

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

Chapter_Name: 09 Community, Health and Well-Being

Response_Number: 5

Persons_Name: Carol M Burton

Representing_Who?: Herself

Respondents_Comments:

The principle of green lungs in built up area still holds good, and the bigger the built up area, the greater the need. This does NOT mean providing open space on the fringes of town. It does mean preserving and cherishing the green sites we already have, such as the Halley Stewart field and the Castle playing field. Both should have open access to townspeople and visitors at all times. On no account should they be built on, even if some business entrepreneur offers huge sums for them. Some things are beyond price.

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically the preferred policy approach to "Community, Health and Well-Being" which seeks to prevent the redevelopment or change of use of existing recreational and sports facilities, except in certain specified circumstances.

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:

20

Persons_Name:

Mr Des Ford

Representing_Who?:

D Brown Builders

Respondents_Comments:

Sports fields and pavilions.
 Within the document we seem to be talking about our aspirations but if my own experiences with the delivery of the hufc site are an accurate reflection of the process then everything within planning will always go against the creation of these much needed facilities. We should determine an area of land around each major settlement that could be used only for such facilities. The area should be sufficient in size so that a full curriculum of sports can be played and the pavilions /changing facilities should be able to generate enough income to be self sustaining. A good example of what can be achieved can be seen at Wisbech St Marys sports and community pavilion.

To enable some of these facilities to be built a radical approach to existing facilities could be used i.e. if we used Holbeach as an example. It plays its football on carters park the club rents from the parish council and its relationship is sometimes fraught. However its current club house and changing facilities are dated and will soon require a considerable amount of investment to satisfy current foot ball association regulations and also to enable disabled sport participation etc. A scenario to help facilitate this would maybe be allow the development of the former club house site for residential and condition it so that the sale monies are reinvested into an all purpose facility at the penny hill site that allows the relocation of the first team and club, this would open the park back up for the town maybe encourage the reintroduction of cricket into the park or maybe even at the new sports facility.

Officer_Response:

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:	36	Persons_Name:	W Smith	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
I think a priority should be the provision of further amenity land for the increase in population. Already surveys have shown that the present provision is among the worst in the country and this needs to be addressed. Other areas have well planned country parks etc for healthy recreational activities and something similar needs to be provided here.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.		Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD		
	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.				

Response_Number:	78	Persons_Name:	Natural England	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
Natural England supports Options A as we believe that everyone should have access to good quality natural green space near to where they live (please note the ANGSt standards above).	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response_Number:	79	Persons_Name:	Natural England	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Preferred Policy Approach Community Health and Well Being As you mention in the preceding explanatory text there are strong links between the open space, sport and recreation elements of this policy with the Environment policy. We would suggest that the policy wording should be strengthened to reflect this linkage particularly by more detailed wording on GI as suggested above.	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:	148	Persons_Name:	Ms Rose Freeman	Representing_Who?:	The Theatres Trust
Respondents_Comments:	We suggest a more comprehensive description for the term 'community facilities' and, although para.9.17.1 is adequate, it could be expanded for clarity to; community and social facilities provide for the health and wellbeing, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community.	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:

149

Persons_Name:

Ms Rose Freeman

Representing_Who?:

The Theatres Trust

Respondents_Comments:

Option A is obviously the right choice because, as you know, your document would be found unsound at examination if all your policies relied on the National Planning Policy Framework guidelines. Policies should be relevant to the local area and be specific about what is required rather than being indistinguishable from other local authorities' plans.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 150

Persons_Name: Ms Rose Freeman

Representing_Who?: The Theatres Trust

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy approach at para.9.24 on page 226 does not adequately promote health and well-being because it does not reflect para.9.1.1 – ‘by protecting and enhancing’ (this paragraph should also include the word ‘cultural’ for consistency).

