character of East Lincolnshire and to promote on-shore wind energy. Short of excluding any further wind turbines, even as the policy stands an enormous burden is placed on that undefined word “significant”, and we feel that to avoid repeated application disputes the wording needs to be much more tightly defined.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1350	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>Question 67 – P. 209, Blue Box, Second Half, Bullet Point 1 – After “built environment” add “(especially listed buildings and conservation areas).”</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1351	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 68 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1352	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 69 – Yes, but needs revising as set out in response to question 70.		<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).	

---

Response_Number:	1353	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>Question 70 – P. 211, Blue Box – We feel the whole section, particularly the first paragraph, needs revising. Para 1 – Without being prescriptive, the paragraph needs to offer much stronger guidance. As long ago as 1955 Ian Nairn was denouncing the way “the end of Southampton [looks] like the beginning of Carlisle; [with] the parts in between ... looking like the end of Carlisle or the beginning of Southampton” (Architectural Review, June 1955). Thirty years later Spalding used to be referred to as Allisonville. In other words, housing developments were mere assemblages of standardised units with as much individual character or recognition of regional vernacular as a Lego brick. Layouts usually consisted of meaningless meanders and car-led ‘loops and lollipops’. There were few attempts to create a sense of place, a community of varied buildings with a focus and a distinct character. More recently, the promotion of the ‘local’ seems to have produced little more than dreary pastiches of sub-Edwardian terraces and houses (without a trace of the originals’ inventive variety as seen in the decorative brickwork of chimneys and eaves and the equally decorative, individual carpentry of the square bays). Most modern estates are mere assemblages still. Rare indeed in Spalding is a development making “innovative use of local traditional styles and materials” such as the apartments on the riverbank opposite Yew Lodge, where the very local (riverside warehouse) has been drawn on with flair and imagination to produce something new and with real character, not mere Pastiche. Spalding has not been happy in its major contemporary buildings. The Telephone Exchange, the former Sorting Office and the Westlode Street frontage to Carpet-Right and Homebase, for example, are grossly insensitive. Yet it is perfectly possible for the contemporary and the historic to sit comfortably side-</p>	<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>		



by-side, as any Scandinavian town will show.

In short, we would like to see the section rewritten so that the prime emphasis is on creating distinctive places, both in layout and design. And yes, the "local" is important, but should not be over emphasised.

Accordingly, we feel the second sentence should read simply: Encouragement will be given to high quality contemporary design. (after all, if "local" had been insisted on in the past, we should be without Kingston's Corner and the art deco Elsom House making their distinctive contributions to the attractiveness of the town centre.

Para 2 Extra bullet point At start: creating a sense of place.

Bullet point 4 After "historic" insert: street patterns and.

Bullet Point 5 After "scale" insert: visual closure.

Extra bullet point After Bullet Point 7 insert new bullet point: the avoidance of visual intrusion by advertising, other signs and the clutter of service and communication paraphernalia.

Bullet Point 10 Rephrase: the values of visual closures, landmarks and views.

---

Response_Number:	1369	Persons_Name:	Sutton Bridge P C	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
A policy should be produced that will protect and enhance the Natural Environment, there are too many 'get out clauses' in this proposed plan, basically it allows for any development, affording little protection for the environment or residents quality of life.	These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response\_Number: 1428

Persons\_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?: Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

ENVIRONMENT

The NPPF offers general guidance which is not always relevant to and appropriate for local circumstance. Q61 Local policies for the protection and enhancement of the natural and built environment particularly of historic or architectural interest that are in broad conformity with the NPPF can recognise distinct area differences. They should not reinforce the NIMBY tendency nor unnecessarily retard economic change.

---

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number: 1429

Persons\_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?: Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer\_Recommendation:

Q62 The proposals as outlined do strike a reasonable balance between the need to preserve our environment without hindering the need for economic growth. The statement of principles is encouraging. Delivery through the development process is often the concern not the lack of a reasonable realistic principled policy options. The NPPF guidance is quite clear, all the existing protections and safeguards to protect existing designated sites of outstanding natural beauty, sites of special scientific and nature conservation interest, sites of designated architectural or historic merit remain in place.

There is even some recognition that sites not designated as being special in any way but which are integral to the well being of a local community can be given some recognition in Parish Plans and ought if practical be given some degree of protection from development.

One concern is that fenlands are not recognised as areas of outstanding natural beauty; Driving north into the Wolds the absence of wind arrays is striking compared to the Lincolnshire fenlands increasingly despoiled by wind arrays and the less visually intrusion of single smaller commercial turbines.

South Holland commissioned a survey to identify areas in which future wind array development could be acceptable.

The cost to wind generator developers of land with a presumption in favour of development unless there were sufficient relevant material planning considerations with sufficient weight to justify a refusal was and is higher than land outside these areas.

How many of the current built and proposed wind arrays have been located in those areas identified as being suitable (perhaps reluctantly) for wind array developments?

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

South Holland did not adopt a NIMBY approach in the national interest. While individual arrays may be small the accumulative impact will gradually destroy the fenlands unique land, water and skyscape.