A policy for the protection of valued community assets and facilities should specifically state the councils’ support for them in the policy, and the criteria for their loss should be expanded for clarity on guidance regarding planning applications. The final section of the preferred approach must include the word ‘cultural’ for continuity or, we suggest for succinctness, that the term ‘community facilities’ can be used on its own for new facilities as its definition has been explained in para.9.17.1. and does not need to be repeated in the policy.

The second paragraph in this preferred approach – ‘To enable people to lead’ – is irrelevant and does not provide robust policy guidance. This statement should be part of the accompanying text. The policy should provide more substantial criteria for the provision of additional community facilities where residential development is planned.

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:	151	Persons_Name:	Ms Rose Freeman	Representing_Who?:	The Theatres Trust
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>In the Preferred Policy Approach, the protection of existing community facilities could state: The council will protect existing community, cultural and social facilities by resisting their loss or change of use unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the needs of the local population; or necessary services can be delivered from other facilities without leading to, or increasing, any shortfall in provision, and it has been demonstrated that there is no demand for another similar use on site.</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>		
<p>The provision of new community facilities in the Preferred Policy Approach could state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The council will encourage the provision of new community, social and cultural facilities in appropriate locations which are convenient to the communities they serve and accessible by a range of sustainable transport modes, including walking, cycling and public transport, and buildings that are inclusive, accessible, flexible and sited to maximise shared use of the facility. - Developments that result in additional need for community facilities will be required to contribute towards enhancing existing facilities, or provide/contribute towards new facilities. This contribution will be addressed through CIL and/or section 106 obligations, as appropriate. 					

Response_Number:	228	Persons_Name:	Elizabeth Biott	Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>It is important that natural green space is available for both people and wildlife. The Local Plan should ensure that new developments are required to provide a network of natural green space within the green infrastructure of the site. Sufficient natural green space should be accessible to residents to meet Natural England's Accessible Natural Green Space Standards. The Trust would therefore recommend that natural green space is added to the end of the second paragraph of the policy so that it reads 'To enable people to lead healthy and active lifestyles, residential development shall support the provision of new sport and open-space facilities and natural green space'.</p>	<p>Whilst this issue is addressed in part by the Delivery Chapter of the Preferred Options Document, infrastructure (including natural green space and other community facilities) will be comprehensively addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process, and will accompany the Submission Version of the DPD.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		<p>Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.</p>		

Response_Number:

252

Persons_Name:

Mr Steve Mason

Representing_Who?:

Lincolnshire County Council

Respondents_Comments:

We are grateful for being consulted on this exciting plan. The headline figure of 8250 units in addition to those with planning or recently completed means an additional 1650 primary pupils and 1880 secondary and sixth form pupils in South East Lincolnshire at the end of the plan period residing in these new, yet to be approved, homes.

LCC has a statutory duty to ensure sufficient school places are available but it is very clear it lacks the resources to provide additional new capacity to meet the growth in pupils from new housing and there is an expectation by the DfE that such funding would be from developer contributions not the DfE.

We want to work positively with the growth agenda and appreciate being consulted at this early stage. We appreciate the viability issues surrounding development and the need to keep any S.106 or developer contribution requests to the minimum based on only requesting developers provide funding for additional capacity where necessary and reasonable and directly proportional to the development in question. With this in mind and without apparent other large capital funding streams, requests for developer funded new schools are made only where existing ones cannot be expanded sensibly and requests for additional developer funded school places are made only where necessary.

Clearly it is for the LPA to decide if our request can be supported and where development goes but we would bring to their attention the high cost to LCC of transporting pupils from places without a school.

A brief summary for each key village and town is

Officer_Response:

Whilst this issue is addressed in part by the Delivery Chapter of the Preferred Options Document, infrastructure (including educational facilities) will be comprehensively addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process, and will accompany the Submission Version of the DPD.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

enclosed showing what we feel the current projected situation will be and what the preferable solution to accommodate growth could be. Spalding remains our key concern with the secondaries being difficult to enlarge further on such a scale to cope with 6000 new homes to be delivered by 2031 but with only 3750 new homes coming forward for consent (with Holland Park already having consent) so limiting the viable options available.

No discussion has been held with individual schools nor detailed study done as to the feasibility of expanding those shown just a desk top analysis to show where there would be a lack of capacity available and need for expansion and new schools potentially.

We appreciate the wording in the draft document indicating sustainable locations are to be prioritised and we would welcome clear policy that ensures where there is not local school capacity available development is only allowed when the applicant agrees to a directly proportional contribution towards necessary additional capacity, including land potentially.

One issue to note, following the consultation day on Thursday, 23 May 2013 in Boston, is that Spalding is a difficult situation to resolve with secondary sites being constrained. A new small secondary 'facility' would be needed, we feel, though we have sought to minimise the land take and cost to the developer as far as possible seeing it as likely to be an annex to an existing school rather than standalone and sharing facilities with the primary school and community groups where possible.

If we can assist and be involved in the process in any way, we would welcome it.

Boston Town

Based on 2900 additional units (580 primary, 660 secondary/sixth form pupils)

Primary

We have little expected capacity and once the effects of the 557 already approved dwellings come through then there will be no available capacity even with large scale current investment in Boston. 2900 additional units is the equivalent to 3 FE (forms of entry) and we note 1900 are likely to be proposed at West Road / Chain Bridge Road so would request a site and proportional funding for a new 2FE primary school there. We would request all developments contribute towards additional capacity and we would achieve this through the new 2FE school plus expand an existing town school by one form of entry to balance the position potentially.

Secondary

The scale of development would produce 660 secondary and sixth form pupils with 25% expected to go to selective school where there will be capacity leaving around 500 pupils needing a non-selective school place in Boston where no capacity is expected. The Haven High Academy's capacity would need to be expanded very significantly and this would be difficult to achieve as both their sites are constrained and there is protection applied against building on Team Games areas. However this seems the only feasible option and we would work closely with them to achieve that but would require capital from all housing development by S.106 or CIL to achieve that.

Boston Villages

Kirton

420 units (84 primary, 72 secondary pupils excluding selective)

A substantial expansion of the primary school is planned and out to consultation. If approved this would result in available capacity to accommodate much of the growth proposal.

The secondary school is projected to have some capacity to accommodate some of the growth so only a part-contribution would be requested.

Swineshead

400 units (80 primary, 68 secondary pupils excluding selective)

An expansion has occurred but is not expected to result in substantial additional surplus capacity being available and further expansion using S.106 would be needed but noting it is a difficult site to expand.

Spalding

6000 units but with Holland Park now approved so 3750 assumed new units for consideration (3750 = 750 primary, 855 secondary and sixth form pupils))

The 3750 home expansion of Spalding on one site above the sites already with existing consent is complex. The development itself will clearly warrant a new large primary school but on its own a new secondary school for 640 pupils (once 25% have been assumed to attend the selective school) appears to result in a very small new secondary school to operate as a stand-alone facility. However, analysis of the existing school site at the Sir John Gleed School show it is difficult to be expanded very significantly to meet the numbers needed to accommodate projected growth from the now approved Holland Park.

A balance has to be drawn between getting a new facility that is the best size to meet all future demand and a facility that costs the developer a proportionate amount of capital and land. Therefore, as there is no

apparent capital from Holland Park for secondary expansion it seems the only option is that just the 3750 units expansion of Spalding North is catered for with a new on-site secondary facility that is linked to an existing school operator as an detached annex rather than as an entire new school. The type of facility and operation would be subject to further discussions at an appropriate time. We would therefore request a site of 7.3ha is made available that would allow a 3FE primary school to be built plus a 640 place secondary 'facility'. The site areas are based on the minimum areas suggested by guidance and assume the school facilities will be collocated to minimise land take cost etc. They would still be capable of being separately managed facilities however.

We have sought to be realistic and understand viability issues and keep costs to a minimum i.e. not ask for land and funding for an entire new secondary school as we had been discussing some time ago to serve West Spalding as a whole which would require much more land and capital we cannot envisage being available in future. There would also need to be some expansion at other primary schools locally to take the extra 120 places needed potentially, most likely at Pinchbeck.

In detail the requirements would be:-

Primary
3FE 2.5ha site

Secondary
640 place 4.8ha site

The secondary and sixth form figures are on the hypothetical basis that the Grammar Schools would be willing and able to take the 25% of growth from Spalding and areas served by Spalding. This would be very difficult at the High School with its very

constrained site but it seems only fair that growth in numbers is matched by proportionate growth in selective places so that pupils from villages served by Spalding for selective education are not disadvantaged by the distance criteria in admission policies.

We would request primary and secondary contributions from all development.

Spalding Villages

Crowland

300 units (60 primary, 51 secondary and sixth form excluding selective)

A larger primary school is already planned which would provide adequate capacity.

Secondary places would be served by The Deepings School, the University Academy Holbeach or Sir John Glead Spalding, with none of these expecting any surplus capacity so would need capital to expand.

Donington

300 units (60 primary, 51 secondary and sixth form excluding selective)

The primary school remains full in future so would need capital to expand.

The secondary school appears full so again would need capital to be expanded.

Holbeach

1000 units (200 primary, 170 secondary and sixth form excluding selective)

The two urban schools are collectively able to absorb some of the pupils but would need to be extended to cope with the bulk of the new residents. A new school

is not needed just capital to expand the existing ones by approximately 160 places. For secondary the Holbeach Academy would need to be expanded as it is not expecting surplus places but has the potential to be enlarged.

Long Sutton

150 units (30 primary, 26 secondary and sixth form excluding selective)

There is expected to be some capacity, noting it is small scale at primary level and some capacity at secondary for part of the growth here and in Sutton Bridge, so a part-contribution would be needed.

Sutton Bridge

150 units (30 primary, 26 secondary and sixth form excluding selective)

There is expected to be sufficient capacity following recent investment plans at primary level. At secondary it is the same situation as at Long Sutton, the nearest secondary school.

NB

Please note for all villages, the only selective provision is at Spalding with the lack of surplus capacity issues as detailed above for Spalding.

I note there are plans for an IDP to be produced and when you require detailed cost estimates for education infrastructure we will calculate this.

As an initial estimate on the basis of just 10% of growth able to be accommodated in surplus capacity and any land required being provided free of charge to LCC I would estimate:

Primary $8500 \times 0.2 \times 90\% = 1530$ pupils at £11,276 each

£17,252,280

Secondary 8500 x 0.19 x 90% = 1453 at £16,991 each

£24,687,923

Sixth Form 8500 x 0.19 x 0.2 x 90% = 290 pupils at

£18,427 each £5,343,830

Total £47,284,033

or £5,731 per new home

Response_Number:	255	Persons_Name:	Mr J Law	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
Throughout the policy Public Rights of Way seem to be ignored. Although these are the responsibility of the County Council, South East Lincolnshire should recognise them as important leisure facilities and promote them to get more people walking and cycling to improve the general health and well being of the people of South East Lincolnshire.	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).		
The statement should also ensure any development which has a Public Right of Way included should be in a green corridor and not end up as an alley between buildings.	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.				
Any development should also have cycle routes/paths in green corridors linking to the existing Pubic Right of Way network.					

Response_Number:	579	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:	580	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The policy approach is adequate.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	581	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:	632	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	633	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The policy approach is adequate.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	634	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:	677	Persons_Name:	Cllr A Austin	Representing_Who?:	Herself
Respondents_Comments:	Before facilities can be developed in relationship with public transport infrastructure, there needs to be public transport present in the first place. Much of the area is not served by public transport.	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The respondent is quite correct that much of South East Lincolnshire is poorly served (or completely unserved) by public transport. These parts of the Plan area would be regarded as less suitable locations for new community, educational, health, recreational, sport or social facilities, given that the preferred policy approach "Community, Health and Well-Being" indicates that such facilities should be well-related to public transport infrastructure.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	708	Persons_Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge	Representing_Who?:	English Heritage
Respondents_Comments:	A number of community, recreational and social facilities may be regarded as heritage assets in their own right, particularly if the facility occupies a historic building (e.g. a museum) or uses a historic park (e.g. for recreation). Therefore, the redevelopment or change of use of such facilities should not be based solely on whether the facility is still needed by the community or if adequate provision can be made elsewhere, but also on whether the redevelopment or change of use would harm the significance of any heritage asset (where applicable). We feel that the wording of the policy should be amended to reflect this issue.	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:	718	Persons_Name:	Helen Cattle	Representing_Who?:	Sport England
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>Community, Health and Well-Being (page226) The principle of including a policy covering community, health and well-being is strongly supported. In particular, the requirement for residential development to support the provision of sport and open space facilities is welcomed. However, the wording of the policy should be amended to refer not just to supporting the provision of new sport and open space facilities, but also to the enhancement of existing facilities. This would help to secure provision to address qualitative as well as quantitative need in accordance with that it identified within the evidence base (which should be regularly updated) that supports the policy and its on-going application.</p> <p>Consistent with the comments made above in respect of Site Allocations Criteria, the policy should also be modified to ensure that the loss of facilities (including sports facilities) is precluded unless it can be clearly demonstrated that they are not needed or that the loss would be compensated by alternative provision of at least an equal or higher quantitative and qualitative standard. The wording as it currently stands does not accord with Paragraph 74 of the NPPF.</p> <p>It is essential for this policy to be underpinned by a robust and up to date assessment of needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision as required by Paragraph 73 of the NPPF. As previously stated in relation to the Vision, the current evidence base will need to be reviewed and expanded upon as the Local Plan is taken forward, not only to support the on-going application of this policy but also to feed into the emerging IDP. Although the policy does not currently include any site or project specific references, going forward it may be</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>		

appropriate to consider the inclusion of specific objectives or priorities for delivery where this is justified by the evidence base, whether within this DPD or a subsequent document.

Response_Number:	797	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:	798	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The policy approach is adequate.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	799	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:	850	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	851	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The policy approach is adequate.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	852	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:	907	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:	908	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The policy approach is adequate.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	909	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:	966	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	967	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The policy approach is adequate.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	968	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:	1018	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is supported, but reference should also be made to the consideration of a potential marina recreational facility at Spalding.	Officer_Response:	The provision of a marina/marinas 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_Number:	1019	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:	The policy approach is adequate and Option A is supported.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1020	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:	Changes should be made to refer to a potential marina recreational facility at Spalding.	Officer_Response:	The provision of a marina/marinas 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_Number:	1273	Persons_Name:	Mr J Hobson	Representing_Who?:	Chestnut Homes
Respondents_Comments:	Question 71-73 – Community, Health and Wellbeing In the interest of delivering sustainable development, the principle of ensuring that developments should contribute to the creation of socially cohesive and inclusive communities is supported. In particular, the development of large scale urban extensions have the ability to introduce a wide range and mix of land uses that are able to support the new community and integrate with existing settlement. The policy acknowledges that to enable people to lead healthy and active lifestyles, residential development should support the provision of new sport and open space facilities and we would agree with this approach subject to the overall being reasonable, viable and proportionate to scale and nature of the development proposed.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1354

Persons_Name: Mr J Charlesworth

Representing_Who?: Spalding and District Civic Society

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

Question 71 - Yes

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1355	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Question 72 No. Apart from several appearances of the phrase “higher quality open space”, the important matter of informal green leisure space is basically ignored. In an area where the land is almost entirely given over to agri-industrial food production, with virtually no opportunity to simply enjoy the countryside, and where the gardens of new houses get smaller and smaller, it is vitally important to secure the provision of open parkland-like space for informal leisure, where kids may simply kick a ball about, fly kites, play tiggy and improvised, unorganised games, where people can walk their dog, take their toddlers for an open-air hour or so, jog, etc., etc. Whilst the section contains tables for “Sports Facility Requirements” and “Playing pitch Requirements” informal open space is not even discussed, even though it affects far more people than sports facilities and playing pitches. The omission is serious. In repairing it, it is essential to note that the existing provisions of such space is very generously provided (e.g. Crowland and Holbeach). Nor is there any mention of allotments, another serious omission. Or public parks and gardens.</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:	1356	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Question 73 The whole section, including the blue box, needs to be rewritten to take account of points raised in response 1355, and to incorporate: P226 Blue Box Para 2 After “lifestyles” rewrite: shortfalls of sports facilities and informal open space in existing communities will be rectified, and new residential development must support the provision of new sports facilities and informal open green space nearby.</p> <p>Para 4 Bullet Point 1 After “Maximise” insert proximity and.</p> <p>Bullet Point 2 replace “related to” by served by.</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:	1438	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>COMMUNITY, HEALTH AND WELL-BEING</p> <p>Participation is an essential component of wellbeing; participation in sport and recreation participation in community life; feeling secure in your community; participation in making decisions about things that affect your life and the lives of your neighbours . The emphasis in this section is on the health, recreational and physical wellbeing.</p> <p>Q71 It would be unreasonable not to address these concerns through a locally agreed plan bur to rely of the NPPF default position.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Support noted.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>

Response_Number: 1439

Persons_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

Q72 I do not think so.

The redevelopment of any community or recreational, health or sport, or community or educational facility would be permitted if the facility is no longer needed or adequate alternative provision made. This policy is not necessarily compatible with the maximization of access. The proper provision for field (team) sports is a land intensive use for participants and spectators. Modern provision of proper facilities has always been located on the periphery of urban areas. Financial viability (to minimise the support needed from the public purse) relies on a large client base so search facilities need to be located on sites to much the largest number of clients can have access. In South Holland the nodal point for in the distribution of population and the nodal point offer ease of access by car or public access lies between Pinchbeck and Spalding to the north of Sharpe's Bridge near the hospital site.(LCC study) For Field Sports and Aquatic Sports facilities this could be the optimum location. Small team and one on one sports are capital expense and more expensive to maintain. They tend to have small facilities in private collective membership and are footloose in their locations often oversubscribed in their membership based in run down facilities, but they are often located in easily accessible urban centre sites . The criteria for alternative provision must be accessibility on foot, by cycle, public transport or car. The same is equally true of post school education, health, theatre, cinema public or private halls, restaurant, coffee bars etc. All are town centre activities particularly for those without vehicular access.

All need the largest possible client base to remain commercially viable. Relocating a facility to a site which restricts access for some does not necessarily increase public wellbeing.

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).

Response_Number: 1440

Persons_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q73 It reads well but is it delivered. There are available improved street lights which are brighter but which are low energy and low cost to run. Properly light streets are a significant factor in diminishing fear of crime. Have they been installed in South Holland? Does this plan promote defensible spaces in estate layouts? Do Building Regulations promote installation of sturdy external doors, lockable windows, smoke and intruder alarms external security lights on new build homes. The rates of crime property crime fall when people properly protect the homes from intruders.

The NPPF needs to be considered against the Localism Act.

This Act gives Parishes and Neighbourhood councils with democratic credibility some devolved planning powers to give local residents some influence on what is to happen in their local communities. Is there any real recognition of this in the Plan? Community wellbeing and inclusive community spirit would be increased if local residents particularly in rural parishes, felt that did have some real influence over what happens in and to their community that their family members could live in their home village maintaining the community and familial networks which will underpin the future care of the elderly. Wellbeing is more than participation in health activities. Explain to parishes and the people the opportunities that are now available to them. Parish Plans have to be in broad conformity with the District Plan and a proportion of any development levy from development in their parish has to be transferred to them.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. These issues are 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