---

Response\_Number: 1430

Persons\_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?: Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer\_Recommendation:

Q63 The NPPF guidance is development in the national interest should be permitted unless there are alternative sites where the demonstrable harm to the environment would be less. The onus would be on the developer to demonstrate that there were no alternative sites available and to propose mitigation measures to protect the environment and if necessary some compensation arrangements. The question is how best to mitigate the impact of development when no alternative sites are available. A distinction can be drawn between looking at and looking from. Sensitive siting of development can help mitigate the impact of the development, but this is not always effective close to the development site. Trees can effectively mask visual intrusion, just as affectively some distance from the development site, more effectively than on the development site, as well as muffling noise and reduce pollution. Distant vegetation screening would involve delicate negotiation with third parties in which the Planning Authorities have a role. If a development proposal vital for the wider public interest, but which has a negative impact on a designated protected site then is necessary in the interest of achieving a balance between the wider public interest and the protection of the environment, should be willing to exercise its' compulsory purchase powers to acquire land on which to secure vegetation screening. If a Planning Authority has identified through the planning process locations in which the demonstrable harm from developments could be on balance acceptable, then any development proposal outside the identified zone could be refused, and that refusal upheld by the Planning Inspectorate. Councils attempting through their Plan to minimise the negative impact of development proposals while supporting the wider public interest are entitled to expect. A case can be made that the view from historic

These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The impact of development on the historic or architectural built environment is undertaken on all applications that may impact the setting of such places. It is not considered that justification can be made for the suggested distances. The NPPF advises that more vulnerable uses and essential infrastructure should only be permitted in flood zone 3a (the area that would flood without defences) if the exception test is passed. Essential infrastructure permitted in this zone should be designed and constructed to remain operational and safe for users in times of flood. Flood zone 3a extends further than the red zone and therefore this concern is covered by national guidance.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

or architectural built environments given the highest designated grade for their importance should be afforded a ground and visual 'cordon sanitaire' of at least 2m at ground level and 5 km visual. No infrastructure development in the red flood risk zone unless there is no alternative site and only then if the development is fully flood risk resilient. These in my judgment would be reasonable planning constraints for protecting the environment.

Response_Number:	1431	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
The prudential approach to climate change should be supported. The fact long term climate change cannot be denied; the causes are debatable .	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		
Q64 Yes					

Response_Number:	1432	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
Q65 Up to a point, The pursuit of energy efficient is in the long term a win - win situation. In this regarded a Planning Authority can make a big difference -A planning consent condition on all new development ( or extension ) insisting on a maximum energy efficiency rating plus an obligation to generate 80 % of the household energy requirement from renewable energy sources enforced through Building regulations would benefit the dwelling occupiers, help the Councils meet any contribution towards achieving carbon emission targets and the developers (low annual energy bills are a positive selling point when energy costs will be rising).	The requirement for development to exceed current Building Regulation standards has not been considered through the Preferred Options Document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.		Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.		

Response_Number:	1433	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Q66 With 2 operational gas power stations, with another 2 gas power generators with outline consent along with a bio-mass gasifier plant with outline consent, a number of operational wind turbine arrays and more in the planning stage a case can be made that South Holland is making a significant contribution to meeting the national low carbon power generation targets. Policies in the Plan could be supportive of innovative sustainable rural energy schemes through rural co-operatives exploiting known and test small scale energy generation technologies. Schumacher Small is Beautiful.	Officer_Response:	These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1434	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Q67 The text of the local Plan should welcome development proposals and be supportive of pilot schemes to create low cost low carbon energy schemes in rural communities.	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1435	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
Q68 It is necessary to have a policy in relation to the design of new build schemes and individual policies. South East Lincolnshire has a vernacular interpretation of the Georgian architectural style which exhibits some significant variations on the local iconic Georgian style. A uniform nation style would erode local identity.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response_Number:	1436	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
Q69 Most of the selected design criteria relate to the outward appearance of residential dwellings and the layout of new residential estates where an extant street pattern does not constrain design considerations. There is a threat that new estates will be visually uniform and boring. Creating flood resilient housing and buildings presents an opportunity for architectural innovation (dwellings on stilts, 3 storey buildings with ground floor garaging and utility space tidal rise building think Dutch?) Mitigating against flood risk is appropriate across the whole Plan area (all electric circuitry to be 1m above ground floor level return valves on outflow water pipes.) A concomitant review of Building Regulations should be undertaken parallel to the Plan Process. Energy efficiency through estate lay out and dwelling internal spatial arrangements should be a priority. Ample usable green space should be a significant feature, especially in areas of high density housing.	The requirement for development to exceed current Building Regulation standards has not been considered through the Preferred Options Document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.		Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.		
	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.				

---



Response\_Number: 1437

Persons\_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?: Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Q70 Emphasise the role of the Building Regulation regime in securing compliance with the design style guidance in the text.

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. This issue is beyond the remit of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD

---

Response\_Number: 1450

Persons\_Name: Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?: English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

We welcome the references to the historic environment in the list of bullet points, although query what is meant by “no significant adverse impact” in the preceding paragraph. This suggests that adverse impacts that are less than significant will always been acceptable, which may not be consistent with national policy.

Paragraphs 132 to 134 of the NPPF argues that substantial harm should be outweighed by substantial public benefits, and even less than substantial harm should be weighed against public benefits. We welcome the reference to the visual dominance of St Botolph’s Church tower in the final bullet point, although it is dominant over the skyline of the wider countryside and not just Boston. Furthermore, whilst St Botolph’s is the most dominant church tower or spire, there are many other churches in South East Lincolnshire whose tower or spire form a dominant feature in the surrounding landscape. Retaining this dominance should be a requirement for all types of development, not just those associated with renewable energy, and it may be more appropriate to state this requirement in the (historic) environment policy (which would help with the positive and locally distinctive strategy for the historic environment).

Officer\_Response:

These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

Response\_Number:

1451

Persons\_Name:

Anne Casey

Representing\_Who?:

RSPB

Respondents\_Comments:

The RSPB supports the need for there to be local policy included on this topic rather than relying totally on the national policy.

We strongly suggest that there needs to be a Supplementary Planning Document developed relating to renewable energy which gives clear guidance to developers on appropriate areas for development. This could be similar to South Kesteven's SPD on Wind Energy.

Officer\_Response:

The need for an SPD on Wind Energy will be considered at a later date in the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD