

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

Chapter_Name: 06 Housing

Response_Number: 4 Persons_Name: Carol M Burton Representing_Who?: Herself

Respondents_Comments: Officer_Response: Officer_Recommendation:

The plan to put new housing in one large block does not seem ideal, especially if the block is remote from the life of the town centre. I would rather see it broken up into smaller blocks on Brownfield sites and to this end I would be glad to see greater use of compulsory purchase where sites are derelict and no longer serving a useful purpose. Railway land springs to mind and also large sites containing the most ugly derelict buildings, e.g. that dreadful old post office building in the Crescent opposite the Free Press. One further thought: - rural areas around here are dotted with no longer needed farm yard complexes of considerable size. These are large enough to make space for complete new mini villages and would do something to alleviate pressure for new housing in town.

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Given the level of housing that is required to be delivered over the plan period there is a need for significant greenfield development at Spalding in the form of an urban extension. Furthermore, the need to control residential development is also adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 12 Persons_Name: Mark Price Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments: Officer_Response: Officer_Recommendation:

In Boston town there are many properties empty that could be put into housing use. There should not be a policy of converting fields into Housing Estates.

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Given the level of housing that is required to be delivered over the plan period there is a need for significant greenfield development at Boston in the form of an urban extension.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

14

Persons_Name:

Hilda Gilding

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

My concern is that the existing primary school in Abbey Road (Swineshead) will pose a greater threat to parking and through traffic, as it is not ideal and potentially dangerous to all who use the school. Also the school will be nowhere big enough if more housing near the Almshouses and Cragg Close goes ahead. There maybe noise issues if the school has to be extended nearer to the alms houses as the tenants are all well past pensionable age and enjoy their peaceful surroundings.

Officer_Response:

Infrastructure in it's entirety 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

18

Persons_Name:

Mr Des Ford

Representing_Who?:

D Brown Builders

Respondents_Comments:

1. The provision of social housing in south Holland at 1 in 3 is preventing a lot of housing schemes getting of the ground. You should alter it to 1 in 5 as per the Boston area when you take into account the other building measures that planning requires such as 10% renewable etc and the landowners expectations then schemes cannot start. Maybe a temporary 2/3 year relaxation would be a possibility. Viability reports to demonstrate that schemes should achieve less are another pre planning permission cost that prevents investment into such schemes.
2. The affordable requirement at 1.3 ratio is too high other areas such as fenland, kings Lynn, Boston all have a lesser provision.
3. There is an ideal opportunity to create accommodation in the countryside by relaxing the residential aspect in relation to farm buildings. Again we seem to be out on a limb in south Holland when it comes to residential development.
The plan can help stimulate the construction industry a major economic player in the area. Some measures which if time limited would stimulate the process.

Officer_Response:

1 and 2) A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.
3) The need to control residential development in the countryside has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

19

Persons_Name:

Mr Des Ford

Representing_Who?:

D Brown Builders

Respondents_Comments:

The separation of each settlement and the allocation of properties that can be built is inadequate for the period of years the plan refers to. Development should be allowed in all villages within the district. The determining factors should be focused on the style and quality of the build . i.e. materials and what the building will deliver in terms of character for the village it is in.

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

28

Persons_Name:

Tracey Meachen

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

No objections to the proposals for the Pinchbeck area. Information concise. Will not impact on village itself.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

29

Persons_Name:

Tracey Meachen

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

No objections to the proposals for the Pinchbeck area. Information concise. Will not impact on village itself.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

34

Persons_Name:

Mrs J R Cooke

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

With regard to the number of new houses to be built around Spalding, does anyone at the Council have any idea how difficult it is for those of us who have lived in the area our whole lives to get an appointment with our doctor NOW?

Officer_Response:

Infrastructure in it's entirety 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

37

Persons_Name:

W Smith

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

The proposed new areas for housing development seem logical. The provision of a new relief road is very welcome as previous plans for past construction as far as Bourne Road would have inevitably led to more traffic (especially heavy traffic) on Wygate Park. This would have been further exacerbated by the proposed rail hub and increased rail traffic. In the meantime, in view of the proximity of schools and play areas, speed/weight limits on Wygate Park need reviewing.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

44

Persons_Name:

Martin Bagshaw

Representing_Who?:

Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy

Respondents_Comments:

Proposals to focus development on Spalding with a secondary focus on Holbeach as the second largest settlement in South Holland are broadly supported by our client. It is however suggested that Holbeach, as a Main Service Centre is capable of accommodating additional housing numbers should the results of an objectively assessed housing needs survey for the South Holland area dictate an increased requirement. There is considered to be no justification to support the provision that nearly two thirds of the housing requirement in the plan period be provided in Spalding and despite the indication that the SHLAA may identify land which is potentially available to deliver that level of development there is no guarantee that the individual dwellings will be delivered to the scale proposed.

It is therefore our clients considered opinion that at least an additional 200 dwellings should be accommodated within Holbeach in the plan period where there are sites similarly identified in the SHLAA to accommodate the additional development. The previous level of housing requirement has not necessarily been commensurate with its role as the second largest settlement and therefore further opportunity for growth should now be acknowledged and encouraged in this plan period.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

45

Persons_Name:

Martin Bagshaw

Representing_Who?:

Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy

Respondents_Comments:

Proposals to focus development on Spalding with a secondary focus on Holbeach as the second largest settlement in South Holland are broadly supported by our client. It is however suggested that Holbeach, as a Main Service Centre is capable of accommodating additional housing numbers should the results of an objectively assessed housing needs survey for the South Holland area dictate an increased requirement. There is considered to be no justification to support the provision that nearly two thirds of the housing requirement in the plan period be provided in Spalding and despite the indication that the SHLAA may identify land which is potentially available to deliver that level of development there is no guarantee that the individual dwellings will be delivered to the scale proposed.

It is therefore our clients considered opinion that at least an additional 200 dwellings should be accommodated within Holbeach in the plan period where there are sites similarly identified in the SHLAA to accommodate the additional development. The previous level of housing requirement has not necessarily been commensurate with its role as the second largest settlement and therefore further opportunity for growth should now be acknowledged and encouraged in this plan period.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

46

Persons_Name:

Martin Bagshaw

Representing_Who?:

Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy

Respondents_Comments:

Our client objects to proposals to phase housing land delivery by back-loading delivery to the latter part of the plan period. Whilst it is accepted that the economy is having an influence, it is important to plan positively to boost significantly the supply of housing in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. Our client would be pleased if these comments could be given due consideration in progressing the preparation of the Local Plan and as such we would appreciate confirmation of receipt and being informed on the further stages in the process of preparing the Local Plan.

Officer_Response:

The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

47

Persons_Name:

Martin Bagshaw

Representing_Who?:

Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy

Respondents_Comments:

Our client objects to proposals to phase housing land delivery by back-loading delivery to the latter part of the plan period. Whilst it is accepted that the economy is having an influence, it is important to plan positively to boost significantly the supply of housing in accordance with Paragraph 47 of the NPPF. Our client would be pleased if these comments could be given due consideration in progressing the preparation of the Local Plan and as such we would appreciate confirmation of receipt and being informed on the further stages in the process of preparing the Local Plan.

Officer_Response:

The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

51

Persons_Name:

Mrs J Hill

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

Judging by the number of new homes that are planned for this area, a great deal of land is going to be required but I could not find anything explaining what land will be used so I can only assume it will be farmland. If this is the case then this is something I would oppose most strongly.

You mentioned land west of Spalding. All that land is prime farming land and where a much opposed wind farm is proposed.

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Given the level of housing that is required to be delivered over the plan period there is a need for significant greenfield development at Spalding in the form of an urban extension.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

54

Persons_Name:

Mrs J Hill

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

Your criteria for a satisfactory traveller site does not take into account the lack of suitable sites. South Holland Council have so far taken some 9 years to find suitable a site for one illegal traveller, which is still not resolved, after taking some 8 years to expensively find site for another.

Again you are saying that such sites should be well-related to local services and at the same time respect the scale of the nearest settled community. This is simply not possible since settled communities are already built around such amenities, that is sensible planning. How can you then plan to impose traveller sites within the same areas. Commonsense should tell you that such sites will always impinge on the settled communities and also will place undue pressure on the local infrastructure.

Nothing is said about the settled communities and their wishes which are, once again, totally ignored since they have no say in the matter. It is well known that once a travellers site moves near to a settled community the value of property is greatly reduced, this is not bigotry or anti-traveller, this is a pure and simply fact. Any estate agent will tell you this is correct.

Have you even asked the travelling community where they would like sites to be located. Usually they are not too concerned about being "near to local facilities" since, as their name implies, they are used to travelling but prefer to live in caravans rather than bricks and mortar. So before imposing all these conditions relating to the placement of these sites, talk to the travellers and get some input from the settled community as well who should be taken into consideration.

Officer_Response:

This issue is adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. We are duty bound to address under provision and maintain an appropriate level of supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

55

Persons_Name:

Andy Fisher

Representing_Who?:

Boston BC Housing

Respondents_Comments:

1. Boston Contributions – whilst the current EVA shows 20% as a current maximum, the plan will outlive the EVA so I would suggest a Boston requirement of one third, negotiating accordingly, especially given that we say that we will use the most up to date assessment of housing need.
2. In respect of any ‘off site contribution’, the developer should provide sound evidence and proposals for an exceptional approach to be taken (including a robust open book financial model) which will be considered and scrutinised by the Authority. Although the Authority has a vested interest in securing affordable housing, there is a real danger (as experience tells us!) that developers submit poor quality and poorly justified reasons why schemes can’t deliver anything and leave it to the Authority to provide the evidence and challenge.
3. Rural exception sites should be considered adjacent to any settlement that meets the tests set out within the consultation document at page 15; we should not limit ourselves to Main Service Centres and Service Villages only.
4. Whilst I agree that some exception sites will need an element of market housing to make them viable, we should be setting the maximum amount of market housing at 40% as the drafted 50/50 split masks that the driver for exceptions development is the need for social housing and not large private houses in the countryside!
5. Only single dwellings should be exempt from making a contribution towards affordable housing. Lifting Boston’s affordable housing contribution to ‘one third’ of dwellings (as set out at point 1 above) would then support a simple financial contribution for anyone wanting to develop a pair of houses. Clearly we need to work in partnership with developers and take a real enabling role, however, we must not

Officer_Response:

- 1, 2 and 5) A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.
- 3 and 4) The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes and the consideration of a lower maximum percentage of market housing on rural exception schemes are not issues that have been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options Document. As such, both of these represent new options for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

forget (most) developers are private businesses. Even in the difficult times we face now, I've never seen a developer roll up to one of our meetings in a hundred thousand mile six year old Ford Mondeo!

Response_Number: 58	Persons_Name: Cllr F Biggadike	Representing_Who?: Himself
Respondents_Comments: I think that these figures are about right. 1,000 homes in Holbeach up to 2031 is adequate but we will need extra medical facilities to accommodate the growth. I think the current allocation would be suitable to accommodate some of this growth	Officer_Response: Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation: Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 59	Persons_Name: Cllr F Biggadike	Representing_Who?: Himself
Respondents_Comments: I think rather than providing a max of 25 dwellings in Tydd St Mary these should go to Weston and Whaplode because of the closer proximity that they have to Spalding/Holbeach.	Officer_Response: Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation: These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

60

Persons_Name:

Cllr F Biggadike

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

I do not think the one third of total dwellings should be set in stone because some developments cost more to do than others and it could make them unviable.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

61

Persons_Name:

Stuart Horton

Representing_Who?:

Boston BC Housing

Respondents_Comments:

Yes – However please see my response to Q 40 below

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

62

Persons_Name:

Stuart Horton

Representing_Who?:

Boston BC Housing

Respondents_Comments:

Unless there is a fixed agreed standard charge (or simple agreed calculation) for offsite contributions it would be extremely time consuming to negotiate an affordable housing contribution from proposals for very small sites of only 1 or 2 dwellings as it would need to be a financial contribution for offsite provision. This would also be the case in Boston Borough for sites of only 3 or 4 dwellings because of the proportion of affordable housing contribution proposed for Boston Borough (20%) and although financial contributions from these sites would be very welcome, to support the delivery of affordable housing on other sites, consideration needs to be given as to how this can be agreed with applicants without taking up considerable officer time negotiating.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

63

Persons_Name:

Stuart Horton

Representing_Who?:

Boston BC Housing

Respondents_Comments:

Although the proposed level of contribution for Boston Borough is supported by current viability information we need to make sure that it is regularly updated / reviewed to ensure that we maximise affordable housing delivery when the housing market improves/recovers. Alternatively we should seek a higher contribution (25% or keep the current 30%) but implement the flexible approach proposed to allow us to reduce the level of contribution sought by agreement on a case by case basis. This will ensure that we maximise the delivery of affordable housing as the market changes/ improves without the need to update and change our policy frequently.

Although I agree with a flexible approach the proposed affordable housing contribution required for Boston Borough should not, unless there are very exceptional circumstances, be negotiated below 20% as we are supposed to be developing new housing to meet local needs, a significant proportion of which (50% +) is for affordable housing as identified in the Coastal Lincolnshire SHMA. The policy currently seems to give the impression that in Boston Borough we are starting at a 20% requirement but that this is an open door to reduce.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

64

Persons_Name:

Stuart Horton

Representing_Who?:

Boston BC Housing

Respondents_Comments:

Rural exception sites should not just be restricted to main service centres and service villages but should also be permitted in other settlements where there is strong evidence of local need. However, although I agree that an element of market housing should be permitted to cross subsidise the development, the maximum of 50% market housing is a little too high for an exception site and should be limited to 35 or 40%. With a potential element of intermediate (shared ownership) affordable housing making up some of the affordable housing this should be sufficient to help ensure delivery and that the exception site is being developed to meet local housing need.

Officer_Response:

The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes and the consideration of a lower maximum percentage of market housing on rural exception schemes are not issues that have been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, both of these represent new options for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

65

Persons_Name:

Stuart Horton

Representing_Who?:

Boston BC Housing

Respondents_Comments:

As in my responses to the questions above I would:

1. Seek a higher contribution for Boston Borough than the 20% proposed (25% or keep the current 30%) but implement the flexible approach to allow us to reduce the level of contribution sought by agreement on a case by case basis. This will ensure that we maximise the delivery of affordable housing as the market changes/ improves without the need to update and change our policy frequently. It should also help ensure that we meet the need for affordable housing for Boston Borough identified in the Coastal Lincolnshire SHMA and that housing is actually developed to meet local need.
2. Limit the maximum percentage of market housing to 35% or 40% on exception sites. (With a potential element of intermediate (shared ownership) affordable housing making up part of the affordable housing this should be sufficient to help ensure delivery and that the exception site is being developed to meet local housing need).
3. Unless an agreed standard sum or method of calculation is set and agreed with developers as part of the policy it may be worth considering increasing the threshold for the number of dwellings exempt from making a contribution in Boston Borough to a slightly higher level, in line with the proportion of affordable housing to be sought, to avoid protracted negotiations between applicants and the Council about commuted sums. (As much as it pains me to miss out on any contribution to affordable housing I am concerned that it could be very time consuming to pursue this along with the other proposals)

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy that considers a lower maximum percentage of market housing on rural exception schemes is not 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

66

Persons_Name:

Stuart Horton

Representing_Who?:

Boston BC Housing

Respondents_Comments:

In addition to the assessments already undertaken to assess the suitability of the broad location for housing development around Boston it may be worthwhile conducting an Economic Viability Assessment on the most reasonable options/sites to assess what they require and may be able to contribute depending on the level of the market over the likely forecast delivery timeframe. As well as providing information on what the site may be able to contribute e.g. affordable housing etc, this would provide further evidence to support the most appropriate site/s.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform what the site can contribute in terms of supporting infrastructure.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:	70	Persons_Name:	Natural England	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	<p>We note that in figure 6.1 the potential areas for housing are indicated. For Boston we would draw your attention to several sites of nature conservation interest within the marked area. There are three Local Wildlife Sites: South Forty Foot Drain; Botolph's Park Pond and Tytton Lane West Pitts. In addition there are areas of coastal and floodplain grazing marshes which are a BAP priority habitat. If this area is developed these areas should be incorporated into the green infrastructure network with sufficient buffer zones so that their nature conservation interest is protected. The identified housing area for Spalding is close to Vernatt's Drain which is a Local Wildlife Site. There are also small patches of coastal and floodplain grazing marsh which are a BAP priority habitat. If this site is developed these areas should be incorporated within the Green Infrastructure network.</p> <p>We note that paragraph 6.87.3 acknowledges that there is potential for both of these housing areas to have a significant effect on European sites and should therefore be screened by the Habitats Regulations Assessment process.</p>	Officer_Response:	The Local Plan has been assessed through the HRA process and the Natural Environment policy amended.	Officer Recommendation:	Objection - changes within draft Local Plan

Response_Number:	83	Persons_Name:	Mr R Haynes	Representing_Who?:	Parkinson's
Respondents_Comments:	<p>I refer to our telephone conversation of today concerning the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Consultation, a strategy that I support. I would wish to propose the parcel of land Title number: LL196618 which has been previously proposed in SHLAA ref: SOU002. Access provision was incorporated for this land in the design by Chestnut Homes when they re-developed the Old Wyberton Road dairy. I trust this layman's reply is fit for purpose.</p>	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

84

Persons_Name:

Mrs E Portass

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

The percentage of affordable housing on new sites should at least be in line with the "Government Guidelines", and in line with those proposed in Boston Borough i.e. 20% or 1 in 5 affordable homes on new sites.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

108

Persons_Name:

Mr R Neve

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Affordable housing should be brought in line with Government proposals and the same as Boston Borough Council i.e. 20% or one in five.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

<u>Response_Number:</u>	110	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Miss Sally A Minns	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Herself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>I believe that the proposed location for housing development at Boston would wipe out an area of natural beauty, and wildlife habitation unnecessarily. Within the proposed area there is grassland and mature hedgerows. This is one of the few areas around Boston which contains such habitats, and it should not be destroyed for housing when there are other areas that could be developed.</p> <p>The proposed development site also has a poor network of roads, and I believe the development would be better placed between the new A16 and the River Haven, extending along the road to Wyberton East, or between the \a16 and A52 to the north.</p> <p>If the proposed area is developed then all the existing hedgerows should be retained and building should only take place on existing farmed agricultural land, not grassland.</p>		<p>Following consideration of the representation, further work will be required on broad locations for housing growth in Boston.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	112	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Bird	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>Having attended the exhibition at Crowland I was not happy with the proposed housing plots/sites in the area being sporadically placed.</p> <p>I believe future housing expansion should occur along highways from Crowland expanding from existing developments so as to reduce vehicle movements from home to services and keep them within (as near as possible) the existing built up area.</p> <p>I was also unhappy that land owners were going to profit from land sale direct to builders and developers. I believe the council should purchase this land first at agricultural rates, selling it to builders and developers at a profit to regional rate payers at large.</p>		<p>The site selection process for sites in Crowland are evidenced in the Housing papers and the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>There are no mechanisms whereby Local Authorities can acquire development land as suggested or control who benefits in financial terms</p>		<p>Objection - site selection work to be taken forward in the Local Plan</p>	

Response_Number:

113

Persons_Name:

Mr C Shepherdson

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Whilst appreciating that the terms of reference for the plan were set by government I think it is inadvisable to consider possible building sites in isolation. Obviously I do not know all the locations listed but I do have concerns about the one that I do have some knowledge of, i.e. the land west of Horncastle Road, Boston. From my address you will gather I have some interest in the future use of this site.

I can remember that only a few years ago (2007?) the local plan for Boston included a section of the cemetery and crematorium which indicated that the former was filling up rapidly and would need to be extended. It was proposed that the land north of Red Cap Lane and west of Horncastle Road be reserved for that purpose. So if up to 150 houses are to be built on this land could you please advise me where the cemetery extension is to be situated? It would seem obvious that if a cemetery extension is going to be necessary within the next decade this site is the ideal place.

Officer_Response:

Sire selection work has been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and is evidenced in the Housing papers

Discussions have also taken place with regard to the need to extend the cemetery. No formal proposals have been made with regard to this.

Officer_Recommendation:

No change to the plan is recommended.

Response_Number:

114

Persons_Name:

Mr A Carrott

Representing_Who?:

Witham Forth IDB

Respondents_Comments:

Further to the recent meeting and your email below please note the following comments in respect to possible development areas within our catchment. I am aware that these locations have been excluded from your initial determination of suitable locations but these comments may be of use should those decisions be re-visited.

B1 – drainage infrastructure improvements required and benefit from proximity of IDB watercourses and a good outfall (Cowbridge Drain)

B2 - no existing IDB infrastructure (outfall to EA Maud Foster?)

B3 - drainage infrastructure improvements required and benefit from proximity of IDB watercourses and a good outfall (Cowbridge Drain)

B4 – existing IDB infrastructure can support no more development. Major drainage infrastructure improvements required as no convenient outfall (most difficult all the proposed sites in our area to drain)

B5 – existing capacity within IDB system to receive attenuated flows

B11 – no existing IDB infrastructure (outfall to EA River Witham?)

Infrastructure improvements could take 2 to 4 years from first discussions through design and modelling to completion depending on size. It's a real ball park guesstimate but costs could range from £50,000 (B1, B3) to £250,000 (B4, especially if road openings are required for new culverts). Responsibility for delivery – developer and/or Board (depends on scale and type of project). For the bigger schemes the Board would have to look seriously at the areas of benefit and consider partial funding of projects however I suspect that would depend on the Borough's long term plans for development. For example a scheme to provide

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representation, further work will be required on broad locations for housing growth in Boston.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

adequate drainage for area B4 would be very expensive. It may be that Board contribution or even grant aid funding could be sought if a scheme was also able to benefit B2 and B3 at the same time, however that requires a commitment by the BBC to developing a significant area north east of Boston.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	122	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Hollie Howe	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	St John's College
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We support the apportionment of 1,000 dwellings to Holbeach. However we believe that further windfall sites should be allowed to come forward, if they meet the site allocations criteria. As part of this, we believe that land off of Branches Lane and land off of Barrington Gate should be considered as site options, as shown on the attached site location plans. This will help support Holbeach's role as a Main Service Centre.	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number:

123

Persons_Name:

Freya Trotman

Representing_Who?:

S Pratt and J Haresign

Respondents_Comments:

The proposed site my clients have offered for development is off Wagnall's Gate in Holbeach. I note from your Distribution and Scales of Housing Development that Spalding has an allocation of 6000 dwellings and Holbeach only 1000. There is already massive development in Spalding. Holbeach presently has very little low cost housing available, consequently there are few let properties and so what could be a thriving town is being strangled by lack of investment, housing, provision of facilities in transport etc. The high street shops are struggling through lack of strategic planning. I most strongly the planning office to consider this. Holbeach is ideally placed on the natural silt ridge to provide housing on low flood risk land. The Wagnall's Gate site has good access to all amenities, shops, transport, roads, utilities, schools etc.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

126

Persons_Name:

Freya Trotman

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

There are many existing buildings within the settlement boundaries which are unused and could be ideal for redevelopment. Could some of these be compulsorily purchased with a view to develop and the owners be given a share back of the profits from development. It makes sense to fully utilise what already exists rather than building massive developments on town margins. Some of these could be community projects helping the unemployed back into work and teaching young unemployed new job skills or even used for apprenticeship training if local colleges got involved. Apart from building our way out of a recession it would give local people back pride in their towns and provide a mutual sense of community spirit. I feel it is something most people actually aspire to being part of, but in such an ethnically unique culture as we have in this area, sadly the locals and the migrant populations tend not to mix freely and consequently build up suspicion and resentment.

Officer_Response:

The acquisition of land and buildings by a Local Authority is a possibility but not a significant measure by which Local Plans can meet Objectively Assessed Housing Needs. Some sites which have been considered by the site selection process are previously developed land or sites that have building on them that might be suitable for re-use.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	141	Persons_Name:	Mr J S Birkett	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>There appears to be a considerable imbalance between proposed development in Boston and in Spalding, bearing in mind that between 2001 and 2011, the increase in population was slightly higher in Boston than in South Holland. The figures on your table show that currently there is more house building activity in Boston than in Spalding (although that is for a very limited period). It is understood that the main reason for this imbalance, allocating twice as much development in the smaller town than the larger, is the flood risk situation. But flood risk is only one factor of many to be taken into account. It is a very important factor, but does appear to be driving decision making almost single handedly, wielding far more weight than any other planning considerations, or set of considerations. In any future documents this will need to be carefully and explicitly justified in some detail. I would reiterate my opinion that demand for housing in Boston cannot be successfully diverted to Spalding</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.</p> <p>'At the meeting of the Joint Committee on 25 November, officers updated their response by reporting a new concern about the need to increase housing provision in both Boston Borough and South Holland District in the light of new household projections. As a consequence of this action, it would be necessary to reconsider the nature of the cap on housing development in the ROY zones.'</p> <p>These Considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>	Officer Recommendation:	<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>

Response_Number:	142	Persons_Name:	Mr J S Birkett	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>The notion that very small villages, almost without any services, should be designated as 'service villages', simply because of a low flood hazard, is nonsensical. This is not sustainable. Anyone living in Algarkirk needs to travel for every service (except for an occasional Anglican church service). The choice of service villages should be based primarily on the presence of a (specified) range of services.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.16 which explains that this approach is required to deliver the 'cap'. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.</p>	Officer Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>

Response_Number:

143

Persons_Name:

Mr J S Birkett

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

I would suggest a further clause be added to the policy on rural exception schemes:
'the identified site needs to be well located to the settlement visually and in terms of access to services'.
Not all sites adjoining the boundary of a settlement are going to be suitable, and this clause would give the opportunity for some discretion.

Officer_Response:

The draft policy includes clauses with regard to "adjoining the defined settlement boundaries," "scale of the development" and "in keeping with the role and function of the settlement".

Specific site considerations would be material issues of other policies e.g. The Development Management Policy.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.

Response_Number:

158

Persons_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr S Harris

Respondents_Comments:

Page 145. Para's 6.81.2 & 6.85 state that Option A is preferred. Treating dwelling no's as minimum requirements.
This is supported.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

159

Persons_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr S Harris

Respondents_Comments:

The cap of 25 dwelling in any one service village is unhelpful to the practical planning of each area. Sites need first to be allocated then a number established. The number '25' is a false creation that is only convenient for statistical assessment. Objection as we think you should remove the cap of 25 houses, and consider additional allowances for 'other rural settlements' .

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

160

Persons_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr S Harris

Respondents_Comments:

Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be. Until additional locations are presented, the table in 6.87 (distribution of housing) cannot be verified to see if it is realistic.

Officer_Response:

The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	161	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Mr S Harris
Respondents_Comments:	Certain larger sites should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. Main Road Nursery, Drove Road, Holbeach Drove PE12 OPS should be allocated for housing . A preliminary report is attached on the site. The principle of this new allocation is sound. This site is generally part of a settlement where substantial new housing is appropriate.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.
	The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the site's suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide.				

Response_Number:	172	Persons_Name:	Gregory Gray Associates	Representing_Who?:	The Garden Centre Group
Respondents_Comments:	Q28 Distribution and Scale of Housing Development The preferred policy approach contains proposed housing allocation figures for several individual settlements, including a total of 300 units for Crowland. Given the fact that Crowland is outside the ROY zones, and that its existing size as a main service centre means that it supports a good range of existing facilities, it is considered entirely appropriate that Crowland support a significant number of new dwellings. It is noted that a significant proportion of these could be provided on my client's site which is ideally located in relation to the existing residential area and facilities.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

189

Persons_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr and Mrs Ravell

Respondents_Comments:

Para's 6.81.2 & 6.85 state that Option A is preferred. Treating dwelling no's as minimum requirements. This is supported.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

190

Persons_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr and Mrs Ravell

Respondents_Comments:

Objection. The cap of 25 dwelling in any one service village is unhelpful to the practical planning of each area. Sites need first to be allocated then a number established. The number '25' is a false creation that is only convenient for statistical assessment. Objection as we think you should remove the cap of 25 houses.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	191	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Ravell
Respondents_Comments:	Q27 Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be. Until additional locations are presented, the table in 6.87 (distribution of housing) cannot be verified to see if it is realistic.	Officer_Response:	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	192	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Ravell
Respondents_Comments:	Certain larger sites should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. A major site in Moulton Chapel should be allocated for housing as suits its sustainable position, and two sites are suggested (land off Roman Road and land off Woodgate Road). A preliminary report is attached on these sites. The principle of this new allocation is sound. These sites are generally part of a settlement where substantial new housing is appropriate. The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the sites' suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	198	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners
Respondents_Comments:	Page 145. Para's 6.81.2 & 6.85 state that Option A is preferred. Treating dwelling no's as minimum requirements. This is supported.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	199	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners
Respondents_Comments:	Objection. The cap of 25 dwelling in any one service village is unhelpful to the practical planning of each area. Sites need first to be allocated then a number established. The number '25' is a false creation that is only convenient for statistical assessment. Objection as we think you should remove the cap of 25 houses.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	200	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners
Respondents_Comments:	Q27 Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be. Until additional locations are presented, the table in 6.87 (distribution of housing) cannot be verified to see if it is realistic.	Officer_Response:	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	201	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Spalding Lifestyle owners
Respondents_Comments:	Certain larger sites should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. A major site in Pinchbeck (Spalding Lifestyle) should be allocated for housing as suits its sustainable position and location opposite the new hospital. The principle of this new allocation is sound. This site is generally part of the area where major residential expansion of Spalding is already anticipated in Para 6.87.2. There is no need to retain the site for industrial purposes given the more than ample supply elsewhere. The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the site's suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

203

Persons_Name:

Mr J S Birkett

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

While I do believe that this the south western quadrant of town of Boston is suitable for development in many ways, there is the problem of how to integrate the development into the town's transport system. I suppose it might be possible, when the waterway proposals have been fully developed, to devise a river bus system joining the area to the town centre. But an adequate road system is going to be fundamental, and I anticipate that a road (like the old southern relief road proposal) joining the A52, near chain Bridge, to the former and current A16 roads will be crucial. So crucial in fact that before the Borough Council commits itself to a substantial housing scheme in this area, that question needs to be resolved, or the proposal will eventually need to be abandoned again, just as it was 8 years ago. Substantial new investment in junctions and bridges will be needed where any new road meets the A52/A1121. Also there needs to be an achievable, affordable and effective means of joining with the A16. It will not be acceptable to adopt this proposal and hope that these problems can be resolved at a later date.

Officer_Response:

Infrastructure in it's entirety 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.

Officer Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

207

Persons_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr S Hatter

Respondents_Comments:

Para's 6.81.2 & 6.85 state that Option A is preferred. Treating dwelling no's as minimum requirements. This is supported.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

208

Persons_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr S Hatter

Respondents_Comments:

Objection. The cap of 25 dwelling in any one service village is unhelpful to the practical planning of each area. Sites need first to be allocated then a number established. The number '25' is a false creation that is only convenient for statistical assessment. Objection as we think you should remove the cap of 25 houses, and consider additional allowances for 'other rural settlements' .

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

209

Persons_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr S Hatter

Respondents_Comments:

Q27 Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be.

Officer_Response:

The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	210	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Mr S Hatter
Respondents_Comments:	Certain larger sites should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. This site in Holbeach Drove should be allocated for housing . A preliminary report is attached on the site. In my clients view, the principle of this new allocation is sound. This site is generally part of a settlement where substantial new housing is appropriate The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the sites' suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	211	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Mr Morris Wilson
Respondents_Comments:	Q27 Objection: it is recognised that the document is intended to be broad brush, but it is difficult to see how the distribution of housing will be secured (in table 6.87). A parallel document should have been published to show where the allocated sites are likely to be.	Officer_Response:	The proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	212	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Mr Morris Wilson
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Land at Bridge House, Spalding Common, Spalding, PE11 3AU should be recognised as suitable for development given a need to show how the settlements can advance. This site in Spalding should be allocated for housing.</p> <p>The representation sets out a detailed assessment of the site's suitability for development and the key features that any new housing development would provide. In particular, it is argued that the site could form part of the sustainable urban extension to the west and south of Spalding. It will assist in providing much needed community infrastructure and affordable housing for the town. Certainty is offered that that the land in question will come forward, so that the necessary infrastructure can be properly planned and implemented in a logical and economic manner. The identification of the present site as housing land is desirable as an integral part of promoting sustainable and properly planned urban extensions.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>

Response_Number:	213	Persons_Name:	Mr G Smith	Representing_Who?:	Mr Morris Wilson
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Overreliance on too few new allocations within Spalding itself. A small number of large allocations will result in too much new development being under the control of a limited number of developers. Diversity of ownership will ensure that implementation is not restricted to a few landowners, whilst still securing a comprehensiveness of approach. The Holland Park development (Appendix 3) is one such example of a single owner driven development.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>

Response_Number:	214	Persons_Name:	Mr A R Yarwood	Representing_Who?:	National Federation of Gypsy Liaison
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
1. The policy needs to recognise the need to allocate and/or grant permission for sites in accordance with an up-to-date analysis of need.		This Policy has been subject to revision following changes in national legislation and new assessment work		Objection - Revisions to be made in the draft Local Plan	
2. The criteria should make it clear that it will be used to guide allocations and decisions on applications.					
3. The first criterion does not accord with government guidance in 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' in that criteria for determining applications should be applied irrespective of need. This criterion can only be used in regard to allocation of land for traveller sites, not in relation to the consideration of applications.					
4. The second criterion should not include "employment opportunities" as to qualify as a Gypsy or Traveller, persons must travel for work.					

Response_Number:	220	Persons_Name:	Elizabeth Biott	Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust supports the fifth criterion to ensure that developments of gypsy and traveller sites would not adversely affect areas of importance to nature conservation.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:

231

Persons_Name:

James Daniels

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

The council should adopt Plan B (50 new build houses) for the smaller villages, spreading housing out will reduce traffic congestion. It will also keep the villages vibrant.

Planning permission should be given for locations within, say, 200m of existing sewer, water main, and telephone and electricity mains, to minimise the costs of having to provide services to new houses.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

237

Persons_Name:

Woods Hardwick Planning

Representing_Who?:

Wheatley PLC

Respondents_Comments:

With specific regard to Crowland, the identification of new housing is supported. As the plan highlights, Crowland is free from any coverage by ROY zones and is also identified as a Main Service Centre i.e. a sustainable location for future growth. Part of the evidence base for the plan comprises an Assessment of the Sustainability of Rural Settlements, excluding Boston and Spalding.

Crowland was ranked 5th, providing a number of key services and as such is entirely appropriate to accommodate a significant amount of housing required over the plan period.

The option of identifying 300 homes is therefore supported in principle. However, as argued elsewhere in respect of the plan, higher levels of housing are required over the plan period. It then follows that the respective settlements in the hierarchy should receive a proportionate increase to meet that need.

The unreasonable options identified relate to both lower and higher levels of housing growth. The allocation of a lower level has been rejected as to do so could undermine the role of Crowland as a main service centre and would be inconsistent with levels of growth in the past. This is fully supported as it complies with guidance within the NPPF which seeks to direct growth to such centres to support and increase their level of service provision for the settlement itself and surrounding settlements.

Allocating higher levels of growth has been rejected as a reasonable option on the basis of their relatively lower provision of services and facilities compared to Holbeach. In making this statement it is accepted that Crowland is entirely outside of the ROY zone. Holbeach

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

in comparison lies largely within the ROY zone, the plan proposing 900 of the 1000 dwellings identified within that zone.

In order to support Crowland as a main service centre and facilitate the extension of the facilities that could be offered, it is considered appropriate to increase the numbers of dwellings that could be accommodated within the settlement. The fact that these can be delivered wholly outside the ROY zone further supports this. The SHLAA (2012) also shows that there are a number of sites that could come forward to meet need.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	239	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Woods Hardwick Planning	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Wheatley PLC
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Representations have been made to other sections of the plan stating that an increased level of housing is required. This is supported by recent ONS figures published in May 2013. An overall increase in housing delivery therefore by definition means that each tier within the settlement hierarchy should accommodate a proportionate increase in housing numbers.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Crowland has been identified as the 5th ranked settlement in terms of sustainability and the settlement is also entirely outside of the ROY zone. It is therefore appropriate to allocate additional housing which would further support its role as a service centre.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>

Response_Number:

245

Persons_Name:

Jonathan Ireland

Representing_Who?:

Irelands Farm Machinery

Respondents_Comments:

If the growth potential of Sutterton is recognised (see response number 244) it would require the delivery of an increased number of new houses within Sutterton which may have to exceed the current proposed 300 target on ROY sites within the service villages. This figure is considered to be unnecessarily restrictive for a village like Sutterton. Sutterton would only be likely to receive a limited level of new housing growth which could restrict it's future potential and also reduce it's current sustainability.

It is considered important that the potential of Sutterton, and therefore in all likelihood some other settlements, should be recognised within the spatial approach. This would point towards adopting option B in determining the distribution of development.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

246

Persons_Name:

Jonathan Ireland

Representing_Who?:

Irelands Farm Machinery

Respondents_Comments:

It is accepted that a criteria-based policy approach should be adopted in guiding site allocations. It is not accepted that the level of housing should be capped within ROY zones if the settlement hierarchy is to be adhered to and the relevant site selection criteria are met. The limit to the level of development on ROY sites in a village such a Sutterton could restrict future development with a consequent detrimental impact on the sustainability of the settlement with existing services and facilities coming under economic pressure to remain viable and open. Whilst the principles behind the ROY approach are understood a greater capacity for development on those sites within the most sustainable settlements should be considered as these settlements including Sutterton are likely to remain the most desirable places for people to live in the future given their existing range of facilities and services.

Officer_Response:

The issue of flood hazard, and the requirement and basis for a 'cap' on future development in the ROY zones, has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically sections 4.17-4.22.
'At the meeting of the Joint Committee on 25 November, officers updated their response by reporting a new concern about the need to increase housing provision in both Boston Borough and South Holland District in the light of new household projections. As a consequence of this action, it would be necessary to reconsider the nature of the cap on housing development in the ROY zones.'
These Considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

249

Persons_Name:

Jonathan Ireland

Representing_Who?:

Irelands Farm Machinery

Respondents_Comments:

It is accepted that an affordable housing policy will be included within the Local Plan. It would be expected that the evidence basis for the policy would justify the levels of affordable housing required and the triggers requiring the delivery of affordable housing. In the current economic climate regard should be had to the impact of viability on the deliverability of housing schemes if these triggers are inappropriately set. It is a concern that this would be the case with all schemes of 3 units or more requiring an affordable housing provision. It is considered that this position should be reviewed or be subject to some form of viability criteria or assessment.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

251

Persons_Name:

Lt Colonel D B Burgess

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

The SELLP sets out the strategy for the area for the next twenty years. The Plan recognises the need to protect the environment and character and appearance of local areas.

Bicker, as you are aware, is a small village situated to the west of the A52 between Swineshead and Donington. The village has very little in the way of infrastructure and would not be capable of accommodating a large housing development. There is a village shop and Post Office and very limited transport facilities. There is no school except for a fee-paying primary/preparatory school, the fees for which are beyond the purse of many in the local area. The village has a local restaurant/public house which is a Grade 2 listed building. The building has been renovated by the owner at exceptional cost.

The village has a conservation area which contains all the buildings of historic interest; the public house (Ye Old Red Lion) a 16th century building sits on the eastern boundary of the conservation area adjacent to Bic003.

The Villages Plan for 1999, promulgated by Boston Borough Council, established a restricted building line at the eastern edge of the village overlooking the A52 beyond which no building could take place. By establishing that restricted building line it ensured that the village was set well back from the main road and it also helped maintain its character as a village by not overbuilding. In other words the last major construction of housing, completed c2001, was commensurate with Bicker's standing as a rural village and the number of completed dwellings was absorbed adequately by the local infrastructure. At the same time care was taken to maintain open rural surroundings.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

SELLP set aside seven areas in Bicker as part of the local plan for the next twenty years. Comments on the proposals are as follows:

Bic001 - consider it is feasible for 1 property but not 2

Bic002 - this is meadowland and as such should not be built on as it would affect the character of the area.

Agree with SELLP recommendations.

Bic003 - the comment that it is suitable to build up to 7 properties on what amounts to .86 of an acre, adjacent to the Grade 2 listed Red Lion, the oldest building in Bicker, is fundamentally flawed. Any property constructed on Bic003 would seriously alter the character and setting of this beautiful building and its integrity and stand alone prominence should at all costs be maintained. Additionally any amount of building on Bic003 would not have an acceptable relationship to the existing built up area. It is interesting to note that a planning application for one dwelling to be built on Bic003 in 2004 was rejected by Boston Borough Council for the following reasons:

a. The site is adjacent to a Grade Two Listed Building and from the information supplied the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that a development will result that will not adversely affect its setting. Consequently the proposed is contrary to the Boston Borough Local Plan

b. The proposal is on a site outside the village envelope as identified in the Boston Borough Local Plan. It does not constitute infill development in accordance with Policy CO2 nor is it a dwelling needed for agricultural purposes in accordance with Policy CO4.

Bic004 - the SELLP report suggests that up to 27 homes could be erected on the site but then advises that the scale is inappropriate in scale for a village with a limited scale of services. This is agreed, however equal consideration should have been given to not destroying the outlook of the village by building too far towards the A52. The 1999 Plan adequately positions the forward edge of the building line on Donington Road. It

should remain as such.

Bic005 - its agreed that building on Bic005 is feasible but not in the numbers suggested, fewer properties perhaps 5/6 would best suit the area

Bic006 - the comments on 006 as being too big and unsustainable for a village of this size are agreed

Bic007 - agree with recommendations

Any development on greenfield sites will have an impact on the landscape. The aim of any development in Bicker should be directed toward maintaining the character of the village and protecting and enhancing its environment. Open rural surroundings must be maintained. This can hardly be the case when, without exception, from Bic001 through to Bic007 the total amount of space allocated to construct each proposed dwelling is a little in excess of .12 of an acre.

Bicker, as a small village, must be allowed to retain its character and not be subjected to too much development. The infrastructure in the village would not support more than an additional ten properties. Schooling has to be sought outside the village which will add to the pressure on Primary schools in Swineshead and Donington. Both of these locations will be subjected to an increase in population thus compounding the problem over the availability of school places.

The preservation of the conservation area should be viewed as paramount. The Red Lion Public House, a listed building within the conservation area, should be allowed to stand alone as any attempt to infill, as suggested, with seven properties completely destroy the character and standing of the building on this green field site, bearing in mind that Planning Permission has already been refused and nothing has changed to alter the situation.

It is considered that in a rural environment the

allocation of c .12 of an acre is too small. .12 of an acre would probably suit an Urban environment whereas in the village .20 of an acre would better suit the environment.

Finally, the public transport situation in the village is not good and almost every citizen has to rely on their own mode of transport, with ever increasing fuel costs this poses a problem with commuting for some especially with affordability. The lack of good public transport needs to be borne in mind when building additional properties.

Response_Number:	254	Persons_Name:	Mr A Tunnard	Representing_Who?:	Himself and Mr C Tunnard
Respondents_Comments:	Support the allocation of 420 dwellings in Kirton.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Land reference KIR 010 has been submitted to the SHLAA and has initially been considered Suitable, Available and Achievable. I now own this land along with my brother Mr Charles Tunnard. The SHLAA details may refer to my father Mr J W Tunnard and Mr E Brown who used to own the land and should be updated.

This land can contribute to meeting the 420 dwelling allocation for Kirton.

Response_Number:

256

Persons_Name:

Freiston Parish Council

Representing_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents_Comments:

Freiston is well connected for services and amenities and could support limited housing development on the eastern side of the parish.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

258

Persons_Name:

Richard Burrell

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Affordable housing is already a problem in this and other rural areas. Problem is parking space with most houses having at least one vehicle and visitors in own transport. Where is the work and employment for these occupants?

Officer_Response:

These issues have been addressed adequately in the Preferred Options Document.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	265	Persons_Name:	Mr R Smith	Representing_Who?:	Pedals
Respondents_Comments:	<p>There must be changes to the supporting text relating to the broad location of land for housing development for Spalding. This proposed land is within convenient cycling distance of Spalding's town centre and many of the town's facilities and amenities. However, the Vernatt's Drain, the railway line, and the proposed western relief road all present significant barriers to direct, safe movement between the identified land and the rest of the town. This is likely to result in excessive use of the motor car unless specific provision is made for safe, convenient cycling (and also walking).</p> <p>It is vital at this stage in the planning process to state that the development of this land will need to include the delivery of significant infrastructure to provide cycling links between the development and the rest of the town. This infrastructure is likely to include bridges for cycling over the Vernatt's Drain, the railway line and the western relief road.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Infrastructure in it's entirety 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>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.</p>

Response_Number:	268	Persons_Name:	Sally Waltham	Representing_Who?:	Herself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Agree that additional housing should be restricted to Spalding, Holbeach, service centres and larger villages with development generally not permitted in the countryside i.e. all other settlements</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Support noted.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>

<u>Response_Number:</u>	269	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Sally Waltham	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Herself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>					
Do not agree that Exceptions Sites Planning might be permitted in the countryside since this goes against the overall objective of the plan to permit only sustainable development and the specific draft policy on housing that Exceptions sites should be permitted only as extensions of service centres.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>				
	The Preferred Policy Approach to 'Affordable Housing', specifically in relation to exceptions sites, is adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document and is in general conformity with national policy.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>			
		Objection - No change to the approach is required.			

<u>Response_Number:</u>	270	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Alan Mowton	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>					
We feel that villages like Fosdyke should be included in future development plans for the following reasons: excellent access to the A17 is not a "backwater" remote village has main sewerage, with a capacity of more dwellings to be added excellent and widely used village hall one of the best playing fields in the Borough together with Bowls Club, Football Club, and Social Club - again widely used Marine, boat workshop facilities, which continue to grow strongly Popular public house Best riding and walking facilities- off road- more popular than ever, also cycle route, more children in the village than when the school closed because of development in past Employment opportunities available locally. We feel Fosdyke has excellent opportunity for potential growth if steady future development is allowed.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>				
	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>			
		Objection - No change to the approach is required.			

Response_Number:

271

Persons_Name:

Mr DJ and Mrs HP Bowler

Representing_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents_Comments:

Bicker is a small village with very little in the way of infrastructure and totally incapable of accepting a large housing development. The village has one shop/PO, one pub/restaurant, one private school and one small motor garage. The roads are extremely poor, already busy and could not support extra traffic. The bus service is very limited and there is no trains. Almost everyone has to use a motor vehicle, and existing houses often take 5 years to sell.

Current Proposals.

1 Bic 001. Probably suitable for one property but not two.

2 Bic 002. Grassland which should not be built on but left as open space.

3 Bic 003 Grassland which should not be built on so close to the listed Red Lion pub, also 7 properties on such a small area would seriously alter the character of the present properties. Planning permission for one property on the land was declined in 2004. Subject to severe noise problems from the A 52.

4. Bic 004 Suggestion for up to 27 houses totally inappropriate for Bicker village with very limited infrastructure and services. Far too close to A52.

5. Bic 005 Suggest present proposal acceptable if number of houses reduced to say 5.

6. Bic 006 Suggested development far too big, with all traffic going through the centre of the village, and totally unacceptable.

7. Bic 007 Agree with recommendations.

Conclusion.

The proposal that Bicker should become a service village is seriously flawed. Bicker has in the recent past suffered considerable adverse local development including 13 wind turbines, a massive electricity sub station, and a number of coloured prefabricated houses at Bishops Way, all on agricultural land.

Bicker is also under threat of another three electricity

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

sub stations covering circa 50 acres of agricultural land. Enough is enough, and Bicker should now be excluded from any prospect of more adverse and inappropriate development within the village boundaries in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. Bicker should be classified as countryside in the plan.

Please note that since my previous e-mail it appears that Bicker is to lose its only bus service, which makes it even more imperative that no large scale housing is built in the Bicker parish.

In addition, R.W.E. Has announced that the three new electricity sub stations covering circa 200 acres are to be built in Bicker and all in all the parish cannot stand either more industrial or housing development.

Bicker is an agricultural area for the growing of much needed food supplies, Bicker must be re-classified as countryside.

Response_Number:

272

Persons_Name:

M J Smith

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

You make reference to housing needs but nothing is said about the necessary infrastructure improvements that will have to be undertaken before any building can take place. Where I live I note:

- a) The lack of capacity in the drainage system. From what I have learned the foul sewer capacity is practically on its limit. There is no reference to consultation with the relevant drainage authority. And alongside this where is the funding to prime the costs prior to development?
- b) The road system needs upgrading to cope with increased traffic. This was not done at the time of the A1073/A16 build and yet we now suffer faster and increased numbers of traffic with some very unsafe junctions.
- C) There is room for development particularly on difficult to access land within the villages. But once again the access to and from the sites would have to be laid before development.
- D) Any development should be in keeping with the community and enable the residents to sustain themselves. There must be no repetition of the idiotic siting of the bungalow on the High Road at Weston to the West of Broadgate.
- E) There should be an assessment of the facilities available to residents now, and in the future. On the one hand you highlight the areas dependency on cars but do not, within developments, ensure the retail outlets are available to sustain the villages. This would reduce road usage.

Officer_Response:

Infrastructure in it's entirety 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:	274	Persons_Name:	M J Smith	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Housing should be assessed as appropriate where there is: a) an adequacy of routes for commuters b) an adequacy of drainage c) and adequacy of services in general d) and adequacy of facilities i.e. shopping. So far as Weston is concerned most of the above apply and a moratorium would be appropriate on the grounds of limits safe vehicular routes and drainage, until such times as improvements are made.	Officer_Response:	Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	289	Persons_Name:	Antony Aspbury Associates	Representing_Who?:	Lincolnshire Diocese
Respondents_Comments:	We support the basic approach to identifying the Distribution of Housing Development across South East Lincolnshire. However, as set out in our responses to Questions 10 and 11 we consider that the starting point of the overall housing provision is too low and does not appear to adequately address issues such as levels of high in-migration.	Officer_Response:	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

290

Persons_Name:

Antony Aspbury Associates

Representing_Who?:

Lincolnshire Diocese

Respondents_Comments:

To be consistent with our response to the previous question (and Questions 10/11), the specific figures for the individual settlements are too low. However in terms of the proportion of the housing to be allocated to these settlements relative to the overall provision, we would not object to this balance of distribution.

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

291

Persons_Name:

Antony Aspbury Associates

Representing_Who?:

Lincolnshire Diocese

Respondents_Comments:

We support this approach. Infill and conversion opportunities are an appropriate level of development for these unnamed settlements below Service Village level.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	292	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Antony Aspbury Associates	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Lincolnshire Diocese
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>				
We support this approach. These are potentially the sustainable supporting centres within Boston Borough going forward into the future in terms of minimal flood risk and capacity and so planned growth for supporting facilities should also be a consideration in land use terms. In the same context we feel that the restriction of development within the South Holland Service Villages to a maximum of 25 dwellings is too low a ceiling for these settlements. We would prefer the option with higher ceiling figure of a maximum of 50 dwellings applied subject of course to a critical assessment of the capacity and sustainability of the individual Service.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.				
	<u>Officer Recommendation:</u>				
	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.				

<u>Response_Number:</u>	293	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Antony Aspbury Associates	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Lincolnshire Diocese
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>				
We would wish to see an increase in the baseline housing provision for South East Lincolnshire and pre-rata increases in the proportion of housing allocated to the respective settlements in the hierarchy. We would wish to see the maximum housing provision cap for the South Holland Service Villages increased. With the exception of the ROY village sites where a cap on provision is justified, we do not see any justification in a ceiling or capping of provision in other non-ROY settlements (such as is proposed in the South Holland Service Villages. The Provision for Housing 'policy' sets out a provision for a net increase of at least 13,920 dwellings and so the emerging policy of scale and distribution of housing should be consistent in setting a minimum figure (excepting the justified stance on ROY settlements)	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.				
	<u>Officer Recommendation:</u>				
	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.				

Response_Number:

294

Persons_Name:

Antony Aspbury Associates

Representing_Who?:

Lincolnshire Diocese

Respondents_Comments:

We support the approach to and the outcome of the appraisal indicating that identifying a broad location for growth for Boston is the preferred option. With the significant scale of development proposed for the town and the inherent constraints of flood risk ,it is a sensible approach to seek to identify the most appropriate locations having due regard to delivery and flood risk issues.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

295

Persons_Name:

Antony Aspbury Associates

Representing_Who?:

Lincolnshire Diocese

Respondents_Comments:

We have no evidence to question the preferred broad location for growth for Boston yet note that this accommodates only 1900 dwellings of the proposed requirements for the town. We would question the need for an additional large scale broad location for growth and consider that the residual housing requirement could be distributed around the town at site allocation stage, having due regard to flood risk and other delivery considerations.

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

296

Persons_Name:

Antony Aspbury Associates

Representing_Who?:

Lincolnshire Diocese

Respondents_Comments:

We support the Rural Exception Policy and consider that rural exception schemes could be extended beyond the current restrictions to Main Service Centres and Service Villages. We do not consider that exception schemes should be permitted in unsustainable countryside villages yet there are opportunities within the outlier settlements close to the Sub -Regional centres which are relatively accessible to services and facilities within Boston and Spalding. Settlements such as Wyberton, which are defined as part of the Boston area, yet separate from it, would be a classic example of an additional settlement where an exception scheme could potentially be developed.

Within the towns themselves, some consideration would need to be given to setting a maximum threshold site size where this policy would apply at the edge of the urban area. There is a danger however that urban exception sites (promoted with elements of cross subsidy from market housing), could potentially threaten the delivery and viability of allocated housing sites.

Officer_Response:

The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

299

Persons_Name:

Peacock & Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr R Hardy

Respondents_Comments:

We consider that it is necessary for a large percentage of the overall housing requirement for Boston Borough to be located within Boston itself, thereby reflecting its role as a Sub-Regional Centre. Our client considers that the preferred provision of 2,900 additional dwellings in Boston itself is a level that is commensurate with its role and can be reasonably and successfully delivered.

It is also appropriate that all of the housing requirement in Boston can be provided on ROY sites. It is encouraging that the Joint Committee acknowledges that the majority of Boston is within ROY Zones and therefore the entire settlement is at risk of flooding to a lesser or greater degree depending on the specific location.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

300

Persons_Name:

Peacock & Smith

Representing_Who?:

Mr R Hardy

Respondents_Comments:

As stated above, our client is in control of the land that forms the site to the south of Wainfleet Road in Boston. It is understood that this broad location was assessed (potential location B4) for its potential to accommodate a strategically significant amount of housing development required to contribute to the need to provide 2,900 additional dwellings in Boston over the Plan period to 2031.

Appendix 12 of the Preferred Options document provides an appraisal of each of the considered broad locations for housing development and seeks to rate them against a number of criteria. It then comes to a conclusion as to which broad location is a reasonable option for moving forward.

Our client's site has previously been put forward through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA, September 2012) process as Site FIS017 (Land to the south of Wainfleet Road, Boston) (an extract from the SHLAA document is attached for reference). The site proforma attached to the Draft Findings of the SHLAA (September 2012) states that this site covers a total of 76.81ha and is capable of accommodating 2,300 dwellings.

Our client notes that Appendix 12 of the Preferred Options document states that the broad location identified as 'land to the south of Wainfleet Road' only covers an area of 8.12ha of deliverable land. Accordingly, our client would like to provide further up-to-dated information about the status, suitability, deliverability and availability of the site, along with details of how we consider the site would successfully contribute to the identified housing requirement in Boston.

Availability and Deliverability

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of this representation, it is evident that further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

The site (in excess of 180 acres) is available for development and is capable of accommodating up to 2,300 dwellings. The entire site is under the sole control of our client. Furthermore, Mr Hardy has been in contact with Lindum Homes, part of Lindum Group Ltd, who has shown interest in developing the site for housing. Discussions are on-going with Lindum Homes and our client will endeavour to update the Council as soon as further progress is made.

Given that the entire site is under the sole control of Mr Hardy, the ability of the site to come forward will not be hampered by the need to assemble numerous plots of land.

Furthermore, our client acknowledges that a site of this scale would require development phasing over a number of years, however the land is in principle available immediately for development.

We consider that the site is clearly available for development given that the majority is under the ownership of our client and given that interest has been received from a known house builder and live discussions are underway, the site is also considered to be deliverable. We consider this broad location therefore complies with the size (1,000+ dwellings) and deliverability tests as set out at Appendix 12.

Flood Risk

Appendix 12 goes on to assess each of the broad locations against flood risk criteria. The broad location of our client's site is considered to have a predominantly medium (some low) relative probability of tidal flooding and a low relative probability of fluvial flooding.

Although our client's site does not have the least

potential for flooding out of the assessed broad locations, it is by no means the worst. There are 3 sites that have been identified as having a medium relative probability of tidal flooding and some have a worse probability of fluvial flooding.

When considering the larger potential locations for growth (those capable of accommodating 1,000+ dwellings), our site sits favourably in terms of flood risk, with the exception of potential location B8, which is the preferred location for growth.

Our client acknowledges the challenges faced with areas of flood risk, however this assessment is based solely on the undeveloped land as it currently stands. Should the site be brought forward for development, flood mitigation measures will be explored that would be to the overall benefit of the surrounding area. Furthermore, the SHLAA proforma confirms that the presence of flood risk on this site does not impact on its achievability.

Development of a larger site for housing development, such as our client's, outweighs the development of a number of smaller sites as it provides the opportunity to offer a significant amount of land for flood mitigation measures

Location

The site is located to the north east of Boston. New housing development in this location would form a natural extension to the existing neighbourhood and would contribute to a balanced distribution of growth across Boston, as opposed to a concentration of development elsewhere, particularly in the south west.

Adopting this approach would ensure that the entire road network surrounding Boston is utilised to its full potential and that the existing infrastructure that is

currently concentrated in the south west is not put under adverse pressures.

The Wainfleet Road site is in an accessible location, with access to the A52 and A16, which has been acknowledged as a positive point in the assessment at Appendix 12.

Recommendation

Appendix 12 identifies only one reasonable option for a broad location for housing development, however paragraph 6.51.2 of the Preferred Options document acknowledges that the additional housing requirement that the preferred site will not bring forward, could be realised through the identification of a second broad location should new information come to light during the preparation of the Strategy and Policies DPD. Otherwise, the outstanding housing requirement will be addressed through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD.

In light of the additional information and clarification provided by our client in relation to land to the south of Wainfleet Road, we consider it necessary for the Joint Committee to review the suitability and deliverability of the site to come forward as a strategic location for housing growth through the Strategy and Policies DPD.

Furthermore, our client will be following up these representations with a letter to the Joint Authority confirming the status of the Wainfleet Road site for the purposes of updating the SHLAA.

Response_Number:

301

Persons_Name:

John R Fearn

Representing_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

We appreciate the fact that you have classed our Site C (Kir007) as suitable for development. The site is bounded to the south by the new Health Centre, to the north by the Cemetery and to the west by Bungley Lane, with proposed accesses from Boston road to the East.

We have been notified by a Parish Councillor that the existing Cemetery area is almost at its capacity. My clients would consider donating part of an adjoining field for this purpose is required, in exchange for Planning permission for residential development on Kir007.

We consider the present "village envelope" boundary to the North is too restrictive. In our opinion, as the East side of Boston Road is fully developed up to the crossroads with West End Road and Middlegate Road. We repeat our previous suggestion that the envelope should be extended accordingly up to the crossroads. This would involve our site Kir001 being included within the developable area. This would allow for a Cemetery extension within Kir001.

Taking this suggestion further, we feel that Kir007 could be developed with individual housing, to match the housing on the East side of Boston Road and, as Middlegate Road is partly developed on the South side, and as it is fully serviced, it would seem to make sense to develop affordable housing and small apartment blocks along the North side of Middlegate Road.

As the remainder of the township is developed (Station Road) up to the by-pass, we feel that finalising the development of Middlegate Road up to the by-pass would be a sensible course of action.

We have not changed our view that all the other Kirton

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

sites and the Freiston site suggested under the SHLAA are also suitable for development, if not for housing, then for non-housing use.

Response_Number:	302	Persons_Name:	Mr and Mrs Hill	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
Although some of our land is in the Conservation area, its quite plain to see that Low Road, Wyberton has quite a lot of properties built along it. The area where our glasshouses stand is sorely neglected now and we are retired. Its and eyesore for visitors to see and we think it would look much better if we were allowed to develop it with attractive properties. Although the area is not necessarily in the local plan area, there are two newly developed areas (i.e. Loveday Lane and Browns Close) which have appeared within recent years, and are in fact slightly off the Low Road, and fairly secluded. So I imagine a development on our nursery could arguably be compared to these two. We have not yet consulted with our architect as to the type of properties but will wait to hear from planning.	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number:	311	Persons_Name:	Mr Mark Johnson	Representing_Who?:	Assura Properties Limited
Respondents_Comments:	Notwithstanding our earlier comments relating to the overall quantum of housing provision in Boston, we agree with the apportionment split of housing to be provided in Boston. We respect the requirement to identify broad locations for housing development in Boston and have no objection to the identified 'only reasonable option' for a broad location is that identified as B8 – Wyberton West road / Chain Bridge Road / Swineshead Road area of Boston with an approximate capacity of 1,900. This leaves a requirement of a further 1,000 dwellings within the Boston Borough. We consider this 1,000 dwelling requirement should be a minimum requirement which should be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD. Site SOU004, Land to the South of St Thomas Drive, Boston, is a suitable, available and deliverable site that will contribute to the dwelling requirement of Boston. This is a brown field site that is immediately available and its development will be in accordance with the Framework.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	312	Persons_Name:	Mr Mark Johnson	Representing_Who?:	Assura Properties Limited
Respondents_Comments:	We do not object to the three dwelling threshold or the 20% affordable housing requirement in Boston and the flexible tenure mix based upon the most up to date evidence of need.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

313

Persons_Name:

Mr Mark Johnson

Representing_Who?:

Assura Properties Limited

Respondents_Comments:

We do not object to the three dwelling threshold or the 20% affordable housing requirement in Boston and the flexible tenure mix based upon the most up to date evidence of need.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

314

Persons_Name:

Mr Mark Johnson

Representing_Who?:

Assura Properties Limited

Respondents_Comments:

We support the approach taken to the size, type and density of additional housing, that being to accord with the best available and up to date evidence i.e. outlined in the SHMA in relation to size and type. We support Option 2 in relation to density which proposes not to include a minimum density and proposes to deal with each proposal on a case by case basis.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

324

Persons_Name:

Mr Neil Osborn

Representing_Who?:

Larkfleet Homes

Respondents_Comments:

We SUPPORT significant development in the Service Villages including Fishtoft as we consider that this is the appropriate balance that needs to be struck between delivering an appropriate spatial distribution of development, meeting the scale of growth required and balancing consideration of environment and flood risk.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

325

Persons_Name:

Mr Neil Osborn

Representing_Who?:

Larkfleet Homes

Respondents_Comments:

Subject to our objection to the assessment of the basis of housing provision and to the scale of provision that is needed, we note the reference at paragraph 6.6.2 to the fact that completions in the Boston urban area have amounted to approximately 65% of dwellings built and that Kirton has accommodated an additional 12% of dwelling completion. We consider that this is a significant factor and that emerging policy should support significant continued growth in principal locations where there is demonstrable capacity and demand.

Specifically with respect to Kirton we SUPPORT Option A so far as it addresses the principle of making further positive residential allocations however we OBJECT to the restrictive scale of such allocations having regard to:

- The failure of the Plan to identify sufficient housing to meet the needs of the Plan area based on a full objective assessment of need and of capacity;
- The capacity of the settlement to accommodate growth to support local services and facilities having regard to environmental constraints;
- The availability of land as identified in the SHLAA at Appendix 8; and
- The inappropriateness and untested level of the cap on ROY land as proposed.

Overall with respect to the scale of growth within the non-ROY zone settlements in Boston and in particular South Holland, we consider that there is an opportunity to reflect the capacity of settlements to continue planned growth that will help support local economies, aid diversification and assist in meeting overall housing need as objectively assessed.

In respect to Service Centres in Boston we OBJECT to Option A as we consider that this will fail to make use of unconstrained capacity where it exists, will not help support local communities for their own sake and will not assist the Joint Local Plan to deliver its objectively

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

assessed housing requirement. It is clear however that there are some Service Centres which are better placed both in relation to proximity to Boston, capacity identified in the SHLAA and the extent of areas either excluded from the ROY or that are within the ROY but able to support development and that guidance should be given to direct development accordingly.

In respect to Service Centres in South Holland we OBJECT to Option A as we consider that this will fail to make use of unconstrained capacity where it exists, will help support local communities for their own sake and will help the Joint Local Plan area to deliver its objectively assessed housing requirement. In particular this reflects the availability of land identified in the SHLAA at Appendix 8 and will assist the Authorities in resisting development in ROY areas in furtherance of other general strategies sought to be established in the Plan.

Overall we OBJECT to the policy on the Distribution and Scale of Housing Development across South East Lincolnshire (2011-2031) as it fails to reflect a properly objective assessment of housing need and capacity. We generally SUPPORT the distribution save for OBJECTION to the classification of Pinchbeck as a Service Village failing to reflect its relationship with Spalding.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	326	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr Neil Osborn	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Larkfleet Homes
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We have no comments on these matters at this time	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response_Number:	327	Persons_Name:	Mr Neil Osborn	Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
We SUPPORT Option B insofar as there should be no prescriptive control over density of affordable homes. Density should be a factor of site specific considerations, local character they type of housing required to be provided and in turn the assessed form of local need.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> We SUPPORT Option A in respect of the delivery of affordable homes. The delivery of market houses is essential to enable affordable homes to be secured and such delivery must be viable and may need to be assessed for viability in each individual case having regard to other planning obligations deemed necessary to support the development. Flexibility is required to respond positively to present market conditions and we support a policy approach that would enable such conditions to be reviewed in the event of an upturn in demand for housing and improved viability of housing costs and delivery.					

Response_Number:	328	Persons_Name:	Mr Neil Osborn	Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
We SUPPORT the proposed policy that the density of new development should reflect the local circumstances of the site, taking into account the viability of the development.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response_Number:

329

Persons_Name:

Mr Neil Osborn

Representing_Who?:

Larkfleet Homes

Respondents_Comments:

We strongly OBJECT to any form of phased provision of housing.

Where it is Government policy to boost significantly the supply of housing, and particularly as this is consistent with regional policy which sought to ensure that housing allocations were treated as a floor rather than a ceiling, the Plan would not be rendered unsound by the delivery of new homes at a rate greater than prescribed, given the tenor of Government policy. It would, for the same reasons however, be rendered unsound by failure to deliver sufficient housing and to artificially delay or constrain supply.

Policies in the development plan should be enabling not restraining. Phasing is a constraint on development coming forward and now falls contrary to the Government's expectation that local planning authorities should boost significantly the supply of housing land (NPPF paragraph 47). The proposal to phase the delivery of housing can only reflect a regime provided by Planning Policy Statement 3 and the principles of 'plan, monitor, manage' in which Government advice stated that: "Local Planning Authorities should set out the circumstances in which action will be needed to ensure performance is achieved in line with the housing and previously developed land trajectories". Such advice is no longer extant and any reliance upon it is no longer appropriate. In that respect, the Joint Local Plan would not be in conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, whose provisions should assume the greater weight for the purposes of development management and plan-making.

Officer_Response:

The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	331	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	D Braybrooks
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Qu 28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	332	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	D Braybrooks
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	334	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	D A and N Casswell
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
In response to Qu28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	335	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	D A and N Casswell
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Qu 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	336	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	D A and N Casswell
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	338	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs B Blundy
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	339	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs B Blundy
Respondents_Comments:	We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sites, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.				
Officer_Response:	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.				
Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.				

Response_Number:	340	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs B Blundy
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.				
Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.				
Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.				

Response_Number:	342	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs J Tetley
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	343	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs J Tetley
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	345	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	N Ward
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town’s services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	346	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	N Ward
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	348	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C Slooten
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.</p> <p>We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	349	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C Slooten
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.</p>	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	352	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	M Fragale
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.</p> <p>We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	353	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	M Fragale
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.</p>	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

355

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

M Fragale

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 020, and as being classified as undevelopable. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Pinchbeck, and if developed in conjunction with site Pin 016, it would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on the frontage of the site.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

356

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

C Slooten

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 016, and as being classified as undevelopable. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Pinchbeck, and if developed in conjunction with site Pin 020, it would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on the frontage of the site.

Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links. We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools.

Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water passing through the area'. The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems. The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	357	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	N Ward
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro 016 , which you classified as undevelopable due to the site having an open countryside character. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Crowland, very close to the school and with extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Spalding.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	358	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs J Tetley
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Whaplode, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Wha 022. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered inappropriate in scale for a village with a limited arrange of services and facilities. We consider the village's services are good, and this site is located well centrally to the village services.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

359

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Mrs B Blundy

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Gosberton to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Gos 005. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered appropriate in scale for a village with its range of services and facilities, but relates poorly to the existing built up area. Our clients wishes us to re-assert her view that the site is very well located for close proximity to transport routes

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

360

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

D A and N Casswell

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Gosberton to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. Although not submitted by ourselves previously, you have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Gos 001. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered in-appropriate in scale for the village. Our clients wish to point out that Gosberton is one of only a very few local villages to have a Medical Centre, and consequently wishes us to re-assert their view that the site is extremely very well located for close proximity to this important Local and Community Service, and believes, Gosberton has a far greater range of Services than many other local villages of similar 'Service Village' classification. It has become a major shopping centre and we believe there is a case to support a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

361

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

D Braybrooks

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Moulton Chapel, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

363

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

R Bingham

Respondents_Comments:

In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	364	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	R Bingham
Respondents_Comments:	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sites, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Officer_Response:	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	365	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	R Bingham
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

367

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

R Bingham

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Quadring, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Qua 003 , which you classified as undevelopable due to being inappropriate in scale in a village with a limited range of services. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in Quadring, but would be prepared to agree to a smaller part of the site being developed.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

369

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

M & J Woodroffe

Respondents_Comments:

In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

370

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

M & J Woodroffe

Respondents_Comments:

Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

371

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

M & J Woodroffe

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro 017 , which you classified as undevelopable due to being somewhat remote from the town, and unless developed with Cro 010,would relate poorly to the existing town. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Crowland, and could be developed with the adjacent land through a joint agreement. The site has extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Spalding via the new A16 route.

Our clients have also additional land, shown on the other attached plans, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the curtilage of Crowland , by the opening of the new Crowland Bypass, and provides land, with excellent transport links, off Barbers Drove and Carrington Drove.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

373

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

R Bennett & M & J Woodroffe

Respondents_Comments:

In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	374	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	R Bennett & M & J Woodroffe
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	375	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	R Bennett & M & J Woodroffe
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro018 , which you classified as undevelopable due to being close to industrial and warehousing uses. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Crowland, immediately adjacent to existing estate residential development, and there would still be a good buffer gap between the site and the Industrial development to the south. The site has extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Spalding via the new A16 route.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	377	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C Adams
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town’s services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to the area.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	378	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C Adams
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	379	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C Adams
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
<p>We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro 019 , which you classified as undevelopable due creating ribbon development , and increasing the perceived extent of the built up area.. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Crowland, very close to the school and with extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Crowland.</p>	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>		

Response_Number:	381	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs E M H Todoroff
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
<p>In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>	<p>It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>		

Response_Number:	382	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs E M H Todoroff
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	383	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs E M H Todoroff
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Gedney Hill, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Geh 005 , which you classified as undevelopable due to scale.. Our client still wishes to put forward this land as considers the site provides for suitable development in this part of Gedney Hill, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents similar to that opposite at Sycamore View.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

384

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Mr and Mrs H Goodley

Respondents_Comments:

We write on behalf of our above named clients, whose land at Holbeach has been previously referred to you in the SHLAA, ref Hob 013, and we understand it is currently allocated as part of an urban extension. We have studied the proposal Options document and Sustainability Appraisal Report, and would like to make a further representation at this stage of the Plan review.

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider that the proposed Housing allocation set for Holbeach - at an additional 1000 new allocations in the 2011-2031 time frame, is in proportionate to the housing needs in Holbeach. We consider the development of the land in the north west sector of Holbeach is an excellent location for this development to take place due to very good links to infrastructure and transport.

We include a plan showing our client's site, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number: 386	Persons_Name: Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?: C L Cave
Respondents_Comments: In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number: 387	Persons_Name: Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?: C L Cave
Respondents_Comments: Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response: A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation: These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	388	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C L Cave
Respondents_Comments:	<p>We include a plan showing our client's sites in Gedney Hill, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as sites Geh 006/007/008, the first two of which you classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame, the third as undevelopable due to scale. We agree the site provides for suitable development in this part of Gedney Hill, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents links to frontage infilling off Sycamore View.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:	390	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C A Cave
Respondents_Comments:	<p>In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:	391	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C A Cave
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	392	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C A Cave
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Holbeach Hurn, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Hob 014, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Holbeach Hurn, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents frontage infilling.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	394	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr and M Hotchkin
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	395	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr and M Hotchkin
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

396

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Mr and M Hotchkin

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Whaplode, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Wha 021. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered to link the village's built up area to a separate group of dwellings to the north, but we consider this is only represents reasonable frontage infilling.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

398

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Mrs M Louis

Respondents_Comments:

In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	399	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Louis
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	400	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Louis
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Moulton Chapel, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Mou 013. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered inappropriate in terms of scale for the village, but we consider Moulton Chapel has more than a 'limited range of services, indeed it has a good range of Local services - Local Shop/Post Office, Butchers, Garage, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House,/Church, and Good Bus service, and these should be further supported by additional phased planned housing development .	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	402	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	J L Crossland
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number:	403	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	J L Crossland
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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 following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.		

Response_Number:

404

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

J L Crossland

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Moulton Seas End, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Mou 012, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Moulton Seas End, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents frontage infilling.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

406

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Mr R and Mrs J Warrick

Respondents_Comments:

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.

We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	407	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr R and Mrs J Warrick
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	409	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr R and Mrs J Warrick
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 019, and as being classified as un-developable. We would like to take this opportunity to ask for the site to be –re-assessed, as the site provides for suitable frontage in-filling in this part of Pinchbeck, both sides of the site, and opposite the site. The development of the site would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the presence of existing large scale Horticultural development at the rear of the site.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	411	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	P Borst
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.</p> <p>We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	412	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	P Borst
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.</p>	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	414	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	P Borst
Respondents_Comments:	<p>We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 021, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Pinchbeck, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on three sides of the site.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:	416	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W
Respondents_Comments:	<p>In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:	417	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	419	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's sites in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as sites Pin 015 and Pin 017, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

424

Persons_Name:

Matthew Hogan

Representing_Who?:

South Holland District Council

Respondents_Comments:

1.1. Affordable Housing Policy

1.1.1 The policy needs to make reference to the available evidence base, including specific references to the newly emerging evidence base around the SHMA and viability assessment.

1.1.2 The policy needs to refer to the evidence which justifies the proposed plan target of 470 units per year, including the findings of the emerging SHMA

1.1.3 The policy need to set out the evidence which justifies the policy 33% approach, both in terms evidenced need and development viability.

1.2 'Normally on-site provision will be made and a flexible approach will be taken to tenure depending upon need.'

1.2.1 The Strategic Housing team is of the view that the policy needs to firmly state that on-site provision is the council's default position, and that this position will only be deviated from in exceptional circumstances.

1.2.2 That wording to the following effect is considered... 'Affordable housing shall be provided on the development site, unless the developer can demonstrate exceptional circumstances which necessitate provision on another site. Where a developer can

demonstrate that on or off site provision is not feasible, the council may consider, at its discretion, the payment of a financial contribution of broadly equivalent value to the council enable the delivery of affordable housing elsewhere'.

1.2.3 The team is also of the view that the policy needs to set out a broad split in terms of tenure, as opposed to being left open to interpretation. The wording of any adopted policy needs to be based around the findings of the emerging SHMA. Wording to the following effect should be explored... '70% of any affordable dwellings should be in the form of rented accommodation and 30% in the

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. In respect of South Holland District, an update of the Peterborough Partial SHMA is currently being prepared. Early findings of this study will also inform the next stages of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

form of intermediate homes, adjusted where necessary to balance housing need and make schemes financial viable, subject to negotiation’.

1.3 ‘Where the size of the site... the authority or developer will provide sound evidence and proposals for an exceptional approach to be taken’

1.3.1 The wording of this aspect of the policy needs to place the onus on the developer to provide evidence that an exceptional approach needs to be taken, and not the local authority.

1.3.2 Furthermore, the policy needs to reiterate that any evidence needs to be provided through an ‘open-book’ approach.

2. Exception Site Policy

2.1 The Strategic Housing team is of the view that exception site development should be led by considerations relating to evidenced local need and site sustainability, and should not be arbitrarily constrained to certain settlement types within a settlement hierarchy (namely the Main Service Centres and Service Villages as defined within the proposed policy).

2.2 Note that page 97 makes reference to rural exceptions affordable housing development being acceptable in ‘the countryside’, whereas the policy on page 153 restricts development to main service centres and service villages.

2.3 The Strategic Housing team is keen to ensure that the local planning authority retains control over the nature of development that takes place upon exception sites. Consequently, the team is of the general belief that the policy, relating to market housing on exception sites requires further consideration, specifically:

2.3.1 That the inclusion of market housing on exception sites should not be the default position. The policy wording needs to stress that first and foremost, exception site development is for the purposes of delivering affordable housing. A market element should only be considered where viability issues (principally associated with infrastructure costs and a lack of public subsidy) can be clearly

demonstrated by the developer.

2.3.2 With this in mind, if SHDC adopts an approach of allowing market housing on exceptions sites, the policy needs to state that the maximum level of market housing permitted on an exception site would be the minimum required to make delivery of the affordable provision financially viable, as assessed on a case by case basis. The policy wording needs to make this clear, and the reference to an explicit limit should be removed.

2.3.3 The team is also of the view that market housing should only be permitted on an exception site for the purposes of meeting an identified local need/demand (as it is with affordable housing on such sites).

3. Dynamic Viability

3.1 The Strategic Housing team is of the view that in order a) to maximise planning gain and affordable housing delivery and b) to ensure that wider housing growth is supported, a 'dynamic viability' approach to target setting for affordable housing should be explored.

3.2 This follows the example set by other authorities across the county who use a similar model, including Kings Lynn and West Norfolk. Under the Kings Lynn and West Norfolk model, a new affordable housing percentage and/or threshold level will be published on an annual basis. This percentage and/or threshold is informed by an analysis of the following factors:

- o RICS index of build costs
- o Prevailing house prices
- o Alternative land use values
- o The level of contributions sought for other matters

KL&WN Core Strategy –

<http://www.westnorfolk.gov.uk/pdf/Complete%20Core%20Strategy%202011.pdf>

KL&WN Affordable Housing Policy -

[http://www.westnorfolk.gov.uk/pdf/Affordable%20Housing%20Policy%2012th%20May%20](http://www.westnorfolk.gov.uk/pdf/Affordable%20Housing%20Policy%2012th%20May%2011.pdf)

11.pdf

Response_Number:	425	Persons_Name:	Matthew Hogan	Representing_Who?:	South Holland District Council
Respondents_Comments:	4.1 The team is supportive of for the use of a Site Allocations DPD to identify specific sites for gypsy and travellers, informed by the findings of the recent Gypsy and Travellers Needs Assessment.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Response_Number:	429	Persons_Name:	Crowland Parish Council	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	We agree to Housing growth scenarios for Crowland (which align with our existing directional vision). Delivery must ensure parallel development of infrastructure, and prevent unintended "dormatorisation" of Crowland.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

435

Persons_Name:

Mr C Shepherdson

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Further to my letter of the 11th June it has occurred to me that there is no mention in the above plan of the land bounded by Norfolk Street on the south and the backs of the houses in Grand Sluice Lane on the east and Norfolk Street Industrial Estate on the west. This land appears to be waste land. This wasteland widens out to the east as far as the backs of the houses in Horncastle Road and goes as far north as the Norprint factory. Some of this land appears to be allotments or in use by a nursery. This land continues northwards as part of the now disused Norprint sports field and bowling green and, as I remember from several years ago, the town plan scheduled this land and the neighbouring nursery to the north for housing. Access was to be from Horncastle Road via a widening of the Norprint entrance. Should not this land have been included in the S.E. Lincs Plan and if not could you advise me why? In addition, the Norprint premises on the south side of Norfolk Street would be better positioned elsewhere on their main site. The building is squeezed between houses and part of it has been empty and for sale /let for several years. It is now an eyesore and would suggest this site is ripe for redevelopment and because of its position ideally suited for housing. Its derelict condition certainly isn't a good advertisement for Boston.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

436

Persons_Name:

Tony Dickinson

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

I am writing to your to put a number of points forward for land in Leverton to be considered for inclusion in the forthcoming South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. After seeing the "Draft Plan" for local villages I was surprised that no land in Leverton was included as Leverton is better situated than some areas included for the following reasons:

- 1 Proximity to Boston
 - 2 Distance from Main Road and bus route (including bus stopping point)
 - 3 adjacent to existing development (one of which is very recent).
 - 4 We have in the village the following:
 - a. Shop
 - b. Church and church hall
 - c. Village community Centre
 - d. Public house
 - e. Childs Nursery
 - f. Village grass playing area with slides, climbing frames and swings etc.
 - G. Fire station (Hopefully not needed)
 - 5 Nearness to:
 - a. Doctors Surgery
 - b. Post Office
 - c Primary School
 - d. Secondary School
 - 6 Recent upgrade to main sewerage system
 - 7 Various types of employment with a variety of nearby business' both permanent and seasonal.
-

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

444

Persons_Name:

Lorraine Worrall

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

South East Lincolnshire SHLAA draft findings
(September 2012)

The proposed site adjacent to the Red Lion Public
House in Bicker (bic003).

The site is adjacent to a Grade Two Listed Building. The
Red Lion Public House is Grade Two listed, is over 400
years old and stands alone at the central entrance road
to the village of Bicker. The setting has an open
character and I believe that a development on this site
will adversely affect the setting of the Red Lion. This
area was designated a protected area of open space on
the previous village plan and I believe that this should
continue.

The proposed site on Donington Road Bicker (bic004).

This site has an open character and I believe that the
character would be compromised if developed. The
open character of this site re-enforces the rural nature
of the village of Bicker. Bicker is a village with a limited
number of facilities which I believe would not support
the needs of the residents of large numbers of new
homes.

This area was designated a protected area of open
space on the previous village plan and I believe that this
should continue.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the
Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites,
other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for
Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in
due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft
Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers
e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

448

Persons_Name:

Mr D Logan

Representing_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents_Comments:

Following a review of the documents and attendance at a recent consultation event held by the South East Lincolnshire Council Policy Unit and Lincolnshire County Council in relation to delivery of infrastructure, I wish to make the following comments in relation to the proposals for the Boston area.

The majority of housing numbers (around 1900) proposed are located on one site in the area situated in the south west quadrant known as Wyberton West/Chain Bridge Road (ref B8). The reason for the housing numbers in this area appears to be because the proposed western relief road is planned for the area.

Whilst we are not against the allocation of land in this area we believe that there is significant risk to delivering over half of the plan period housing numbers required in this way because of the following reasons:-

1. This land for the 1900 homes is predominantly controlled by one developer; development rates could therefore be restricted to 40-50 homes per annum, taking delivery of the scheme up to 40 years, well beyond your plan period.
2. In relation to the Relief Road the planning, purchase of land (CPO's), technical obstacles and arrangement of finances and contractors for delivery may take many years without which the delivery of homes from this site would be restricted. This would reduce the amount of homes being delivered in the plan period.
3. The allocation of one main site with major issues to be resolved prevents other less technically complicated sites coming forward. Other smaller sites could deliver homes quicker to aid delivery of homes in the area earlier in the plan period.

We believe that the following matters should be

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD. The delivery of a Boston Distributor Road has not been a factor in identifying a broad location for development.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

considered in order for the councils plan to be robust and delivery more likely:-

1. Rather than just one major allocation to the south west of the centre the Authority should identify broad areas of growth including urban extensions in a variety of locations to provide choice and proximity to employment, schooling and transport corridors.

2. A variety of locations may also make it easier to assimilate areas of new development into the existing townscape.

3. Allocation of a number of available sites within the town will provide the council with a better opportunity of meeting its annual housing numbers and overall plan period numbers.

4. A more balanced spread of developments should deliver the funds through CIL policy in a more predictable way ensuring that services and infrastructure are catered for as Boston grows.

I hope that our comments are of use during this consultation and confirm that we shall be pleased to attend any future workshop or consultation events in relation to the Local Plan, CIL or Infrastructure that the council may undertake.

Response_Number:	451	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	B J Runciman
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
<p>In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale.</p>		<p>It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>	

Response_Number:	452	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	B J Runciman
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
<p>Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.</p>		<p>A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.</p>	

Response_Number:

453

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

B J Runciman

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's sites in Weston, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Wsn 007, 008, 010. We are aware of the comment that the sites are considered too large, and affect the village's built up area, but our clients considers they represent reasonable in village infilling, and hopes they will be re-considered in the near future for possible housing development.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

455

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

M J R Nell

Respondents_Comments:

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.

We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	456	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	M J R Nell
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	458	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	M J R Nell
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Pin 018, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year time frame. Our client agrees with this planning allocation, and would only like to seek to allow development of individual frontage plots, similar to those in the immediate surrounding area.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	460	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs G Pell
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number:	461	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs G Pell
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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 following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	462	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs G Pell
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>We include a plan showing our client's site in Gedney Hill, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as sites Geh 004, which you classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. We agree the site provides for suitable development in this part of Gedney Hill, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given that it represents links to frontage infilling on Mill Lane.</p>				
<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

<u>Response_Number:</u>	464	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Parigo Horticultural Company Limite
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q32 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. We consider some development on peripheral western parts, and the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Spalding Common, is now a discontinued horticultural use, and falls adjacent to residential development and as such an alternative use for the land would be beneficial.</p>				
<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.</p>				
<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:	465	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Parigo Horticultural Company Limite
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	467	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Parigo Horticultural Company Limite
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Spalding Common, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Stm 004, and as being classified as un-developable due to lack of services in the area. Our client considers this land as suitable as it is located on a good peripheral road on the outskirts of the town, allowing for quiet semi-rural development.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	469	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	T Tyrell
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	470	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	T Tyrell
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	471	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	T Tyrell
Respondents_Comments:	<p>We include a plan showing our client's sites in Cowbit. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Cow 003, Cow 004, Cow 008, the first of which being classified as un-developable due to being too large, and inappropriate to the services in the village, and the other two being classified as developable in the 6-10 year time frame . Our clients consider the sites all provide for suitable rounding-off of this part of Cowbit, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of the new Spalding Bypass and residential development on the other sides of the sites.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:	473	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	E A Smith
Respondents_Comments:	<p>In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

<u>Response_Number:</u>	474	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	E A smith
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	475	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	E A Smith
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Cow 006, and as being classified as un-developable due to being inappropriate due to the lack of services in the village. Our clients consider the site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Cowbit, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of the new Spalding Bypass and residential development on the other sides of the site. In addition the site is now too small in size to accommodate modern farming machinery, land is lower quality Grade 1 land, than some of the areas. It is sandwiched between existing uses, that support residential development of the site.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	477	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs C Stratton
Respondents_Comments:	Q32 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. We consider some development on peripheral western parts, and the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Spalding Common, is now too small a field to farm in an efficient manner, and an alternative use for the land would be beneficial.	Officer_Response:	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	478	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs C Stratton
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

480

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Mrs C Stratton

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Spalding Common, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Stm 006, and as being classified as un-developable due to lack of services in the area. Our client considers this land as suitable as it is located on a good peripheral road on the outskirts of the town.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

482

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

I Login

Respondents_Comments:

In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	483	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	I Login
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	484	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	I Login
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We include a plan showing our client's site in Holbeach Drove, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as sites Hob 012, which you classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame.. We agree the site provides for suitable development in this part of Holbeach Drove, and our client hopes that this will allow for housing development to be permitted on the site in the future..	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	486	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	S Dobney
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	487	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	S Dobney
Respondents_Comments:	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Officer_Response:	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	488	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	S Dobney
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	489	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	S Dobney
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's sites in Surfleet and West Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Sur 006 and Sur 007, and as being classified as undevelopable. Our clients are hopeful that this will be re-considered. Additionally at West Pinchbeck, sites Pin 022 and Pin 023, were submitted . Our clients feel these two sites represent reasonable frontage in-filing and that these site will be allocated for development in the near future.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	491	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	D Coxen
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	492	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	D Coxen
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	493	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	D Coxen
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	494	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	D Coxen
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Surfleet, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Sur 004, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Surfleet, with frontage in-filling, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on both sides of the site. Our clients are hopeful that this site will be allocated for development in the near future.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	496	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mr and Mrs J Needham
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	497	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mr and Mrs J Needham
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	498	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs J Needham
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	499	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs J Needham
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Surfleet, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Sur 003, and as being classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Surfleet, with frontage in-filling, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on both sides of the site. Our clients are hopeful that this site will be allocated for development in the near future.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	501	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	C Clark
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	502	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	C Clark
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	503	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	C Clark
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	504	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	C Clark
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We include a plan showing our client's site in Gosberton to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Gos 004. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered appropriate in scale for a village with its limited range of services and facilities, and relates poorly to the existing built up area. Our clients wishes us to re-assert his view that the village is extremely well served with services and facilities, and indeed has a Medical Centre, not just a Doctors Surgery, and should have more housing provision provided to support these local services.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	506	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Read
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	507	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Read
Respondents_Comments:	Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sires, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the northern South Holland parishes, instead of the northern coastal Boston villages.	Officer_Response:	Whilst this issue is addressed to some extent in the Preferred Options Document, it is considered that this option is worthy of further consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	508	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs M Read
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	509	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs M Read
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We include a plan showing our client's site in Quadring, together with accompanying site proforma, which she would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the curtilage of Quadring. Our client wishes to put forward this land as she considers the site provides for suitable development in Quadring, and would be prepared to agree to its development in connection with other adjoining land.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	511	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs G Jacko
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town’s services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	512	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs G Jacko
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	513	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs G Jacko
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Cro 002 , which you classified as developable in a 6-10 year frame. The site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Crowland, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential. The site has extremely good transport links to Peterborough and Spalding via the new A16 route.	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number:	515	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mr J Tester
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, whilst stating above our view that this village should be re-classified, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	516	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mr J Tester
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	518	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mr J Tester
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We include a plan showing our client's site in Pinchbeck, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as part of site Pin020, and as being classified as undevelopable. The site however, can have direct access form market Way, not Pinchbeck Road, and provides for suitable frontage plot rounding-off, of this part of Pinchbeck, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on three sides of the site Our client would only like to seek to allow development of individual frontage plots, similar to those on the opposite side of market Way.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	520	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs P Thompson
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town’s services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	521	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs P Thompson
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

522

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Mrs P Thompson

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the curtilage of Crowland, by the opening of the new Crowland Bypass, and provides land, with excellent transport links, off Barbers Drove

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

524

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

J Whiting

Respondents_Comments:

In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for Crowland, set at an additional 300 dwellings over the 20 year plan period, is excellent , and will support the town's services, and hopefully provide for additional services to be willing to locate to

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	525	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	J Whiting
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	526	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	J Whiting
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Crowland, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the curtilage of Crowland, by the opening of the new Crowland Bypass, and provides land, with excellent transport links, off Barbers Drove	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	528	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe
Respondents_Comments:	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	529	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	M & J Woodroffe
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

530

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

M & J Woodroffe

Respondents_Comments:

We have submitted a response for our clients other land at Crowland, but our clients have also additional land at Deeping St Nicholas, shown on the other attached plan, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is now located within the existing frontage of housing at Deeping St Nicholas/Hop Hole, and provides land, with excellent transport links.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

532

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Roe Family

Respondents_Comments:

In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	533	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Roe Family
Respondents_Comments:	Q32 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. We consider some development on peripheral western parts, and the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Pode Hole, is now too small a field to farm in an efficient manner, and an alternative use for the land would be beneficial.	Officer_Response:	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	534	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Roe Family
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	536	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Roe Family
Respondents_Comments:	<p>We include a plan showing our client's site in Pode Hole, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as site Mon 004, and as being classified as un-developable due to lack of services in the village. Our clients consider the site provides for suitable rounding-off of this part of Pode Hole, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed given the presence of residential development on other sides of the site. In addition the site is now too small in size to accommodate modern farming machinery, land is lower quality Grade 1 land, than some of the areas. It is sandwiched between existing uses, that support residential development of the site.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:	561	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:	<p>The appraisal should include reference to an allowance for modest development in the villages that fall between the Service Villages and the Countryside.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:

562

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents_Comments:

A further type of place should be added to the policy to recognise the role of villages, such as Weston Hills, with an allowance for small scale development to support local essential services.

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

563

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents_Comments:

The broad approach is reasonable.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	564	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is acceptable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	565	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.		A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.	

Response_Number:

566

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

567

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

568

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

569

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	613	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:	The appraisal should include reference to an allowance for modest development in the villages that fall between the Service Villages and the Countryside.	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	614	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:	We consider the proposed housing figure for Moulton is too low and should be increased to at least the 50 dwellings set out in Option B.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

615

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents_Comments:

The New Allocations entry for Service Villages such as Moulton should be increased to allow for 50 dwellings in any one village, if not more where there is a suitable site and a good level of service provision.

The total housing number for Service Villages should be increased following a review of the various settlements and an assessment carried out to determine the potential capacity of each.

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

616

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents_Comments:

The broad approach is reasonable.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	617	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is acceptable.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	618	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:	The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Response_Number:

619

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

620

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

621

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

622

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

645

Persons_Name:

Graham Warren Ltd

Representing_Who?:

Broadgate Homes Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

The NPPF defines 'affordable housing' as: Social rented, affordable rented and intermediate housing, provided to eligible households whose needs are not met by the market. Eligibility is determined with regard to local incomes and local house prices. Affordable housing should include provisions to remain at an affordable price for future eligible households or for the subsidy to be recycled for alternative affordable housing provision'.

South East Lincolnshire has an identified need for affordable housing, which has been evidenced in the separate Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs) covering Boston Borough and South Holland District. Therefore, there is a requirement to set policies for meeting needs in these two areas, which reflect the relevant findings of the two SHMAs. Whilst some affordable housing is developed through Government grant funding, the planning system is also required to help in delivering sufficient affordable housing developments and secondly, through the provision of affordable housing on 'rural exception sites (known as 'rural exception schemes').

Accordingly, the emerging South East Lincolnshire Whole Plan Viability Assessment (VA) has been assessing the level of affordable housing provision that market housing developments can afford to fund, having regard to other matters impacting on their financial viability, and also the opportunities for funding rural exception schemes without Government grant. To date, the VA has produced draft findings.

While affordable housing need in both authority areas is great, at present, 20% affordable housing is likely to be viable, with infrastructure provision and flood mitigation measures. Common practice, of course, is

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

that site specific negotiations take place with individual planning applications and where to provision of affordable housing is seen in the context of other contributions that form the subject of negotiations surrounding Section 106 Agreements.

Two policy options have been considered, i.e.

- Option A: To outline a policy approach to securing an element of affordable housing in new residential developments, which sets out provisions for a flexible response to site circumstances and changing market conditions over time; and provides guidance on the provision of rural exception schemes, which exclude any element of market housing; and
- Option B: As Option A but allowing for the provision of an element of market housing in rural exception schemes. Option B is the preferred option because it confers a more flexible approach to the delivery of affordable housing across S E Lincolnshire.

Broadgate fully support the approach to affordable housing (Option B) because this would provide a greater level of affordable housing in rural areas.

Response_Number:

646

Persons_Name:

Graham Warren Ltd

Representing_Who?:

Broadgate Homes Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

The Plan states, and Broadgate agree, that it is necessary to determine an approach that guides the distribution and scale of additional housing in accordance with the preferred policy approaches relating to the 'Spatial Strategy' and 'Provision for Housing' which, in turn, are underpinned by the two strategic priorities relating to sustainable development. Another factor which should inform the determination of the approach, are the emerging results of the 2012 SHLAA exercise which, it should be noted, have not been informed by the Spatial Strategy and Provision for Housing preferred policy approaches.

It is considered appropriate to prepare a separate policy approach governing the distribution and scale of housing development for Boston Borough and South Holland District for the following reasons:

- The separate housing targets set out in the Provision for Housing preferred policy approach; and
- The differing circumstances relating to these two areas (e.g. the great majority of Boston Borough, including all of its principal settlements, Boston is covered by the ROY flood hazard zones (the 'ROY zones') whereas such zones cover less than half of South Holland District, and Boston Borough only has two higher order settlements compared to South Holland's six.

Given the number of dwellings and designated settlements involved in this process, it is clear that a significant number of options for assigning dwellings to settlements could be generated in both Boston Borough and South Holland District are considered in the Plan, with a view to promoting further consideration of this matter through formal public consultation

The preferred housing provision, as outlined in the

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designated as Service Villages.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter, is intended to be met through extant planning permissions (at 31st March 2012) and new allocations. Regardless of future 'windfall' planning permissions, it is intended that the full amount of new allocations will still be brought forward. This will be delivered through the identification of broad locations in the Strategy and Policies DPD and further allocations through the Site Allocations DPD.

Boston

The preferred option for Boston is a minimum of 4,520 dwellings, of which a maximum of 3,600 can be provided in the ROY zones. The preferred Spatial Strategy identifies fourteen designated settlements. Other than Boston, Kirton and Swineshead, no other settlements in the Borough have seen residential development that could be regarded as strategic.

The Plan proposes 2,900 dwellings in Boston town itself, all of which may be located in the ROY zones. Kirton is identified for 420 dwellings. This approach is supported by Broadgate Homes.

Proposals for the service villages in Boston Borough are considered below, and are made when considering the Plan's proposals for the rural areas.

South Holland

The preferred option for housing provision for South Holland district is a minimum of 9,400 dwellings, of which a maximum of 1,600 can be provided on sites in ROY zones. The preferred Spatial Strategy identifies twenty designated settlements.

The importance of Spalding is evidenced by rates of house building over the last 8 years where completions in Spalding have amounted to circa 51%, Holbeach 7%, Sutton Bridge 6%, Long Sutton 3% and Crowland 3%.

Therefore, in recognition of Spalding’s important and growing sub-regional role, and particularly because it is significantly less constrained by ROY zones considerations, it is considered appropriate to allocate some two thirds of the district’s dwelling provision to the town, i.e. 6,000 dwellings. This figure is supported by evidence available in the SHLAA and is supported by Broadgate.

This level of growth is also linked to the need to provide a Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) to support growth and rail downtime issues at level crossings, resulting from the upgrade of the railway that serves the town.

This dwelling provision will be delivered through the identification of broad locations in the Strategy and Policies Development Plan Document and the Site Allocations DPD.

The Plan proposes 1,00 dwellings at Holbeach, 150 at both Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge, 300 dwellings to Crowland and Donington.

Service Villages

A list of these villages is set out at table 6.11 of the Plan, where two options are considered as follows:

Table 3 – Service Villages, South Holland

Service Villages	Option A	Option B
Cowbit, Deeping St Nicholas, Fleet Hargate, Gedney Hill, Gosberton, Moulton Chapel, Pinchbeck, Quadring, Sutton St James, Surfleet, Tydd St Mary, Weston and Whaplode	10 to 25 dwellings in each Service Village	10 to 50 dwellings in each Service Village
Maximum Service Village Total	150	700

The Plan identifies the role of the service villages as accommodating a level of development commensurate with their role as a focus for social and economic activity. It goes on to state that it is therefore not appropriate that significant numbers of dwellings

should be accommodated in the villages.

When the two options are assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) that accompanies the Plan, there is no difference between them in terms of impact. On this issue, the Plan concludes, at 6.46.13, as follows: “Whilst there is some potential for minor negative impacts, both options have a major positive impact in seeking to meet the housing needs of South Holland District in particular. They also seek to support the role and function of Service Villages. The precise nature of some of the impacts will be dependent on the specific locations for development, which will be outlined in the subsequent Site Allocations DPD, but it is probable that Option A, due to its smaller dwelling total, will result in less overall environmental impact”

The Plan then goes on to prefer Option A, stating that it should result in less overall environmental impact, which could occur with a greater level of dispersed growth; a conclusion not borne out by the SA.

Broadgate are of the opinion that there needs to be greater flexibility towards development in the rural area.

Response_Number:

647

Persons_Name:

Graham Warren Ltd

Representing_Who?:

Broadgate Homes Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

The Plan states that the significant number of additional dwellings planned for the sub-regional centres of Boston and Spalding can best be accommodated in planned urban extensions to these towns.

Accordingly, it is necessary to identify 'broad locations' for accommodating this growth. In order to assist this exercise Appendix 12 to the Plan, entitled "Assessment of Broad Locations for Growth in Boston and Spalding" considers a number of sites promoted through the SHLAA process, and identifies reasonable options which have been subject to assessment in the Sustainability Assessment.

Boston

Appendix 12 claims to identify only one reasonable option (Option A), for a broad location in Boston (identified as B*), namely Wyberton West Road/Chain Bridge Road/Swineshead Road. This is based on the SHLAA, has a capacity for 1,900 dwellings and resurrects the proposal in the abandoned Local Plan Review, to provide a Distribution Road, initially to the south of the town.

Because the preferred option for Boston is 2,900 dwellings, all of which can be located in the ROY zones, this leaves the need to identify a sustainable location for a further 1,000 dwellings. The Plan recognises that this could be the second broad location for growth in the town.

Broadgate has interests amounting to 22.65 hectares to the west of the town (South of North Forty Foot Bank) and identified as B9 in Appendix 12.

Officer_Response:

1) Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations
DPD. 2)
Support noted in terms of comments relating to Spalding.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

The assessment of this location concludes that there are no natural or historic environment constraints, the area is well related to the Distributor Road “Likely Area of Assessment”, and it is proximate to edge of town retail facilities (Chain Bridge).

In these circumstances, Broadgate argue that B8 is not “the only reasonable option and has positive sustainability impacts, in terms of housing provision ...”(6.55.1). Area B9 is equally sustainable and has been assessed in the Sustainability Appraisal as such, as are a number of the sites identified in the SHLAA. B9 can accommodate more than 1,000 plus dwellings. Broadgate conclude therefore that area B9 should be identified in the forthcoming Site Allocations Development Plan Document as the second identified area in the town to accommodate the required 1,000 plus additional dwellings.

To this end, Broadgate will liaise with the Boston Borough Council to discuss the merits of the area in relation to the town as a whole and in particular, the virtues of developing it in parallel with B8. The development merits of B9 are equal to those of B8.

Spalding

The preferred option for Spalding is 6,000 dwellings, none of which will be located in ROY zones. The Plan notes that the Holland Park urban extension (promoted by Broadgate), is to provide 2,250 dwellings, leaving 3,750 to be identified. Appendix 12 identifies three reasonable options for broad locations in Spalding, known as:

- 58’ (land between Holland Park and the A151), which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 1,179 dwellings;
- 59’ (Land between the Vernatt’s Drain and the A151), which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 1,697 dwellings; and
- 510’ (Land to the North of the Vernatt’s Drain),

which includes SHLAA sites amounting to 6,965 dwellings.

For the purpose of identifying a broad location or locations for accommodating the outstanding requirement of 3,750 dwellings in Spalding, the reasonable options identified in Appendix 12 above, enable consideration of revised options, based on:

- The area alone;
- A combination of areas S8 and S9; and
- A combination of smaller versions of these two options

As outlined in the SA of S10 in Appendix 12, this option has the potential to impact on the settlement of Pinchbeck. Therefore, any consideration of an option based on S10 must ensure that there is no coalescence of Spalding with Pinchbeck and that a significant landscape buffer between the broad location for development and the village is achieved.

From this, three options have been selected:

Option A ; To identify a broad location for the development of approximately 3,750 dwellings to the north of the Vernatt's Drain and the line of the proposed SWRR, with vehicular access onto the SWRR. However, this area is to be completely separate from Pinchbeck.

Option B; To identify a broad location for the development of approximately 3,750 dwellings lying to the north and south of the A151, with vehicular access onto the SWRR.

Option C; To identify two broad locations for housing growth, each for the development of approximately 1,875 dwellings, based on smaller versions of Options A and B above, with vehicular access onto the SWRR.

Transportation is a significant issue when considering which of these options is to be preferred. All options will have a mixed, minor, positive/minor negative impact. Large scale greenfield development will

inevitably lead to greater levels of car use and, therefore, increased congestion. However, large scale development does offer the opportunity to design-in and establish critical mass for sustainable modes of transport. Furthermore, all options provide the opportunity contribute to the delivery of the SWRR, which will have the benefit of minimising increases in congestion within Spalding, as a result of planned increases in rail crossing downtime.

Modelling work undertaken to date, suggests that Option A appears to offer the most beneficial impact on transport conditions in Spalding, especially if associated with the delivery of the entire SWRR during the plan period, as opposed to only Phase 3 (Pinchbeck Road up to, but not crossing, the Vernatt's Drain) and Phase 1 (Holland Park to the B1172), in that time.

Importantly, in response to the predicted increase in rail crossing downtime, Option A provides the opportunity for the construction of a bridge over the railway at an earlier point in time than Option B.

The Plan concludes that the above considerations show that there is a mixed impact in terms of sustainability. Any large scale new development has the potential to impact on the environment, although there are measures to minimise this. However, there are positive impacts in terms of social and economic considerations, such as access to housing. All options score similarly when compared against the baseline situation of no growth in these locations.

The overall assessment of Option A concludes "Crucially, Option A appears to offer the most beneficial impact on transport conditions in Spalding (preferably in association with the completion of the SWRR, rather than the completion of Phases 1 and 3 only), and for this reason, it is deemed the most preferable."

Broadgate Homes support Option A. The company has been involved for the last 10 years, in shaping development in the sub-regional centre of Spalding and has committed to providing the first phase of the Relief Road, with the essential crossing of the railway. The development of land north of Vernatt's Drain, that would come after Holland Park, will secure the completion of the SWRR.

Based in Spalding, Broadgate wish to see the continuing sustainable evolution of the town, which fosters growth, with the provision of social facilities and community services, and therefore support the provision of 6,000 dwellings at the town. Option A is also supported because it will ensure the completion of the SWRR during the Plan period.

Response_Number:

648

Persons_Name:

Graham Warren Ltd

Representing_Who?:

Broadgate Homes Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

The villages that make up England's countryside face problems directly related to the fact that housing and economic development have been highly constrained. High house prices and lower wages, result in a paradox, where many of the people who work in the countryside cannot afford to live there, while those who can afford to live there, increasingly do not work there.

This means that people who do work in the countryside, in farm shops, in local businesses, providing the practical services and employment needed in rural communities, will be priced out. Many will have to commute from less expensive property in the towns to employment in the rural areas.

With fewer families in the villages, services such as schools, public houses, buses, post offices, become even less viable and when lost, result in communities being less sustainable. These pressures, to varying degrees, undermine the opportunities for rural communities to be economically vibrant, environmentally sustainable, socially mixed and inclusive.

Travel to Work Patterns

Research has shown that in England and Wales, between the 1981 and 2011 Censuses, there was an increase of some 417,000 in the number of people travelling from urban homes to rural workplaces. To an extent, this contradicts the presumption that people living in rural areas have a disproportionately negative impact on the environment.

The assumption that people living in the country have to use cars to get around, travel longer distances and make a relatively large contribution to climate change.

Officer_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

It is this assumption that is used to limit rural development.

However, the table below, shows that the key difference in travel to work patterns is actually that rural residents are more likely to commute under 1km, 35.8%, compared to 21.5% urban working residents. The most common commute for urban residents was between 1 and 5 km.

Table 2

Distance Travelled to Work

% of rural residents who work % of urban residents who work

Less than 1 km 35.8 21.5

1 to 5 km 17.3 31.7

5 to 10 km 17.1 18.8

10 to 20 km 17 15.3

20 to 40 km 8.4 7.8

Over 40 km 1.5 1.5

Total 100 100

Source: The Taylor Review 2008

Further, rural and urban residents are almost equally as likely to drive to work (60.5 and 54.8 per cent respectively), and whilst rural residents are less likely to use public transport, they are twice as likely to work from home (see Table 3).

Method of Travel to Work

% of rural residents who work % of urban residents who work

Car Driver 60.5 54.8

Car Passenger 6.2 6

Work from Home 16.7 7.5

Walk 8.7 9.5

Bicycle 2.7 2.8

Train/Underground 0.7 0.7

Bus 2.6 2.8

Other 1.8 1.9

Source: The Taylor Review 2008

These figures highlight that rural areas are no more unsustainable on the grounds of the environmental impacts of commuting to work than urban areas. The modes of travel and distance travelled are similar. Indeed, although the distances are similar, rural journey times may be quicker (and therefore less polluting) due to less incidence of congestion compared to urban journeys.

The evidence that emerges from, amongst other things, the Taylor Review, suggests that it is misplaced to condemn villages as unsustainable simply because they do not have a bus service, meaning those living there rely on the car for travel.

Similarly, those villages should not be penalised because they lack services and do not feature within the council's scoring mechanism to determine the sustainability of rural settlements.

It is noted that it is recognised that the scoring mechanism only provides a broad indication of settlement sustainability at a single point in time.

Broadgate would recommend that the research conducted by Taylor is interrogated by the authorities and updated. The trend toward people choosing to live in the countryside has not diminished.

If new affordable housing earmarked for local people, means that more people in a particular community have a chance to afford to live there, that will help reduce the need for the rural workforce to commute from town in the future. The trend of young people migrating out of the district could also be slowed.

Similarly, if local business growth means more people already living in rural communities are able to work locally, then commuting to town may be reduced,

thereby improving economic and environmental sustainability.

If the provision of more affordable housing means that people on a broader range of incomes can afford to live in rural communities, then that may increase the social diversity and sustainability of the community by supporting a broader range of community services, shops and employment, so people need to travel less, not more.

It is for these reasons that Broadgate support Option B for the service villages (and propose that up to 50 dwellings are identified for the service villages during the Plan period), thereby enabling greater flexibility in the consideration of housing provision and development generally in the rural villages. There needs to be a policy in the Plan that enables the provision of affordable and niche market housing in the villages, thereby responding to the issues outlined

Response_Number:

649

Persons_Name:

Graham Warren Ltd

Representing_Who?:

Broadgate Homes Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

These representations now briefly comment on the SE Lincs Baseline Infrastructure Statement. The starting point in the background paper in Appendix 12 of the Plan, headed Purpose and Methodology, in the context of Broad Locations for Growth at Boston and Spalding.

It should be made clear, that the purpose of the background paper is not to determine the preferred locations for growth or how to distribute levels of development between them. This is the role of the Housing Chapter of the Plan and SA Report. The background paper merely acts as a sieving process.

The Appendix identifies the broad locations for growth and then sets out the advantages and disadvantages of the identified locations. The characteristics are clearly a matter for future consideration, not least with the application of the sequential and exception tests, when considering the allocation of 2,900 dwellings in the ROY zones of Boston.

Transport

Because development potential of major sites under consideration is predicated on the provision of transport infrastructure, these Representations now consider this issue for both Spalding and Boston, an issue which is considered in the SE Lincs Baseline Infrastructure Statement.

The infrastructure baseline paper has been prepared by Lincolnshire County Council (LCC), in its role as a partner authority in the South East Lincolnshire joint-working arrangements and in dialogue with Boston Borough Council and South Holland District Council. It has been prepared in support of the Local Plan (Strategy and Policies DPD) preferred options. The

Officer_Response:

1) Support noted in terms of comments made relating to Spalding. 2) Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

paper follows extensive discussions with LCC, discussions with District Council services and external organisations, such as utility companies.

The paper sets out details on major infrastructure issues that have been identified by the joint Planning Authorities and partner organisations in relation to existing and emerging infrastructure programmes, plans and projects. It also provides an assessment of potential infrastructure requirements and an action plan (at Appendix 1) for further assessment on these issues.

Spalding

The major piece of transport infrastructure expected to be delivered during the Local plan period is the Spalding western Relief Road (SWRR). The SWRR is considered key to the delivery of the housing growth strategy, as outlined in the housing chapter of the Local Plan and the assessment of broad locations for development. The SWRR has also been identified to respond to the impact of planned future increases in rail crossing downtime through Spalding.

The first phase (including a junction to the B1172 and a bridge over the railway) will be delivered adjacent to Holland Park through the Section 106 Agreement, associated with the 2012 outline consent and to which Broadgate are party. However, the Local Plan as it progresses to examination, will need to include a clear policy context for this development and all relevant infrastructure, particularly phase one of the SWRR.

During 2011, two route options for potential second phase, were the subject of public consultation, with option 2A considered by a small minority of the public (42%), compared to 2B (37%). Option 2A (the western most route) has been protected by LCC, on the basis that 2A has a lesser impact on existing properties and

allotments and is less restrictive for potential residential-led development when compared to 2B.

LCC and SHDC are working with other parties on a complete SWRR route, that will deliver a holistic transport solution for the town and provide potential development land for the longer term. The proposed SWR would provide access from the B1172, in the south to the B1356 Spalding Road in the north, with a proposed junction at the A151 Bourne Road. Route options will be prepared for the northern section of the proposed SWRR, in preparation for a public consultation in 2013.

Lincolnshire County Council, in conjunction with the district authorities. Has undertaken transport modelling to help determine which phases of the road, in conjunction with potential locations for growth, would have the most benefit in transport terms. The results of this modelling have informed the preferred broad location for development around Spalding.

Broadly speaking, the evidence highlights that with the levels of growth planned for Spalding, in conjunction with the planned increases in rail crossing downtime, should a SWRR not be delivered, the traffic impacts upon the town would be severe. For this reason, it is considered that the SWRR is critical to the delivery of the growth strategy for Spalding. As such, it is important to ensure that the emerging Local Plan facilitates its delivery.

There is an outstanding planning permission for development at Holland Park, which is a given. This will provide Phase 1 of the SWRR and crosses the railway. In order to enable further development led phases of the relief road, allocation of land north of Vernatt's Drain, following on from development at Holland Park is essential, not only to secure completion of the SWRR but to reinforce Spalding's role as a sub-regional centre.

The preferred option for growth that would secure the provision of the SWRR, is S10, in which Broadgate have an interest and where the company will continue, as at Holland Park, to play a pivotal role, along with other stakeholders, in securing its eventual completion.

In terms of the provision of the Spalding Western Relief Road, the preferred options at Spalding, S10 and Option A are supported because this will ensure the completion of the relief road during the Plan period.

Boston

The potential to deliver a Boston distribution road is outlined in the latest Local Transport Plan. The Transport Strategy for Boston 2006 – 2021 and beyond, highlights a number of aims related to the Distribution Road, not least in accommodating future development in the town.

To date, no detailed modelling work has been carried out in respect of the Distribution Road's benefits and no technical work has been undertaken related to engineering a specific route or estimated costs. The Infrastructure Background Paper states that it is unlikely to come forward in its entirety in the Plan period.

Broadgate's interest in area B9 in Boston, lies within the Distribution Road "Likely Area of Assessment" and as stated above, the company will seek to enter into discussions with the County and Borough Councils in respect of promoting a growth area for at least 1,000 dwellings and thereby taking into consideration, the provision of the Distributor Road. Initial work undertaken by Broadgate suggests that area B9 could accommodate more than 1,000 dwellings.

Response_Number:

652

Persons_Name:

Home Builders Federation

Representing_Who?:

Their members

Respondents_Comments:

The JPU proposes a housing provision of 13,920 dwellings consisting of 4,520 dwellings in Boston and 9,400 dwellings in South Holland over the plan period of 2011-2031. These housing provision figures are derived from the objectively assessed needs as set out in the Coastal Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Market Area Assessment (SHMAA) dated November 2012 for Boston District Council and the Peterborough Sub Region SHMAA dated August 2010 for South Holland District Council. These figures are in reasonable aligned with the DCLG 2008-based household projections and the What Homes Where? toolkit.

The JPU is proposing an old style Local Development Framework (LDF) with a suite of documents including a LP Strategy & Policies DPD and a Site Allocations DPD rather than one all-inclusive Local Plan. All site allocations are deferred to the Site Allocations DPD. At this time there is no timetable for the preparation and adoption of the Site Allocations DPD unfortunately this type of approach causes an indeterminate period of uncertainty for the house building industry.

The proposed LP Strategy & Policies DPD identifies a spatial strategy based on four types of place namely sub regional centres, main service centres, service villages and countryside together with broad locations for future housing growth. The preferred policy approach to the distribution and scale of housing development across South East Lincolnshire is shown in the Table below :-

TYPE OF PLACE

Boston District Council

South Holland District Council

Sub regional centre

3,545

7,137

Main service centre

432

Officer_Response:

1) Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine an approach to housing delivery that ensures the maintenance of a 6-year supply of deliverable sites.

2) Comments noted in terms of Strategic Priorities - these will be taking into consideration in the next stage of the plan-making process.

3) Comments noted in terms of the preferred policy approach to 'Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period'. This has been deliberately phrased to allow for the possibility of increased delivery of dwellings should market conditions permit.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

2,629

Service village

1,445

350

Countryside

47

237

TOTALS

5,467

10,353

However it is not evident from Paragraph 6.87 whether or not shortfalls in one place can be made up elsewhere. The JPU should clarify this interchangeability issue.

In Paragraph 3.2 Strategic Priorities for South East Lincolnshire Bullet Point 9 Environment refers to prioritising the re-use of previously developed land. This is contrary to the NPPF. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF encourages the re-use of brown-field land it does not advocate a brown-field before green-field policy. The JPU should consider deleting the reference to prioritising. The dictionary definition of priority is to place first in time, place or rank whilst the definition of the word encourage does not involve any such ranking mechanism. By inclusion in a DPD all sites are deemed sustainable and therefore should be granted planning permission as and when planning applications are submitted under the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraphs 6-14 of the NPPF). In the Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period section, the JPU proposes a 6 years supply of deliverable sites representing a 5 years land supply plus 20% buffer. However Paragraph 4.2.1 states that in Boston District Council there is only a 3.6 year supply of deliverable sites. The JPU will need to demonstrate a 5 years supply plus 20% buffer in Boston District Council otherwise Paragraph 49 of the NPPF will take effect which states "relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year

supply of deliverable housing sites”.

Likewise the housing trajectory for the South Holland District is significantly back loaded whilst the Boston District housing trajectory is much more even across the plan period. The JPU should give further consideration to the two proposed housing trajectories as a standard distribution is preferable.

Response_Number: 666	Persons_Name: Cllr A Austin	Representing_Who?: Herself
Respondents_Comments: My comments regarding housing development are confined mainly to Boston Borough although some are applicable to both districts. I question the statement that there is a surplus of intermediate housing due to the availability of cheap private sector housing in Boston. The town is well known for the high cost of private rented property. There is already a shortage of 1-bedroom social-rented accommodation.	Officer_Response: This was a finding of the SHMA for Coastal Lincolnshire. This SHMA has since been replaced by the Boston SHMA.	Officer_Recommendation: Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 667	Persons_Name: Cllr A Austin	Representing_Who?: Herself
Respondents_Comments: I agree with the need for an appropriate of Boston Borough’s housing to be within Boston town. The sub-regional status of such an historic town is a key part of the Borough’s vision for the future and essential for the economy of the area.	Officer_Response: Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation: Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	668	Persons_Name:	Cllr A Austin	Representing_Who?:	Herself
Respondents_Comments:	Places classified as “other villages” must be allowed sufficient infill /peripheral development to enable these existing communities to survive. Amber Hill is an example. Rural exception schemes should be looked on favourably in these circumstances.	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	669	Persons_Name:	Cllr A Austin	Representing_Who?:	Herself
Respondents_Comments:	Emphasis is given on several occasions in the plan document to the protection of listed and other historic buildings. Most of the area’s churches come in this category and village communities need sufficient population to be able to maintain their viability.	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

670

Persons_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

I agree that sufficient housing land should be identified so that a supply of land can be available should there be an upturn in demand

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

671

Persons_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

The broad locations for housing growth for both Boston and Spalding are reasonable but boundaries should not be so rigid as to exclude land marginally outside these areas should windfall or other sites become available.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

683

Persons_Name:

Bidwells

Representing_Who?:

The Duchy of Lancaster

Respondents_Comments:

Paragraph 6.48.1 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Strategy and Policies PDP Preferred Options consultation document states that the preferred option for the delivery of housing in Service Villages is Option A. We object to this option being taken forward.

Two options are provided within the Local Plan Strategy and Policies DPD (hereafter 'the DPD') which are as follows:

Option A: To deliver a scale of new housing in each of South Holland's 14 Service Villages not exceeding 25 dwellings, none of which will be located in ROY zones.

Option B: To deliver a scale of new housing in each of South Holland's 14 Service Villages not exceeding 50 dwellings, none of which will be located in ROY zones.

The DPD also incorporates the necessary Sustainability Appraisal of each of the Policy Options as part of the balancing process in choosing how to move forward. Table 6.12 on Page 124 of the document demonstrates that both of the Options will have the same impacts when scored against the different topic areas. The supporting text provided on Page 125 supports this, with there being no discernible differences in the evaluation. Ultimately Option A is chosen as it will likely have less overall environmental impact due to the lower number of dwellings provided. There is concern, however, that this level of housing will not only overly restrict the level of market housing which can be potentially provided over the Plan Period to 2031 in these locations but that at the same time, it will restrict the level of affordable housing which can reasonably be provided.

Paragraph 55 of the NPPF sets out that to promote sustainable development, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and in consideration of this, identify where housing in one settlement might support services and facilities in another nearby. It should not

Officer_Response:

It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

be automatically considered that, especially in light of the results of the Sustainability Assessment contained on Pages 124 and 125 of the DPD, the perceived impacts of providing an increased housing threshold, including affordable dwellings, in Service Villages will outweigh the potential benefits. As set out below, the majority of the Preferred Policies within the Joint Strategy and Policies DPD build in flexibility so as to be able to respond to changes in the market over the Plan Period and meet the necessary criteria in the NPPF.

The Spatial Strategy proposes a settlement hierarchy in which Service Villages, whilst receiving limited development, will support or improve their role as a focus for social and economic activity in their capacity as service centres for the surrounding rural area. The provision of additional housing will further support existing services and facilities and provides great likelihood for the improvement of these, or even introduction of new amenities. This will not only benefit potential future residents, but also improve the range of services and facilities available to the existing populations. In discussing the need for affordable housing, the preferred policy option within South Holland is to provide 1/3 of all new residential developments over three dwellings as affordable housing. In the case of rural exception schemes, up to 50% of dwellings can be provided for market occupation so as to maintain viability, but should represent the lowest proportion necessary in favour of affordable provision.

The 2010 SHMA Update found that 587 affordable dwellings will be required per annum to 2026. Whilst the majority of these may be provided in the larger sub-regional centres and main service centres, flexibility should be provided for the needs of service villages, particularly when considering the elevation of some settlements due to their location outside of any ROY zone designations.

It is also considered that when taken in conjunction

with other Proposed Policies within the DPD that Option B provides the greatest flexibility and potential to meet the future need of both market and affordable demand. The Council's housing implementation strategy and approach to maintaining a deliverable supply of housing also references the need to build in flexibility so as to be able to 'respond positively to an upturn in demand for housing should it arise sooner rather than later.'

The Plan Period runs to 2031 and there is a reasonable expectation that the economy will recover to better levels of growth than are currently being experienced. The Joint Local Plan should Plan Positively for Growth and it is considered that adopting the higher threshold will allow for this.

Response_Number:	694	Persons_Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge	Representing_Who?:	English Heritage
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
<p>We do not have a specific view on the housing figures for individual settlements, but would like to note that each settlement contains and adjoins a number of heritage assets (designated and undesignated). All contain listed buildings, most contain conservation areas (except Sutton Bridge), while Swineshead and Crowland incorporate a number of scheduled monuments (including the ruins of abbeys to the east of both settlements and monuments within the settlements themselves). Spalding and Boston also contain registered parks and gardens. Much will depend on the location of development sites, but the site allocation process should avoid harming the above heritage assets.</p>		<p>Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>	

Response_Number:

695

Persons_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents_Comments:

We have not assessed the service villages in terms of their heritage assets, but requiring significant development at the above villages (due to their lower flood risk status) may have implications for a number of heritage assets within and surrounding these settlements. We advise that an appraisal of potential historic environment issues is undertaken before these villages are identified for development.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

696

Persons_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents_Comments:

In terms of the both the reasonable and unreasonable options, it should be noted that none of the broad locations have “no historic environment constraints” (as currently stated in Appendix 12). At the very least, any of the locations could have archaeological implications given the nature of the fenland countryside and higher potential for preserved remains. In addition, most of the locations could impact on the significance and setting of nearby designated heritage assets given their size and the nature of the topography allowing long distance views. In terms of the unreasonable locations, we have a few comments as follows in terms of designated heritage assets (archaeological issues should also be examined through the councils’ archaeological advisers):

Boston Locations B1 and B2 have the potential to impact on the Grade II registered park and garden of Boston Cemetery as well listed buildings around Rawson’s Bridge. Location B3 has the potential to impact on the north-eastern end of Spilsby Road Conservation Area and the Grade II* listed Burton Hall. Location B4 is situated between the existing urban edge and the scheduled Rochford Tower (also Grade I listed), with high potential for disruption of views between the tower and the town centre, and therefore harm to its significance and setting. Location B6 could impact on Wyberton Conservation Area to the south, which includes the Grade I listed Church of St Leodegar and the Grade II* Wyberton Park. The scheduled monument of Wybert’s Castle is located to the south-east. Location B7 could impact on one or two listed buildings, including the Grade II* Frampton House to the south-west.

Spalding

Location S1 has the potential to impact on Pinchbeck Conservation Area to the west, particularly on views of the Grade I listed St Mary’s Church, which is visible

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 and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer Recommendation:

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

from the A16 and other locations. Location S2 is very likely to impact on the scheduled monument of Pinchbeck engine draining pump house (also Grade II listed), which is currently located in a very isolated position in the landscape. It is difficult to see how development here would not harm the significance and setting of this scheduled monument. Furthermore, to the east is situated the scheduled monument of a medieval moated monastic grange and retreat house at Wykeham (which includes a Grade I listed chapel). Location S3 could also have impacts on the heritage assets at Wykeham depending on size and scale of development. Location S4 could impact on a Grade II* listed building within the industrial estate at Low Fulney (the old office block of the Land Settlement Association which is an 18th century building with medieval fabric). Location S5 is situated at the southern end of Spalding Conservation Area with potential impacts on views between the town centre and countryside. Location S7 refers to “some elements of historical interest” in Appendix 12, but it is not clear what this means. There are scheduled Roman settlement sites to the south-west at Poplar Farm and the wider landscape will have archaeological potential (as elsewhere). Locations S8 and S9 have the usual archaeological issues as well as potential impacts on listed buildings, including the Grade II* Monk’s House

Response_Number:

697

Persons_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents_Comments:

In terms of the broad locations (B8 for Boston and S10 for Spalding), we would like to make the following comments:
Boston Location B8 This broad location appears to incorporate a scheduled monument in the form of a medieval moated site fronting Wyberton West Road (details on the monument can be found at <http://list.english-heritage.org.uk/resultsingle.aspx?uid=1019528>). There is also a Grade II listed building at West Skirbeck House. It is not clear from the consultation documents whether location B8 includes the monument or not, but it is likely that development would impact on the significance of this heritage asset through change within its setting. Much will depend on the detail of any proposed development in terms of land use, scale and proximity to the monument, but we would like to see general principles established as early as possible. The monument is situated at the north end of a green wedge of countryside that extends into Boston between Wyberton West Road and Garfit's Lane, meaning that the setting of the monument to the south-west is predominantly rural. The fields beyond the monument have high archaeological potential particularly where they remain in non-arable use (i.e. Not ploughed). There are a number of well-established field boundaries of trees and hedges within the green wedge that give the countryside in this location an intimate character. Taken as a whole, the green wedge contains a number of environmental assets (including the monument) and could form a large part of the green infrastructure for any housing development. We assume that vehicular access to the housing development would not go through the green wedge, as this would have major implications for the monument. Furthermore, the relationship between 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 and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer Recommendation:

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

monument and the development needs to be carefully considered to ensure that new buildings do not turn their back on the monument or create hard boundaries, but instead allow natural surveillance of this heritage asset to help with its management. The proximity of built development to the monument needs to be based on an understanding of significance and setting impacts, and it may not be possible to build much into the green wedge. At the same time, the provision of open space in the green wedge should be more informal than formal, avoiding lots of physical changes such as landscaping and lighting. Access to the monument itself may be tricky, but there are opportunities for better interpretation, management and understanding of this heritage asset. We would expect the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan, including the Strategy and Policies DPD, to demonstrate an understanding of the monument's significance and setting, based on desk-top assessment and initial field surveys (utilising various evidence documents and liaising with the councils' archaeological advisers). Our setting guidance (www.english-heritage.org.uk/publications/setting-heritage-assets/) is a useful way of assessing how setting contributes to the significance of heritage assets and how this assessment can be used to inform development proposals. Better understanding of the location's archaeological potential should also be sought, particularly those fields closest to the monument. Some early indication of how the broad location could be developed, and how the monument would be managed, should be expressed at this stage. Spalding Location S10 Although the broad location for Spalding does not appear to have an obvious impact on any designated heritage assets, there may still be considerable archaeological issues given the scale of development and the likelihood for well-preserved remains. We therefore disagree with the Sustainability Appraisal and Appendix 12, which both state there are no historic environment

constraints with this location. We recommend that further assessment is carried out with regards to the archaeological potential of this location, drawing on existing evidence and the support of the councils' archaeological advisers.

Response_Number:	698	Persons_Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge	Representing_Who?:	English Heritage
Respondents_Comments:	Based on the above comments, we would expect the next consultation document to provide more information about how both broad locations might be developed. The policy should set out some of the broad issues that need to be addressed, which would include the scheduled monument for the Boston location and archaeology issues for both locations. Further work on the significance of the monument at Boston should be pursued. We would happy to advise on this before the next consultation.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	699	Persons_Name:	Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge	Representing_Who?:	English Heritage
Respondents_Comments:	We welcome the reference to heritage assets in the draft policy (5th bullet point), although "effect" should read "affect".	Officer_Response:	This Policy has been revised in the draft Local Plan	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

Response_Number:

717

Persons_Name:

Helen Cattle

Representing_Who?:

Sport England

Respondents_Comments:

Broad Locations for Housing Development in Boston and Spalding (page 148)
Although it is understood that the above are only broad locations at this stage, the preferred options for 1,900 dwellings at Boston and 3,750 dwellings at Spalding would clearly generate additional infrastructure needs, including those relating to sports facilities. It will therefore be necessary to carry out a robust assessment of the needs associated with these allocations, including sports provision, in order to feed into an appropriate strategy for delivery / the IDP and underpin other relevant policies within the Local Plan. Consideration will also need to be given to any direct loss of outdoor or built sports facilities that could result from site specific allocations, both in terms of informing the appropriateness or otherwise of those allocations, and / or the need for replacement provision.

Officer_Response:

Infrastructure in it's entirety 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

722

Persons_Name:

Steve Williamson

Representing_Who?:

Mrs EA Wing, Mr JA Wing, Mrs A For

Respondents_Comments:

Housing
The analysis set out in paragraphs 6.2.31 to 32 resulting in “a single reasonable option to the south west of Boston” is fundamentally flawed by giving weight to unsubstantiated “developer interest” which is not a reasonable criteria, paying scant regard to the genuine sustainability criteria set out in the report, and assuming that only that area can be developed in a manner that addresses flood risk issues.
Paragraph 6.7.2 and 6.11.1 - Option A is reasonable.
Paragraph 6.49.3 notes in regard to Appendix 12 that additional information on availability of land may come to light.
For the record my clients are willing to make their land available for development to assist in meeting the plan’s housing allocation. The land is identified as site Fis013 on the most recent SHLAA as being suitable for development, but over a longer timescale. Robert Bell and Co made submissions on the timescale, which will be on the Council’s record. The land can be brought forward in the short term and in terms of the scenario set out in paragraph 6.51.2, of a second strategic broad housing location, the site could form the core of the development allocation.

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	726	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	D D Wilson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself and Clients
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Chapter 6. Planning Policy for Traveller Sites The traveller site at Holbeach has been open for about two years. The site appears to be under-used. I question the need for an additional traveller site within the District. Provision of Affordable Housing The requirement of one third of total dwellings has curtailed development of smaller sites and re-development schemes. Sites of not more than say fifteen dwellings should contribute no more than 20% rounded down.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	1) We are duty bound to address under provision as identified in the evidence base and maintain an appropriate level of supply of Gypsy and Traveller sites. 2)A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. New evidence on Gypsy and Travellers has been considered in the draft Local Plan

<u>Response_Number:</u>	728	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Douglas Dickens	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	In relation to Spalding and Pinchbeck. The site allocated for new employment in Long Sutton has failed to produce a single new job over the last thirty to thirty five years. The allocation requires to be reviewed. There is nothing within the DPD to encourage our growers who together are the most important element of the local economy.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Employment related policies have been subject to review in the draft Local Plan. The Local Plan has no direct control or statutory responsibility for the horticultural sector and its operations.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Employment policies to be reviewed in the draft Local Plan.

Response_Number:

729

Persons_Name:

Jonathan Fovargue

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Bic 003 Bic 004

I have been a Bicker resident all of my life and I am deeply concerned with regards to the proposed land earmarked for future development within the village. Over the last twenty years or so the village has seen substantial development whereby housing has been built to effectively fill in gaps within the building line boundary of Bicker.

Bicker is a quaint and peaceful village and its charm would be lost if massive development of monstrosity new builds are built along side traditional Lincolnshire cottages. Furthermore, to develop a piece of land adjacent to a grade 2 listed coaching inn (Ye Olde Red Lion) that sits in a conservation area is one of madness. The domestic dwelling projections are far to high for a semi rural economy to sustain in terms of employment. Network Rail have refused the offer of a new Halt on the Peterborough line to cater for commuters on the Holland Park estate, ignored the case presented by Littlethorpe to reopen the station and the request by Pinchbeck Parish Council for a Halt.

The new Peterborough road is overloaded and very dangerous. I do not know if allowing HGVs to ignore the 40 mph limit and travel up to 60 mph on this single carriageway makes it safer or not but I would suggest a major growth in traffic from new commuters would. I cannot accept the growth of Spalding onto Pinchbeck land up to Mill green leading to an absorption of the village.

I note that Pin 034, The Flaxmill Field allotments, Parish land belonging to the people and considered in your preliminary assessment that if developed would "destroy the semi rural nature of the Village" has already been declared an "exemption site" by a District Cllr. Who stated she would like the job of sales lady on the site and a proportion of which was sold by the Parish Council for £54k as opposed to the £140k

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

promised to a developer.

I attended a meeting with SHDC planners where this site, not on the agenda was produced and they indicated it was ok.

This is a site previously rejected in 2001 when nearly 600 villagers signed a petition against and was the sole issue on the recent Parish Council election and again was rejected by the Electorate.

The provisions of the Localism Act, and the more recent quotes of our M.P. To take account of local feelings have been ignored and circumvented by saying a planning application by a developer is not a community application, and as I have said if it goes to planning it already has the nod.

I feel this field should remain as agricultural land and the initial reason for rejection be upheld. The point I am trying to make, especially about the Pin 034 field, is that extensive consultation, which came out against this development, on more than one occasion and the provisions of the Localism Act and the views of our M.P..have been ignored by the local Council and this calls into question the whole value of the consultation process when decisions have already been made to build on land outside the current development area..

The proposals in the draft plan suggest that nearly 5,000 dwellings will be built on Pinchbeck land during its duration it is not necessary to build 150 plus on the Flaxmill Field.

Response_Number:

733

Persons_Name:

Carter Jonas

Representing_Who?:

RP Worth and Son

Respondents_Comments:

Main Service Centres of Long Sutton & Sutton Bridge Support is given for the proposed intention to allocate land to accommodate up to 150 dwellings within Long Sutton during the Local Plan period. It is appropriate that a sufficient level of housing is delivered within the Main Service Centres in order to maintain enough growth within such settlements to support existing amenities and to meet local housing needs. Despite the ROY zone designation which covers much of the available land for development, a balance has to be achieved in order to provide for a sustainable distribution of growth. Mitigation measures are available where necessary to reduce any impact of development upon flood risk. Taking into account the higher chance of flood hazard in the locality of Sutton Bridge, it is argued that consideration should be given to Long Sutton accommodating a suitable proportion of the 150 dwellings currently reserved for Sutton Bridge. This approach would remain consistent with the spatial strategy, whilst also providing a sequentially lower risk strategy and minimising vulnerability, in comparison to that currently proposed within the preferred policy option. This approach would be in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. It should be noted that much of the available land located within Long Sutton is highlighted as Flood Zone 3 on Environment Agency mapping; however the risk has been assessed as 'low', taking into account the presence of existing flood defences.

Officer_Response:

The consideration of pooling Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge's housing allocation 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

734

Persons_Name:

Carter Jonas

Representing_Who?:

RP Worth and Son

Respondents_Comments:

3.1 The Site The site area proposed for consideration extends to some 2.4 hectares/5.9 acres. The Site Location Plan opposite identifies this land with a red boundary. The land lies between Daniel's Gate to the eastern side of the Site and Lime Walk to the western side of the Site. 3.2 Context The land is located to the north of John Swain's Way at the northern end of Long Sutton, with agricultural land adjoining to the west, to the opposite side of Lime Walk. The eastern boundary of the Site fronts onto the public highway of Daniel's Gate, with existing low density housing located to the opposite side along Daniel's Gate. The immediate South-Eastern boundary of the Site borders onto allotment holdings. Long Sutton is a Main Service Centre. It is a market town in the South Holland district of South East Lincolnshire, approximately 13 miles east from Spalding. It is located just off the A17 linking Newark-on-Trent, Nottinghamshire to Kings Lynn, Norfolk. 3.3 Current & Proposed Use The land is currently within agricultural use and the site offers the opportunity for a residential led development (medium density 30dph). 4.1 Flood Risk The Site is considered to be located in an area that could be affected by flooding if there were no flood defences. Environment Agency online flood mapping classifies the area as Flood Zone 3, although the likelihood of flooding is listed as low with a 0.5% or 1 in 200 probability. The Lincolnshire Coastal Study identifies the Site as located in a 'ROY' Zone on the boundaries of the orange and red categories denoting a significant to extreme degree of coastal flooding. 4.2 Land Use Designations The Site is not in the Green Belt. The land is partly designated as Open Space within the South Holland District Council Local Plan (2006). 4.3 Heritage Assets The Site does not lie within a Conservation Area. The proximity of the Conservation Area (black dashed line) can be viewed on the map

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

extract taken from the existing Local Plan. It is not considered that views into or out of this area would be affected by development in this location. There are no listed buildings present within the Site or that fall within close proximity. 4.4 Ecology According to Natural England mapping the Site is not designated as a SSSI; National or Local Nature Reserve; Country Park; Doorstep or Millennium Green. Magic Defra mapping also does not identify any constraints.

4.5 Highways

It is anticipated that vehicular access could be provided off Daniel's Gate, via the existing access.

4.6 Further work

This proposal will continue to evolve through the identification of any site constraints (both policy and physical) and it is proposed that these shall be mitigated against or compensation measures put in place to address any issues which may arise. This includes highways, flood risk and drainage, landscape, biodiversity, infrastructure and utilities e.g. gas, electricity and water.

The proposal will also progress through consultation with the relevant local authorities, including catchment schools, to identify if there is capacity to serve the needs of the new development, and if not, what improvements would be necessary e.g. physical expansion. In this case, financial contributions would be sought and agreed from the development as part of a legal agreement.

5.1 Growth Strategy & Settlement Hierarchy The site currently lies outside of the defined settlement framework for Long Sutton. However South East Lincolnshire must allocate land to provide space for housing growth to cover the Local Plan period up to 2031. The presumption, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, shall be for sustainable development. This therefore requires the Council to seek suitable and deliverable sites. The delivery of homes and employment within settlements such as Long Sutton in order to meet local needs and

maintain a balanced and mixed community is key to the future long term viability and success of rural settlements and their economy. The existing South Holland Local Plan identifies Long Sutton as a Main Service Centre within the adopted settlement hierarchy. The current consultation document proposes for the settlement to retain this categorisation. Land allocated towards the south of the Site is designated for major housing development. The adopted South Holland District Council Local Plan includes a housing allocation for Long Sutton up until 2021 for land off Lime Walk (80 units). The scale of these developments has been adequately absorbed into the settlement, and a similar approach should be taken for the Site. Consideration of these schemes is also important in terms of tenure for development of the Site. We are seeking a market-housing led scheme here in order to ensure a greater balance of tenures within this area of Long Sutton.

5.2 Sustainable Development – Existing Services & Facilities

Long Sutton is a small market town, which hosts the following facilities: public houses; places of worship; recreation areas; leisure centre; a medical centre; dentist surgery; and library. The primary school serving this area is Long Sutton County Primary School and Nursery and the secondary school serving this area is The Peele Community College, Long Sutton.

5.3 Sustainable Development – Public Transport Availability

Public transport links from Long Sutton are good, with a frequent seven day bus service operating between Kings Lynn and Spalding (no.505). There exists the opportunity for travel to work with bus timetables providing an early morning and evening service to/from Long Sutton. The nearest bus stops to the Site are located along Little London and High Street, both within 8 minutes walking distance. National Express coach services operate from nearby Boston, Kings Lynn, Spalding and Wisbech. Hourly train service is provided at Kings Lynn train station towards Cambridge and London Kings Cross, whilst Spalding and Peterborough train stations provide alternative routes across the UK.

5.4 Opportunities offered by Development The preceding information demonstrates that development within this location could provide a sustainable solution to the future growth requirements within South East Lincolnshire. This Site has the ability to satisfy demand for housing including providing market dwellings with the requisite number of affordable units. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework, the council should seek to achieve 'mixed and balanced communities'. By virtue of the location of the Site, new residents who occupy any properties subsequently constructed here would be within easy walking distance of all local services and facilities. Sustainable growth in Long Sutton would assist in maintaining the vitality and viability of a currently active rural community. Development on the Site could be assimilated reasonably easily into the village given that it represents a logical extension adjacent to existing development, with potential access points taken from Daniel's Gate and/or Lime Walk.

Response_Number:

735

Persons_Name:

Hilary Williamson

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

I should like to make my representation regarding the Spalding Western Relief Road, and housing developments between Spalding and Pinchbeck.

I own a piece of land adjacent to the footpath which links Spalding with Pinchbeck from Two Plank Lane to Market Way. Up until now this footpath has provided a pleasant rural walk for many, many people. Not only dog walkers and families enjoying an afternoon walk or cycle ride, but also those going from home to work, school, or the shops - and they are all doing these things in the most environmentally friendly way possible!

I therefore ask for this route to be preserved and possibly enhanced (landscaping and screening from the housing estate, for instance, while, of course, leaving access to it from the housing estate).

I would also hope that other green space will be seen as important. At present, there are not many places around Spalding where children can go nutting, scramble through hedgerows or watch the wild animals, so odd little corners of sanitised open space are not what I had in mind. To my way of thinking, all people need access, not only to sports facilities, but also to substantial areas of wild space which they can reach, on foot, from their own homes.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	778	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	<p>We agree with the appraisal of Service Villages (South Holland District) as set out in paragraphs 6.44 to 6.46.12, but support Option B rather than Option A.</p> <p>Option B provides a greater opportunity in the Service Villages and enables larger development proposals to come forward that are more likely to support local services and deliver greater levels of affordable housing.</p>	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	779	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	We consider the proposed housing figure for Surfleet is too low and should be increased to 50 dwellings in accordance with Option B.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	780	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	The New Allocations entry for Service Villages such as Surfleet should be increased to allow for a maximum of 50 dwellings in any one village. The total for Service Villages should be increased following a review of the various settlements and an assessment carried out to determine the potential capacity of each.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	781	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	The broad approach is reasonable.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	782	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is acceptable.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	783	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Response_Number:

784

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

785

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

786

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

787

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	831	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	<p>We agree with the appraisal of Service Villages (South Holland District) as set out in paragraphs 6.44 to 6.46.12, but support Option B rather than Option A.</p> <p>Option B provides a greater opportunity in the Service Villages and enables larger development proposals to come forward that are more likely to support local services and deliver greater levels of affordable housing.</p>	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	832	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	We consider the proposed housing figure for Gosberton is too low and should be increased to at least the 50 dwellings set out in Option B.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	833	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	The New Allocations entry for Service Villages such as Gosberton should be increased to allow for 50 dwellings in any one village, if not more where there is a suitable site and a good level of service provision. The total housing number for Service Villages should be increased following a review of the various settlements and an assessment carried out to determine the potential capacity of each.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	834	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	The broad approach is reasonable.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	835	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is acceptable.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	836	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Response_Number:

837

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

838

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

839

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

840

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u> 885	<u>Persons_Name:</u> Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u> Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u> The appraisal in respect of Holbeach in paragraphs 6.28 to 6.29.2 is supported insofar as it confirms Holbeach's status as the largest Main Service Centre in South Holland.	<u>Officer_Response:</u> Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u> Support - No change to the approach is required.

This representation is made in respect of the important urban extension to the west of Holbeach that is allocated in the current South Holland Local Plan. The land provides the opportunity for planned growth for the town.

Option A identifies a provision of 1,000 dwellings of which 900 may be located in ROY areas. Option A is supported insofar as it will facilitate the delivery of the Holbeach West Urban Extension.

<u>Response_Number:</u> 886	<u>Persons_Name:</u> Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u> Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u> The provision of 1,000 dwellings in Holbeach is supported.	<u>Officer_Response:</u> Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u> Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	887	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	888	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
The broad approach is reasonable.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	889	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is acceptable.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	890	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:	The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Response_Number:

891

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

892

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

893

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

894

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

895

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents_Comments:

The policy should set a more ambitious target for South Holland for the earlier plan periods. The current targets indicate that nearly one third of the housing target is anticipated in the last quarter of the plan period. It is important that the targets are achievable, but they should also be ambitious.

Officer_Response:

The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

896

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents_Comments:

The phasing should set more ambitious targets for South Holland for the periods 2011-2016, 2016-2021 and 2021-2026.

Officer_Response:

The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	897	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:	The phasing targets for South Holland for the periods 2011-2016, 2016-2021 and 2021-2026 should increase with a corresponding reduction for the period 2026-2031.	Officer_Response:	The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.	Officer Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	943	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:	<p>The appraisal in respect of Service Villages (Boston Borough) is too crude and provides only two options, neither of which appear to be fully justified.</p> <p>Option A relies on Swineshead being outside the ROY zone, but this relates to only part of the settlement and predetermines land to be allocated for development irrespective of its relationship with the village.</p> <p>The logical locations for new development in Swineshead would be to the north and east of the settlement, but large parts of both of these areas would be in the ROY zone, as shown in the Boston Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2010. To allocate one third of the total service village housing allocation to that single settlement, therefore, cannot be justified.</p> <p>Option B is wholly unacceptable, as it makes no allowance for whether there are suitable sites for the housing provision.</p>	Officer_Response:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	Officer Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

944

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The Service Villages (Boston Borough) housing provision is too low and should be increased to provide a greater allocation for the 20 year period, as explained in the response to Q14.

The reliance on Boston to deliver large quantities of housing is unrealistic and promotes development in the area at highest risk of flood – it is not a case of development in the ROY zone, but development in the red zone. The Service Villages are more commonly within either the orange or yellow zones and at lesser risk.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

945

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

Algarkirk is immediately adjacent to Sutterton and allocation of development there would be acceptable, but development would rely on the services and facilities in Sutterton, which emphasises the fact that Sutterton is a more appropriate location for new allocations.

Bicker is a small settlement that is outside the ROY zone, but it is heavily reliant on Donington for services. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Fishtoft is within the red 'Danger to All' designation within the ROY zone and at the highest level of risk. It is not appropriate to allocate significant amounts of housing in such a settlement.

Kirton End is a relatively small settlement that is largely within the ROY zone. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Leake Commonside is another small settlement, where the benefits in flood risk are not outweighed by its sustainability for new housing allocations. It is not appropriate to allocate significant housing provision in the settlement.

Swineshead Bridge is a small settlement without village character that is shown in the Boston Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to be wholly within the ROY zone. It is unclear why the Local Authority has suggested this settlement as suitable for any housing allocation.

Wigtoft is another small settlement that is in the lesser ROY zone designations, but it is heavily reliant on other villages, such as Sutterton, for services. Any allocation

Officer_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Wrangle is a settlement with a level of services that reflects its size, but it is largely within the ROY zone. It would appear to be a suitable location for a modest amount of housing allocation.

In summary, the allocation of development in Algakirk, Fishtoft and Swineshead Bridge is not supported. Any allocations in the remaining villages should reflect their size and service provision.

Response_Number:

946

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The policy should categorise the different Boston Borough Service Villages in terms of their size, review the relative level of development likely to be proposed in the ROY zone, assess the potential for sustainable development and set the allocation provision accordingly.

The cap of 300 dwellings to be on ROY sites places a disproportionate burden on the Service Villages. The proportion is 37.5% when compared to the original option A and B target of 80 and 85% which is caused by the fact 100% of Boston town allocations are to be on ROY land. It dictates the approach to site allocation in the Service Villages unreasonably, with the ROY zone becoming the determining factor irrespective of whether land that falls within ROY zone, but is safe development.

The Evidence Base for the Local Plan includes the document Boston Borough rural settlements dated 2008. This includes settlement specific assessments and then a review of service and facility provision. The result of the service provision is that Sutterton is ranked second of all settlements including Kirton, thus it is the highest ranking Service Village. There is a similar review of public transport where Sutterton is ranked third behind Kirton and Wrangle. The concluding analysis ranks Sutterton third overall behind Kirton, which is a Main Service Centre, and Butterwick.

Sutterton is a key settlement in the Borough and should be allocated a substantial level of new housing. The housing provision for the Services Villages (Boston Borough) should be increased overall to reflect the response to Q14. The cap on allocations on ROY land should be increased and the policy should provide flexibility where sites are shown to be safe by site

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

specific flood risk assessments.

Response_Number:	947	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
The broad approach is reasonable.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response_Number:	948	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
The approach is acceptable.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response_Number:

949

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The provision of 20% of dwellings on schemes in Boston Borough is acceptable, but the policy should refer to “up to one fifth” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

950

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one fifth”.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

951

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

952

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	953	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:	954	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Persimmon Homes
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The policy should be applied to a higher Boston Borough housing provision, as referred to in Q14, and set a more ambitious target for the earlier periods.		The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:

955

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The phasing should set more ambitious targets for Boston for the periods 2011-2016 and 2016-2021.

Officer_Response:

The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

956

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The phasing targets for Boston for the periods 2011-2016 and 2016-2021 should increase to reflect a higher housing target in accordance with the response to Q14.

Officer_Response:

The proposed phasing of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. This phasing does not preclude additional housing being delivered if the market dictates.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1002

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents_Comments:

Spalding is appraised in paragraphs 6.23 to 6.27.1. Reference should be made to a potential marina and potential circumstances where housing may be allowed within the ROY zone if specifically proposed as part a larger development.

Officer_Response:

No proposals for a marina or marina related development have been forthcoming

Officer_Recommendation:

No change to the plan is recommended.

Response_Number:

1003

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents_Comments:

The provision of 6,000 dwellings in Spalding is supported, but with reference to the potential for dwellings within the ROY zone if promoted as part of a marina development scheme.

Officer_Response:

No proposals for a marina or marina related development have been forthcoming

Officer_Recommendation:

No change to the plan is recommended.

Response_Number: 1004

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: Fen Properties

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy approach should be amended so that the provision of 6,000 dwellings in Spalding refers to the potential for dwellings to be within the ROY zone if promoted as part of a marina development scheme.

Officer_Response:

No proposals for a marina or marina related development have been forthcoming

Officer_Recommendation:

No change to the plan is recommended.

Response_Number: 1005

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: Fen Properties

Respondents_Comments:

The broad approach is reasonable.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1006	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is acceptable.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1007	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:	The provision of one third of dwellings on schemes in South Holland is an ambitious target. The policy should refer to “up to one third” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Response_Number:

1008

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one third” in respect of South Holland District Council.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

1009

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is reasonable and the preferred policy wording is appropriate.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1010

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents_Comments:

The preferred policy is concise and provides adequate guidance.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1011

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1040

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents_Comments:

The identification of Sutterton as a Service Village is supported.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1041

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents_Comments:

The Service Villages (Boston Borough) housing provision is too low and should be increased to provide a greater allocation. An increase would enable the proper planning for future growth of Sutterton and attract investment.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1042

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents_Comments:

Algakirk is immediately adjacent to Sutterton and allocation of development there would be acceptable, but development would rely on the services and facilities in Sutterton, which emphasises the fact that Sutterton is a more appropriate location for new allocations.

Bicker is a small settlement that is outside the ROY zone, but it is heavily reliant on Donington for services. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Fishtoft is within the red 'Danger to All' designation within the ROY zone and at the highest level of risk. It is not appropriate to allocate significant amounts of housing in such a settlement.

Kirton End is a relatively small settlement that is largely within the ROY zone. Any allocation should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Leake Commonside is another small settlement, where the benefits in flood risk are not outweighed by its sustainability for new housing allocations. It is not appropriate to allocate significant housing provision in the settlement.

Swineshead Bridge is a small settlement without village character that is shown in the Boston Borough Strategic Flood Risk Assessment to be wholly within the ROY zone. It is unclear why the Local Authority has suggested this settlement as suitable for any housing allocation.

Wigtoft is another small settlement that is in the lesser ROY zone designations, but it is heavily reliant on other villages, such as Sutterton, for services. Any allocation

Officer_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

should reflect the level of services and facilities in the village.

Wrangle is a settlement with a level of services that reflects its size, but it is largely within the ROY zone. It would appear to be a suitable location for a modest amount of housing allocation.

In summary, the allocation of development in Algakirk, Fishtoft and Swineshead Bridge is not supported. Any allocations in the remaining villages should reflect their size and service provision.

Response_Number:	1043	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	K Enderby
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
The policy should categorise the different Boston Borough Service Villages in terms of their size, review the relative level of development likely to be proposed in the ROY zone, assess the potential for sustainable development and set the allocation provision accordingly.	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		
Sutterton is a key settlement in the Borough and should be allocated a substantial level of new housing. The housing provision for the Services Villages (Boston Borough) should be increased overall to reflect the response to Q14.					

Response_Number: 1044

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

The broad approach is reasonable.

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1045

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

The approach is acceptable.

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1046

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

K Enderby

Respondents_Comments:

The provision of 20% of dwellings on schemes in Boston Borough is acceptable, but the policy should refer to “up to one fifth” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

1047

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

K Enderby

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one fifth”.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number: 1058

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

The appraisal should include reference to an allowance for modest development in the villages that fall between the Service Villages and the Countryside.

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number: 1059

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

A further type of place should be added to the policy to recognise the role of villages, such as Freiston, with an allowance for small scale development to support local essential services.

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number: 1060

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

The broad approach is reasonable.

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1061

Persons_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

The approach is acceptable.

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1062

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

The provision of 20% of dwellings on schemes in Boston Borough is acceptable, but the policy should refer to “up to one fifth” rather than set a fixed proportion. This will allow flexibility in the event viability may prevent sites coming forward.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

1063

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents_Comments:

The Provision for Affordable Housing policy should refer to “up to one fifth”.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

1064

Persons_Name:

Mr and Mrs D Wren

Representing_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents_Comments:

I wish to comment upon the proposed plans for development in South Holland and concerning Crowland in particular.

I am aware that there is a need for further housing for current and future generations and cannot argue with those aspects of the proposals which relate to this problem.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1068

Persons_Name: Mr B Collins McDougall

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Industrial , Commercial & Housing development in Areas of High Flood Risk

It is irresponsible madness to propose allowing 4,800 new homes and large scale industrial development to take place in flood hazard areas in south east Lincolnshire. The Environment Agency warn that they expect flooding to increase in the future due to climate change. They predict increasing coastal erosion, rising sea levels and more stormy weather.
[Http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/31668.aspx](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/31668.aspx)

In the past decade the incidence of flash flooding throughout the United Kingdom has increased to previously unprecedented levels.

The folly of building in a flood plain was brought home in December 2012. In Ruthin in North Wales, a designated flood hazard area permission was given by planning authorities to built a estate of new homes which was subsequently badly flooded. Residents now find themselves with homes that are impossible to ensure and difficult to sell. They live in fear of further flooding.

Around 5.2 million homes in the country are at risk of sea, river or surface water flooding and flooding is the natural disaster most likely to affect the United Kingdom. Advice from the insurance industry is that building on a flood plain should be avoided wherever possible. It makes no sense whatsoever to add to their number by allowing further development of any kind within the area designated a ROY zone in your plan (your jargon not mine).

The hazards and risks of industrial and commercial

Officer_Response:

The impact of flood risk on the proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

development in a flood zone are so obvious that it is impossible for any reasonable person to understand why the South East Lincolnshire Planning Authority is considering it. The potential for environmental pollution with consequent risk of harm to human health, damage to natural habitats and contamination of the food chain are good reasons for not allowing this type of development. The guiding principle of not allowing anything to be built on a flood plain that can be located elsewhere is surely sound.

Response_Number:	1075	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	O A Taylor Ltd
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villagen in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number:	1076	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	O A Taylor Ltd
Respondents_Comments:	In response to Q29, we consider that it would be incorrect not to identify new housing sites in villages below 'Service Village' level. Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designated as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1077	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	O A Taylor
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

1078

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

O A Taylor

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Fleet Hargate, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Fle 010. However we are aware of the comment that the site is considered to large for the scale of the village's services. We therefore have revised the site area concerned, and show this now on a revised plan. There is also a road – Hocklesgate which runs through the middle of the site, rather than it being one single field. The area to the east of Hocklesgate is adjacent to existing new residential development, and our client considers this site is very suitable for a continued development on this part of Fleet Hargate. The land at Saracens Head – Wha 025, has been misrepresented in the previous SHLAA and we attach two plans of the land correctly showing the areas in question, which we hope you can add to your database.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1080	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	J Grant
Respondents_Comments:	<p>In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 73 per settlement (3.7 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

Response_Number:	1081	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	J Grant
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sites, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the southern Boston parishes, such as a greater number being allocated to Swineshead.</p>				
Officer_Response:	<p>Support noted.</p>				
Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>				

Response_Number:

1082

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

J Grant

Respondents_Comments:

Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

1083

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

J Grant

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's sites in Swineshead to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date, and relevant site proforma.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1084

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

M Cobbin

Respondents_Comments:

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links.

Cont'/over

Cont'd..

We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools.

Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water passing through the area'.

The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems.

The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1085	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	M Cobbin
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1087	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	M Cobbin
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1088

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

R Chappell Esq.

Respondents_Comments:

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links.

Cont'/over

Cont'd..

We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools.

Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water passing through the area'.

The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems.

The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1089	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	R Chappell Esq.
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1091	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	R Chappell
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1092

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Spalding Rectory Feoffees

Respondents_Comments:

We have studied the proposal Options document and Sustainability Appraisal Report, and would like to make a further representation at this stage of the Plan review.

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links. We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water passing through the area'. The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems. The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development is S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of s10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1093	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding Rectory Feoffees
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1095	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding Rectory Feoffees
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date, together with accompanying Site Proforma. If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1097

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

Mrs M Johnson

Respondents_Comments:

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031. Q32/Q33 – The Holland Park development un-fulfilled outline permissions - 2,250, plus the suggested 3,750 in the area north of Vernatt's Drain, would fulfil the entire Spalding Housing need. It is suggested that this figure is reduced to allow for housing development on other sites around Spalding. Having studied the consultation on infrastructure document, it is considered that the S5 area is well located for Healthcare, and Childcare. It is also extremely well located for transport links. We consider some development on the south –eastern areas of the town would spread the burden on infrastructure such as roads and schools. Additionally, our clients land at Cowbit Road, is a lower grade Silt land to the land on the western parts such as S10. From a flooding perspective , consideration should be made to assessments from the IDB's on land drainage and flooding problem, not only EA data on 'Sea and High Level water passing through the area'. The S5 area has little or no flood history or problems. The development of land in S5 would alleviate the problems caused by development in S10 – as all the traffic from that proposed area will feed into Spalding Road, Pinchbeck near the Johnson Hospital. We consider the development of S10 will contribute more to the public realm than the spend needed on two railway flyovers and a river crossing, which would be needed to deliver the SWRR..

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is appropriate to consider a range of smaller sites (through the Site Allocations DPD) in order to complement larger broad locations for housing development in Spalding.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1098	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Johnson
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	1100	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs M Johnson
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass. Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1101	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C Slooten
Respondents_Comments:	Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we note it has been proposed that Spalding will require 6,000 new dwelling allocations for 2011-2031.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1102	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C Slooten
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	1104	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	C Slooten
Respondents_Comments:	<p>We include a plan showing our client's site in Cowbit Road, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. You have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Stm 005. .If considered suitable, this land, developed in conjunction with other immediately neighbouring landowners, in total 200 acres, would deliver housing to Spalding, which would not cause detriment to the character and appearance of the area if developed, given the now natural/physical barrier to the countryside created by the Spalding Bypass.</p> <p>Our clients consider additional development led benefits for the community will arise from Residential development in this part of the town, in particular leisure uses.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>

Response_Number:	1106	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs R Bridger
Respondents_Comments:	<p>In response to Q29, we consider that it would be incorrect not to identify new housing sites in villages below 'Service Village' level. Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designated as Service Villages.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>

Response_Number:	1107	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs R Bridger
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	1108	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs R Bridger
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's site in Holbeach Clough, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is located centrally within the curtilage of Holbeach Clough, with frontage to Clough Road.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number: 1109	Persons_Name: Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?: N Brown
Respondents_Comments: Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider that the proposed Housing allocation set for Holbeach - at an additional 1000 new allocations in the 2011-2031 time frame, is in proportionate to the housing needs in Holbeach. We consider the development of the land in the north west sector of Holbeach is an excellent location for this development to take place due to very good links to infrastructure and transport. We include a plan showing our client’s site, to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date, and a completed site proforma for the property which is now a discontinued employment site.	Officer_Response: Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation: These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.
Response_Number: 1111	Persons_Name: Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?: R C Tinsley
Respondents_Comments: Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, in respect of its currently proposed Spatial Strategy classification as a Service Village, in response to Q28, we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 75 per settlement (3.6 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	Officer_Response: It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation: These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1112	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	R C Tinsley
Respondents_Comments:	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units. We consider rural exceptions schemes should be permitted in Countryside settlements, as this would be the only route available for these areas to be allowed to develop. We believe consideration should be given to sites, to reflect to a degree, the policy in adjacent semi rural districts.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round. The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions Sites to be considered in relation to all settlements with a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	1114	Persons_Name:	Annabel Parkinson	Representing_Who?:	R C Tinsley
Respondents_Comments:	We include a plan showing our client's sites in Deeping St Nicholas to ensure your database of possible sites available for Housing land for allocations is up to date, together with relevant site proforma . This land is located within and behind some existing frontage of housing at Deeping St Nicholas, and provides land, with excellent transport links.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1116	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	H Nundy
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 73 per settlement (3.7 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>				
<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.</p>				
<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>				

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1117	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	H Nundy
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q 30 - We consider that due to good infrastructure and road networks, the shortfall of sites in Boston Borough due to restrictions on development on ROY sites, could be met by additional development quotas being spread amongst the southern Boston parishes, such as a greater number being allocated to Swineshead.</p>				
<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Support noted.</p>				
<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>				

Response_Number:

1118

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

H Nundy

Respondents_Comments:

Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

1119

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

H Nundy

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Swineshead to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date, and relevant site proforma.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1121	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	J Grant
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1122	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	J Grant
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Response_Number:

1123

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

J Grant

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's site in Gosberton to ensure your database of possible sites for allocations is up to date. As stated above, you have already considered this in the earlier SHLAA as site Gos 006. We are aware of the comment that the site is considered in-appropriate in scale for the village. Our clients wish to point out that Gosberton is one of only a very few local villages to have a Medical Centre, and consequently wishes us to re-assert their view that the site is extremely very well located for close proximity to this important Local and Community Service, and believes, Gosberton has a far greater range of Services than many other local villages of similar 'Service Village' classification. It has become a major shopping centre and we believe there is a case to support a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1125	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	The Casswell Family
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. .</p> <p>We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.</p>		<p>It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1126	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	The Casswell Family
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.</p>		<p>A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.</p>		<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.</p>	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1127	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	The Casswell Family
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer Recommendation:</u>		
We include a plan showing our client's sites in Quadring. You have already considered one of these in the earlier SHLAA as site Qua 002. We appreciate the comment that the site is considered suitable in scale for a village with its range of services and facilities. Our client also has other land which they would like to put forward, and we attach herewith two proforma for these sites. They wish us to re-assert their view that all the sites are very well located for close proximity to transport routes, and centrally located in the village	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1129	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	The Casswell Family
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer Recommendation:</u>		
In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement's services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough's 'Service Village' Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number: 1130

Persons_Name: Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?: The Casswell Family

Respondents_Comments:

Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.

Officer_Response:

A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number: 1131

Persons_Name: Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?: The Casswell Family

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's sites in Sutterton. You have already considered these in the earlier SHLAA as sites Sut 009, 010, 011. We are aware of the comment that the first two sites are considered inappropriate in scale for a village with its range of services and facilities, but that Sut 011 is considered a possible suitable site. Our clients wish us to re-assert their view that all the sites are very well located for close proximity to transport routes, and centrally located in the village.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1133	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	J Grant
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	In response to Q28 , we consider that the proposed housing figures for the Service Villages, set at 25 per settlement, over the 20 year plan period, is low (1.25 units average per year). Village services need more support and increased housing development on a sensible basis would provide this support. . We consider the suggested allocations in the Service villages in the Boston Settlements at around 66 per settlement (3.3 units average per year) is more appropriate to support and promote continued settlement development and sustainability for these settlement’s services We consider that it would be incorrect to have inconsistency between the two borough’s ‘Service Village’ Housing scale. At the very least, we consider Option B – 50 new dwellings per settlement should be provided for.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1134	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	J Grant
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q38-41. We consider that affordable housing proportions in Boston Borough and South Holland should be the same and at a rate of one fifth of total dwellings, for developments of 5 or more units.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Response_Number:

1135

Persons_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing_Who?:

J Grant

Respondents_Comments:

We include a plan showing our client's sites in Quadring, together with accompanying site proforma, which they would like to be added to your database of sites available for Housing land. This land is located within the village of Quadring

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number: 1144

Persons_Name: Mrs J M Blundell

Representing_Who?: Herself

Respondents_Comments:

Industrial , Commercial & Housing development in Areas of High Flood Risk

It is irresponsible madness to propose allowing 4,800 new homes and large scale industrial development to take place in flood hazard areas in south east Lincolnshire. The Environment Agency warn that they expect flooding to increase in the future due to climate change. They predict increasing coastal erosion, rising sea levels and more stormy weather.
[Http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/31668.aspx](http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/homeandleisure/floods/31668.aspx)

In the past decade the incidence of flash flooding throughout the United Kingdom has increased to previously unprecedented levels.

The folly of building in a flood plain was brought home in December 2012. In Ruthin in North Wales, a designated flood hazard area permission was given by planning authorities to built a estate of new homes which was subsequently badly flooded. Residents now find themselves with homes that are impossible to ensure and difficult to sell. They live in fear of further flooding.

Around 5.2 million homes in the country are at risk of sea, river or surface water flooding and flooding is the natural disaster most likely to affect the United Kingdom. Advice from the insurance industry is that building on a flood plain should be avoided wherever possible. It makes no sense whatsoever to add to their number by allowing further development of any kind within the area designated a ROY zone in your plan (your jargon not mine).

The hazards and risks of industrial and commercial

Officer_Response:

The impact of flood risk on the proposed distribution of additional housing has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

development in a flood zone are so obvious that it is impossible for any reasonable person to understand why the South East Lincolnshire Planning Authority is considering it. The potential for environmental pollution with consequent risk of harm to human health, damage to natural habitats and contamination of the food chain are good reasons for not allowing this type of development. The guiding principle of not allowing anything to be built on a flood plain that can be located elsewhere is surely sound.

Response_Number: 1145

Persons_Name: Ziyad Thomas

Representing_Who?: McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifesty

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer Recommendation:

Growing Elderly Population

The National Planning Policy Framework stipulates that the planning system should be 'supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities' and highlights the need to 'deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive mixed communities. Local Planning Authorities should plan for a mix of housing based on current and future demographic trends, market trends and the needs of different groups in the community... such as... older people' (emphasis added).

My Client appreciates that the biggest population increases within the Borough are of young adults and children and the Core Strategy Review, quite rightly, focuses its attention on meeting the educational and housing needs of these demographic groups. It must also be noted however that the proportion of elderly people within the Borough is also projected to increase over the Plan period.

The "What Housing Where Toolkit" developed by the Home Builders Federation uses statistical data and projections from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) and the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) to provide useful data on future and current housing needs. The table below has been replicated from the toolkit and shows the projected changes to the demographic profile of South-East Lincolnshire between 2008 and 2033:

THE LETTER INCLUDES A GRAPH HERE THAT HAS NOT COPIED ACROSS.

In line with the rest of the country, this toolkit demonstrates that the demographic profiles of South

The SHMA evidence relating to the Boston and South Holland areas of the plan has been reviewed. The needs of the elderly population have been assessed but do not indicate that a specific policy response is required.

No change to the approach of the plan is recommended.

Holland and Boston Councils are projected to age. The proportion of the population aged 60 and over in Boston Borough will increase from 28% to 36.7% between 2008 and 2033, with the same demographic projected to increase from 30% to 38% % over the same timescale in South Holland. The largest proportional increases in the older population of all three Councils are expected to be of the 'frail' elderly, those aged 75 and over, who are more likely to require specialist care and accommodation. It must be noted that the proportion of the population aged over 60 is significantly higher in South East Lincolnshire than the average projected increase for UK authorities by the Office for National Statistics (23% of the population aged over 65 by 2033).

The provision of adequate support and accommodation for the increasingly ageing demographic profile of South East Lincolnshire is therefore a significant challenge and, unless properly planned for over the next 20 years, there is likely to be a serious shortfall in specialist accommodation for the older population, which will have a knock on effect in meeting the housing needs of the whole area and wider policy objectives. Specialist accommodation for the elderly, such as that provided by McCarthy and Stone, will therefore have a vital role in meeting the areas housing needs.

An overview of private sheltered schemes and the benefits they can provide to the elderly is provided below. In addition, examples and suggestions are given of how policy can support and encourage the development of this much needed type of elderly accommodation, and deliver in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Community Benefits of Private Sheltered
Accommodation

“Housing Markets and Independence in Old Age - Expanding the Opportunities”, a new report by Professor Michael Ball of the University of Reading, was presented at a House Commons launch event in May 2011. The report highlights how owner-occupied retirement housing (OORH), such as that built by McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd, helps to address the challenges of housing an ageing population. In addition, Professor Michael Ball highlights how OORH provides numerous benefits to communities including increasing the availability of much needed family houses in areas of shortage. This is because most OORH residents will have freed up family homes they were previously under-occupying, the majority of which are located in the market area local to the retirement housing development. It is therefore clear that private specialised housing for the elderly has a key role to play in providing a suitable and sustainable housing mix that meets South East Lincolnshire’s wider housing needs.

Furthermore, the presence of specialised housing for the elderly often greatly enhances the sustainability of businesses in nearby town and local centres. A report compiled by ‘The Opinion Research Business’ (ORB) entitled A Better Life: Private Sheltered Housing and Independent Living for Older People shows how Retirement Living accommodation helps to underpin local shops services and facilities. The report found that 62% of residents in retirement living schemes preferred to shop locally, with 45% of resident shopping within one mile of their scheme.

Benefits of Private Sheltered Accommodation for Elderly Individuals

Sheltered housing is a proven housing choice for elderly people who wish to move into accommodation that provides comfort, security and the ability to manage independently to a greater extent. It enables older

people to remain living independently within the community and out of institutions, whilst enjoying peace of mind and receiving the support that they need.

All McCarthy and Stone developments are specifically designed to provide housing accommodation for elderly people, who have experienced specific life changing circumstances that prompt the move into a specialised, purpose built, living environment. The communal facilities and specific features within the apartments designed to meet the particular needs of these likeminded people, generally result in a much improved quality of life.

The peace of mind and contentment that this form of housing brings to its residents should not be underestimated. The maintenance of an organised, stress-free lifestyle that will benefit the general health and well-being of a like-minded group of people within a contained, communal living environment is of paramount importance to the success of this form of housing, and a desirable end-result for society at large, from an economic as well social perspective. As residents feel healthier and happier this inevitably has positive impact on their wellbeing and they will therefore place less of a burden on local health and support facilities. The additional support available to residents within these developments means they are also able to return to their homes quicker after a stay in hospital.

Additionally, McCarthy and Stone also provide (Assisted Living) Extra Care Housing aimed at enabling independent living for the “frail elderly”, persons typically aged 80 and over. The provision of suitable accommodation for the frail elderly will be of critical importance to the Borough and the provision of Extra-Care housing will need to be considered to meet the increasing demand for this type of accommodation.

McCarthy and Stone type developments assist in the delivery this type of accommodation, with the McCarthy and Stone Extra Care concept providing day to day care in the form of assistance and domiciliary care tailored to owners' individual needs, enabling the frail elderly to buy in care packages to suit their needs as they change. It provides further choice for the frail elderly allowing them to stay in their own home and maintain a better sense of independence, enhancing their personal welfare over time rather than through the fixed costs of a nursing or residential care with its one for all approach. Accordingly, Extra Care accommodation possesses a number of 'enhanced facilities' in terms of the communal facilities available and provides a higher level of care when compared to private retirement housing. It is therefore a different form of specialised housing for the elderly than retirement housing and provides the increasingly elderly population with more choice and with an alternative type of accommodation to meet their needs as frailty increases. The benefits to the public purse as outlined above are even more evident here.

Suggestions for the Core Strategy Review

To ensure the adequate delivery of specialist accommodation for the elderly we would ideally recommend an additional policy specifically dealing with this matter.

To encourage Local Government to plan proactively for the development of specialist housing for the elderly a toolkit was developed by a consortium of national housing interests with representation from both the private and public sector entitled 'Housing in Later Life: Planning Ahead for Specialist Housing for Older People'. A copy of this document has been attached for your convenience.

This toolkit encourages a joined up approach to planning, housing and social care policy both in the

collection of evidence and the development of specialist accommodation for the elderly. Fundamental to achieving this is the inclusion of policies supporting specialist accommodation for the elderly into the Local Planning Framework. Whilst we appreciate that no one planning approach will be appropriate for all areas, an example policy wording is provided that could be included within the review of the Local Plan:

“The Council will encourage the provision of specialist housing for older people across all tenures in sustainable locations.

The Council aims to ensure that older people are able to secure and sustain independence in a home appropriate to their circumstances and to actively encourage developers to build new homes to the ‘Lifetime Homes’ standard so that they can be readily adapted to meet the needs of those with disabilities and the elderly as well as assisting independent living at home.

The Council will, through the identification of sites, allowing for windfall developments, and / or granting of planning consents in sustainable locations, provide for the development of retirement accommodation, residential care homes, close care, Extra Care and assisted care housing and Continuing Care Retirement Communities.”

In summary, McCarthy and Stone stress the need to consider addressing the current and future housing needs of older people within South East Lincolnshire and for the Council to take this opportunity to positively address this issue within the emerging Local Plan.

Response_Number:

1148

Persons_Name:

Angela Reeve

Representing_Who?:

Cemex UK Properties

Respondents_Comments:

Paragraphs 6.39 6.43.1 provide the approach to the scale of additional housing to be provided in the Main Service Centres of Crowland and Donington. Only one Policy option, Policy Option A, is provided for this approach and this policy sets a target of 300 additional dwellings in both Crowland and Donington over the plan period. Paragraphs 6.40.1 and 6.40.2 provide unreasonable Policy Options for Crowland and Donington strategic housing growth aims, one of which is that:

It is deemed unreasonable to provide a greater proportion of housing, despite both settlements being outside of the ROY zone, given their relatively lower provision of services and facilities compared with Holbeach. The other of which suggests it would be unreasonable to appraise any option that: considers the provision of less than 300 dwellings .

By establishing both of these options as unreasonable, this provides no prospect for flexibility and creates a rigid and unrealistic policy target of exactly 300 new dwellings. We feel that it can not be considered that both of these policies are unreasonable. We would argue that a higher housing requirement at Donington should be considered a reasonable policy option. This is on the grounds listed below. Firstly, paragraph 4.22, which establishes the council s preferred policy approach to flood risk mitigation in relation to housing growth, identifies that lower levels of housing growth should occur in ROY zones. As the majority of the plan area is covered by the ROY zone, it is suggested that as much growth as possible should be encouraged in areas located outside of the zone. It is therefore not appropriate to put a restriction of no more than 300 additional dwellings in Donington which is situated outside of the ROY zone. The ability to provide higher levels of housing at this MSC to assist in meeting the requirements outlined in the Demographic Projections

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire Report 2012 is therefore not being taken by the Councils. In addition to this, it is outlined in the Local Plan that the rationalisation behind deeming higher levels of housing unreasonable is that the provision of facilities and services in these two MSCs are relatively low compared to Holbeach. We would argue that there is no reason to believe that further housing development in Donington would not facilitate the delivery and improvement of services and facilities in the area and would go so far as to argue that Donington already has a good range of existing services and facilities. We would also argue that the reference to Holbeach is irrelevant as although it may have a better provision of services, this approach does not take into account the prevalence of ROY zones in the north and east of Holbeach compared to the status of both Donington and Crowland as non-ROY zones. The data provided in Appendix 9, illustrates that whereas Donington has land available for development in non-ROY areas with a potential cumulative capacity of 1568 additional dwellings, Holbeach only has an available land capacity for 613 additional dwellings in non-ROY areas. In spite of this, Holbeach has been identified as being able to accommodate 1000 additional dwellings over the plan period. We therefore suggest that the housing targets set for Donington should be increased to reflect the favourable approach to building on non-ROY land, rather than focussing on existing services and facilities provision as a benchmark for future development. As a further point, the Local Plan identifies a preference for a dispersed approach to the distribution of development (paragraph 5.16.1) by encouraging growth in the SVs. This is on the basis that it would enable development to occur in non-ROY zones. In this policy instance, the DPD does not appear to consider the lack of facilities within the Service Villages as an issue, it focuses rather on the importance of developing in non-ROY zones; this is contradictory to the justification for the preferred policy option established for housing growth in Crowland and

Donington. Based on the above points, we propose that housing growth figure for Donington should be increased in order to allow for it to maintain its role as a MSC and provide additional dwellings for South East Lincolnshire in a sustainable, non-ROY location. There is clear scope for this proposed increase; the available sites submitted through the SHLAA (draft findings) provide a potential capacity for an additional 1568 new dwellings in Donington.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1149	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Angela Reeve	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Cemex UK Properties
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
The SHLAA makes reference to our client's site (Don008), classifying it as undevelopable . We do not believe that the reasons set forward in this assessment are robust enough to justify this classification. The site is established as being both available and achievable for development and it is also determined that the scale of the site is appropriate to the village s range of services (which is highlighted as an area for concern in paragraph 6.40.2 of the DPD) and that it has a satisfactory relationship with the existing built-up area. The only reason provided for the undevelopable classification is the potential for conflict with existing neighbouring industrial and haulage uses. We do not agree with this classification nor do we believe that there is sufficient justification for deeming the site undevelopable. A recent housing development on Cowley Road has resulted in new homes being located just 23 metres from the neighbouring depot boundary. As well as this, because of the size and nature of our client s site, a noise buffer or other mitigation measures, could be easily incorporated into the scheme. In light of these points, we would request that the classification for our client's site is revised to indicate that it is developable.	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number:

1150

Persons_Name:

Angela Reeve

Representing_Who?:

Cemex UK Properties

Respondents_Comments:

In conclusion, it is considered that, while the wider principles within the South East Lincolnshire preferred options DPD could be considered acceptable, there are some details which are contradictory to one another and some which are not appropriate and suitable within the wider policy context. We do not believe that the overall housing growth targets which have been set for South East Lincolnshire are reflective of the need indicated in the most up to date background evidence documents. Instead they are only reflective of what the authority believes is deliverable. This is an unacceptable method for setting housing growth targets and we therefore believe that the overall targets should be increased to reflect more the levels of housing shown to be required in the Demographic Projections for Coastal Districts in Lincolnshire Report 2012. We would also contend that the strategic approaches to development distribution, alongside the policies on flood prevention, are in contradiction with the housing allocation targets identified for Crowland and Donington. At present the Plan promotes a wider distribution of development, including the SVs, in order to make best use of non-ROY zones and therefore reduce exposure to flood risk. However, for Donington and Crowland, despite being located in non-ROY zones, the Plan outlines that they should have a relatively low additional dwellings target because of their lack of services and facilities. These two preferred policies contradict each other and should be amended. We propose that the distribution of housing development should focus on the sub-regional centre and the MSCs and provide limited growth in the Service Villages to meet local need. It is also proposed that an increase in the housing requirements for Donington and Crowland is achievable and reasonable.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1157

Persons_Name:

Mr S Marthews

Representing_Who?:

CPRE

Respondents_Comments:

Developments in Spalding and Boston
CPRE is opposed to both of the large green field developments contained in the plan and seeks their withdrawal.
The first is a development of 1900 new homes to the south west of Boston, and the other 3750 new homes to the west of Spalding. Both are on green field sites and there will be enormous loss of natural habitat and visual intrusion into the landscape as well as danger from flooding
According to CPRE research, in Boston Borough, 80% of the new buildings are to be built in areas at risk of flooding. In South Holland 12.5% of the buildings are at risk. Housing need should be met by better use of existing stock, for example empty residential accommodation above shops and offices, and building only in areas where there is a minimal risk of flooding and properties can be made suitably resilient. Anything else is playing with people's lives and livelihoods
To provide such unsafe housing will do nothing for the reputation of planners or housing departments in either Boston Borough or South Holland District.
It has been suggested to CPRE that the main driver for these large and ill-considered developments is profit, but not private profit, but profit for both Boston Borough and South Holland District, out of which both authorities intend to fund road infrastructure. Boston Borough wants to build a new road linking the A16 and the A52, South Holland wants to see the Spalding Western Relief road built. In neither case in present financial circumstances is there likely to be much government finance. So the political solution enshrined in the draft plan is to let housing rip in unsafe flood-prone green field sites, do irreparable harm to the environment and agricultural production and use the resulting housing development levy to fund the roads. If safe and sustainable land cannot be provided then

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

CPRE demands that local councillors find the political determination to explain the realities to national politicians and refuse planning permission

The future of rural villages

Local politicians are caustic about the villages in the south east of England around London. which they scoff have ceased in many cases to have any real village life or identity and have become mere "dormitory areas" for London. This is sadly true.

Local politicians do not appear to understand that continuation of their existing freeze on development in villages, which is deeply resented, will condemn the rural villages in South Lincolnshire to a similar fate.

The scoring applied to villages and the arbitrary classification into sustainable and unsustainable villages destroys social cohesion and guarantees an exodus of young talented people away from the Fens.

CPRE calls for a recognition that on grounds of social justice, all villages should be permitted the development of minimum facilities which would ensure that they become sustainable. The draft plan should set out how the rural villages can become sustainable. Concentrating development in the main towns of Boston and Spalding denies the villages the ability to develop to meet the needs of their residents or provide alternative safe housing. CPRE calls for an end to this pernicious policy.

The draft plan is silent also with regard to the provision of commercial and industrial land. Although South East Lincolnshire is a predominantly agricultural area, some thought should be given to provision for diversification and development of leisure and culture within the plan area.

The developments in Spalding and Boston which CPRE opposes would be unacceptable even if they were not in an area of serious flood risk. There is no provision in the plan for the facilities which will be needed to support the 10,000 plus additional residents. Already facilities are over stretched, and these developments will overwhelm them.

One test of sustainability is the ease with which residents can reach shops and other normal facilities on foot or by bicycle. If this is a serious criterion, then much of the existing development in Spalding and Boston is unsustainable and the new developments will likewise be uninhabitable without the use of the car or van.

Summary

1. The proposals for developments in flood risk areas on green field sites are irresponsible, damaging and potentially dangerous, and should be withdrawn.
 2. The sacrifice of Greenfield sites to fund a road building program is, if true, quite scandalous and must be opposed.
 3. The Red and Orange Zones in South East Lincolnshire should be closed to new development and serious efforts should be made to protect citizens in villages as well as towns by encouraging adaptation for flood resilience.
 4. Infrastructure should also be made flood resilient.
 5. The resented freeze on development in the villages must end and plans put in place to bring all villages to sustainability by permitting the development of minimum facilities taken for granted in larger towns.
-

Response_Number:	1158	Persons_Name:	Bicker Parish Council	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	The Parish Council and residents are concerned of the proposed sites Bic003 and Bic004. This land was refused planning permission previously and is adjacent to a Grade II newly renovated public house and any development would not be in keeping with the surrounding area. There is also a further plot of land that has not been nominated which requires access along the boundary of Bic003 for farming. Additional utilities for water, drainage etc would be a further drain on what the village has in place already and we strongly oppose any development on this land. It is hoped that you would look kindly on the comments of the local people.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. The sites mentioned are not currently allocated for development. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1169	Persons_Name:	P C Bradshaw	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs R Hamilton
Respondents_Comments:	Yes, this is supported.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1175	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Dadge	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs T Croxford
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Provision for Affordable Housing Question 41 – for the reasons mention earlier in the representation Rural Exception Sites should also be permitted in settlements designated as countryside. They would provide additional population to support local services, provide houses for those who do not want to move out of the rural area and free up houses that are currently under-occupied and may, subject to the nature of the affordable accommodation, offer choice to those with a specific housing need.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work. The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions sites to be considered in relation to all settlements within a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1177	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Dadge	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs T Croxford
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Final Comments Future site allocations – the application of the above comments can be demonstrated with reference to a particular settlement. Shepeau Stow is in the countryside in the spatial strategy. It is in close proximity to a number of other small hamlets where services are limited but it does have a village school that is much valued by the local community. Limited new development in Shepeau Stow with market and affordable housing would help support the village school. Similarly small scale employment uses e.g. B1 workshops or workplace home / live work units would help rural employment opportunity and putting these together as a mixed use site would be an eminently sustainable solution. The plans below show a potential site off Gypsy Lane within a 50m of the village school.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1178	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
Respondents_Comments:	Believe Option B should be supported. Service villages should be allocated at least 50 each and allowed to extend to support amenities and facilities in each village. Growth in villages has been curtailed for too long. 25 dwellings in each of the service villages is not enough. We produced evidence that on 15th May 2-12, AHDC Housing Dept. Said there were 149 people on the council waiting list. These people want housing now not in 6 years time.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1188	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
Respondents_Comments:	Support Option B in Table 6.11 of main document. Services should be allowed to expand.	Officer_Response:	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1189	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
Respondents_Comments:	Do not agree	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1190	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
Respondents_Comments:	Prefer Option A	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1191	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Prefer Option B		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	1192	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Agree 1 and 2 houses should be exempt from making affordable housing contribution		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	1193	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
Respondents_Comments:	Think the proposed affordable proportion is too high in South Holland. They should be the same as Boston. This would encourage more building in SHDC area.	Officer_Response:	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.

Response_Number:	1194	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
Respondents_Comments:	Should be permitted in sub-regional centres and settlements.	Officer_Response:	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions sites to be considered in relation to all settlements within a Settlement Boundary.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1195	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Angela Newton	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1196	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Angela Newton	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Service villages should be allowed 50 houses each		It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	

Response_Number:	1200	Persons_Name:	Mr and Mrs B Tidswell	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	That there should be an easing of the restrictions on building in non service villages	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1204	Persons_Name:	Mr and Mrs C Woods	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Most definitely agree. Villages with good facilities and access should be developed, but infrastructure should be improved to cope with extra population.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1206

Persons_Name:

Mrs S Wing

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

I have read and looked at the SELLP with interest. At first i was not unduly concerned as I understood the plan was an amalgamation between Boston BC and South Holland DC and there would be service villages. I saw in the local press that exhibition shows were being held at Swineshead and Donington which are villages either side of where my family live and I thought that these were the service villages. As Bicker wasn't mentioned I naively thought that there was no need to attend the exhibitions. I have since spoken with a Lincolnshire county Councillor involved in the process and realised I should have attended the said exhibitions. Thanks to an observant friend and neighbour I have discovered that housing is proposed for land opposite to our property and next to Ye Olde Red Lion which is a 16th century Grade 2 listed building which has recently been restored and is an asset to our village. When we moved to our property in 2007 we were under the impression that the land mentioned above was in the conservation area, out of the village envelop and that a building application on the land for 1 dwelling had been refused in 2004. I am very surprised when reading the Evidence Based section of the SEELP the land named Bic 003 is deemed as suitable building land for 7 houses.

I would like answers to the following questions please:
How is it possible that when 1 dwelling was previously refused now 7 dwellings are proposed on the same area of land.

How after 9 years the land does not remain in the conservation area or not be in the village envelope.

How can 7 dwellings fit on .86of and acre and not look out of place next to the beautiful 16th century Grade 2 listed building.

Why Bic003 not considered to remain as it is and be allowed to be pretty area of the village with its stand

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. The sites mentioned are not currently allocated for development. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD and the Development Management process.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

alone building when Bic 002 is not being considered and will remain as meadowland.
 Bicker is a small, relatively peaceful village to live in but we do not have many amenities to sustain more housing. We do not have a school, children go to neighbouring village schools which in turn will be under pressure due to development. We use neighbouring Healthcare services which will have the same pressures. Our limited bus service is now under threat of closure. We do have a post office and small shop but for how long.
 I would urge that consideration is given to above points that I have make when decisions are made concerning Bic 003.

Response_Number:	1215	Persons_Name:	Surfleet Parish Council	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
I have missed the comments deadline due to annual leave. However at our last parish council meeting my members did express concern that there is a provision for only 20 further affordable homes to be built in our area until 2031. This will not meet demand or encourage the next generation to remain living in their local community as they will be forced to look for alternatives out of area.	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		

Response_Number: 1217

Persons_Name: Alan Fitzpatrick

Representing_Who?: Prem (Rooster) II LLP

Respondents_Comments:

We act on behalf of PREM (Rooster) II LLP, owner of the former cold storage facility at Horseshoe Road, Spalding. By way of background, the property has been vacant since April 2010 and despite being actively marketed there has been little interest to date in a storage/ industrial facility.

On behalf of our client we wish to submit representations to the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan – Preferred Options which was published on 3rd May for public consultation.

The subject site is located approximately 500 metres from the western edge of Spalding and comprises the following components:

- A large factory/ warehouse building;
- A three storey office building;
- A single storey canteen building which also includes house stores, changing rooms and other ancillary facilities;
- A yard to the rear of the main factory building which provides parking; and
- A field to the rear.

Submissions were made to the SHLAA in October 2012, which promoted the site for housing. The site extends to 6.94 hectares, is vacant and Brownfield in nature.

Horseshoe Road has a number of residential properties located in close proximity to the site. A new residential development has been completed at the Raceground which also sits in close proximity to the site. Redevelopment of the site for housing would relate well to the existing settlement and is considered to be appropriate in scale.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

National Planning Policy Framework (March 2012)

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states that to boost significantly the supply of housing, local planning authorities should:

- Use their evidence base to ensure that their Local Plan meets the full, objectively assessed needs for market and affordable housing in the housing market area, as far as consistent with the policies set out in this Framework.” and
- Identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites... sufficient to provide five years worth of housing against their housing requirements with an additional buffer of 5% (moved forward from later in the plan period) to ensure choice and competition in the market for land...”

NPPF considers that to be deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development, is viable and development could be delivered on site within a five year period.

NPPF also encourages the effective use of land by reusing land that has been previously developed. The redevelopment of the subject site complies with this approach.

It is considered that the site complies with the themes of NPPF in that the development of the site can contribute and create sustainable, strong communities. There are a number of benefits associated with the proposed development of this site for housing and includes an excellent opportunity to regenerate a Brownfield site.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Strategy and Policies
DPD

The Local Plan will cover the period from 2011 to 2031.

Paragraph 4.1.15 advises that Boston and Spalding are defined as Sub-Regional Centres on the basis of their size, the range of services they provide and their potential to accommodate further growth; and their capacity to support sustainable development objectives.

Paragraph 6.1.3 notes that: “Local planning authorities may make an allowance for windfall sites in the five year supply if they have compelling evidence that such sites have consistently become available in the local area and will continue to provide a reliable source of supply. Any allowance should be realistic having regard to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, historic windfall delivery rates and expected future trends, and should not include residential gardens.”

Furthermore, paragraph 6.1.5 acknowledges that local planning authorities should identify and bring back into residential use empty buildings. They should normally approve planning applications for change to residential use and any associated development from commercial buildings.

The proposed site performs well when tested against the criteria above. The subject site is considered to be in a sustainable location where many of the aspirations of the Greenbelt can still be met.

Spalding Western Relief Road Technical Note: Core Strategy Option Testing (March 2013)

Paragraph 6.2.38 considers that to deliver the required housing provision and new road infrastructure in Spalding by 2030 is achieved through the completion of all three phases of the relief road:

- Outstanding housing commitments at Wygate Park;
- The Holland Park Urban Extension; and
- Up to 3,750 dwellings in a broad location to the

north of the Vernatt's Drain.

The Holland Park Urban Extension has outline planning permission for 2,250 dwellings, a district centre, 2 local centres, primary school, open space, access and estate roads. It is our understanding that a reserved matters planning application will be submitted in early course. The site could take around 16 years to complete and responds to the Holland Park Development Brief.

Within the Council's reasoned justification, it is noted that: "The site is appropriate in scale to the town's range of services, and is allocated as an urban extension which relates well to the existing town. Impacts upon the area's character can be mitigated thanks to its scale."

The above is a comprehensive mixed use development and extends to nearly 103 acres of intensively managed farmland. It is noted within the Committee Report that the site itself is critical to the planned strategy of delivering most of the District's housing development within or adjoining existing towns but concentrating primarily upon Spalding as the major urban centre.

It is considered that the redevelopment of this Brownfield site could contribute to the south west expansion of Spalding. If the site for 2,250 dwellings is developed then it is further considered that the subject site would not be a large, incongruous and isolated group of dwellings in the countryside.

It is considered imperative that the Council should identify additional land for housing beyond and above that identified over the plan period as this will help to support the need and demand for new housing within Spalding. Of the sites which have been identified by the Council, a number are complex sites which would require up-front investment and infrastructure. There

are no guarantees that these sites are deliverable through the plan period and could result in a shortfall of housing. Furthermore, it is considered that there is reliance by the Council on the Holland Park Urban Expansion Area and land to the north of Vernatt's Drain and there should be a strategy in place to ensure that if these sites are not delivered then a mechanism is in place to allow for other sites to be brought forward.

It is considered that the emerging local plan should include a strategy to replace sites, which become non-effective. It is considered likely that during the plan period not all of the sites which have been allocated will be implemented. The provision for longer term housing options which could be accelerated to fill any deficiencies within the 5 year land supply is also recommended. An alternative mechanism would be a strategic reserve of land or a policy mechanism to bring additional sites forward through the LDP.

If allocated for housing and an application progressed, a contribution could be made to the delivery of the Spalding Western Relief Road. The redevelopment of this Brownfield site could respond positively to its landscape setting by regenerating a site which has been vacant since April 2010.

Conclusions

It is considered that the site complies with the themes of NPPF in that development of the site can contribute and create sustainable, strong communities. There are a number of benefits associated with the proposed development of this site for housing and includes an excellent opportunity to regenerate a Brownfield site.

We are of the opinion that the Council should identify further land to ensure an effective land supply. There is reliance by the Council on the outstanding housing commitments at Wygate Park, Holland Park Urban

Extension and an undefined site at Vernatt's Drain. We would question why the Council is identifying a Greenfield site at Vernatt's Drain before my client's Brownfield site.

The development of this site offers an excellent opportunity to regenerate a Brownfield site which is in accordance with planning policy.

It is considered that the site should be included as a housing site within the next stage of the Council's Local Plan.

Response_Number:	1219	Persons_Name:	Angela Newton	Representing_Who?:	Mr and Mrs Hartfil
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
Consider allocation of 300 for Donington to be too small. Donington is the 3rd largest town in the District. Has Junior and Secondary School plus all major facilities. Think the number should be increased to 500. The owners of DON 006 request that their site be brought forward into the 0-5 year category. They have developer interest in the land. We supplied evidence when we submitted Availability Assessment that SHDC intimated in May 12 that there were approx. 179 people on their council house waiting list, even though a site of affordable homes had just been delivered by Larkfleet Homes. There is still a need NOW for more homes in Donington. The site is on the same side of the road as the Primary School, play area, within easy reach of the town centre, bus stops and all facilities.	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

Response_Number: 1220

Persons_Name: Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?: Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

ShrimplinBrown Ltd are instructed by Ambrose Lighton Ltd to submit the following representations to the current consultation on the South East Lincolnshire Strategy and Policies DPD Preferred Options draft.

ShrimplinBrown have undertaken a comprehensive review of the Draft Development Plan Document as well as the relevant supporting evidence base.

These representations also have regard to the tests of Soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The NPPF emphasises the overall need for the planning system to work more effectively to stimulate development. It introduced a presumption in favour of sustainable development “so that it is clear that development which is sustainable can be approved without delay” (paragraph 15). This is now the basis for critically assessing all future planning proposals and in the spirit of this shift of emphasis the tests of soundness for judging whether a Local Plan is “Sound” have also been expanded to include a fourth criteria; that plans are “Positively Prepared.”

These representations are focused on the parts of the draft strategy which are relevant to Boston Borough and make specific reference to the suitability of focusing new growth on land within and immediately adjoining the ‘Main Service Centre’ of Kirton.

Whilst the DPD does not at this stage seek to identify specific sites for development it is considered that in order to be Sound the apportionment of housing numbers should be based on evidence that there are sufficient sites that are suitable, available and deliverable within the plan period but also that it in accordance with the overarching policy framework, in particular the settlement hierarchy.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

These representations promote the suitability of land within Ambrose Lighton's control in various locations surrounding the Kirton settlement with a particular focus on land at Boston Road, Kirton which has been identified within the Boston SHLAA as a suitable and developable location.

Our representations are divided into two parts; Part 1 provides summary context setting out the opportunities and merits of focusing development in Kirton and the specific role and potential function of land at Boston Road- as well as other wider opportunities. Part 2 then sets out our client's specific comments and recommendations on the draft DPD. See also the attached completed consultation form which outlines the sections of the draft document on which comments have been made.

PART 1 - CONTEXT

The family associated with Ambrose Lighton Ltd have owned land in the Kirton area for over 100 years. They have in the past made land available to the local community and have, and continue to be, active in the community. As landowners they are not immune from the need to ensure development is viable, but unlike house builders and developers they are less focused on seeking immediate returns on their investment. Their focus is instead on long term secure income and their historic ties with the area mean that the quality and sustainability of what they deliver is of utmost importance.

The sustainability of Kirton

Table H4 of Boston's Interim Local Plan (February 2006) sets out a settlement hierarchy which has Boston, a Sub Regional Centre, at its top. Kirton is identified as a "Main Service Centre", the top of the hierarchy of the rural settlements. The Local Plan

explains that Kirton, along with four smaller “Service Villages”, are “sustainable villages providing a range of services and facilities for both themselves and nearby smaller settlements” (paragraph 8.20). The difference between Kirton and these other villages is that they provide “a more limited” range of services and facilities to Kirton, whilst Kirton is more sustainable “because of its two schools, the range of shopping, community, leisure and recreational facilities and the diverse range of employment opportunities” (paragraph 8.20).

The importance of Kirton at the top of the settlement hierarchy is repeated in the draft Strategy and Policies DPD Baseline Settlement Hierarchy (Para 5.2.5). This maintains Kirton’s important status as the only ‘Main Service Centre’ within the Borough.

The sustainability credentials of Kirton were confirmed in the Council’s 2008 ‘Sustainability Study of Rural Settlements’. Of 28 settlements assessed, Kirton was the most sustainable of the rural settlements (p74), with the most services and the best public transport accessibility.

This report is currently being updated by the South East Lincolnshire JSPU to cover both Boston and South Holland (13 July 2012 South East Lincolnshire JSPU Committee, Section 7, Appendix). This report, like its predecessor, is intended to discover “what makes a sustainable settlement that might take future development and what does not” (paragraph 1.3). As it explains, “Boston has a number of larger settlements outside of Boston itself, which are likely to be more than capable of taking certain levels of growth” (paragraph 1.4). This report concludes that Kirton remains the most sustainable settlement in Boston, below Holbeach and Long Sutton in South Holland. Kirton still scored the highest in terms of services for any settlement in Boston and had the highest public transport score of any settlement in either Council area.

In summary, the evidence base clearly points towards directing significant new growth to Kirton as it is as the top of the rural settlement hierarchy, is geographically very close to the sub-regional centre of Boston and, according to existing and emerging research, is the most sustainable rural settlement in Boston Borough. It should therefore be one of the principle focuses for sustainable new growth in the Boston Borough. The role of Ambrose Lighton Ltd.'s sites

Ambrose Lighton have a number of landholdings surrounding the village of Kirton. These sites were promoted and assessed through the SHLAA. The broad location of these sites is set out on the accompanying plan.

Whilst we consider that all of the sites are well related to the existing settlement and merit consideration for future supply, the following sites are considered to have the most potential to contribute to supply during the current plan period. A number of potential longer term opportunities have also been previously promoted through the SHLAA.

In calculating the capacity of these sites we have used the site areas in the SHLAA but consider that 30 dwellings/hectare is the most appropriate density. This enables the potential of the sites to be maximised and ensures the development is economically viable whilst also facilitating the delivery of associated necessary infrastructure.

The sites are considered by reference to their identification number in the SHLAA. However, we have grouped certain sites together to form more sensible and effective development parcels.

Response_Number:

1221

Persons_Name:

Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

Short term opportunities

Kir004, Kir005, Kir006 and Kir007: Land at Boston Road (6.71ha, 201 units)

These sites together comprise a parcel of land that is enclosed by Bungley Lane and the Kirton cemetery, thus creating a clearly defensible barrier to the countryside which could be reinforced by further landscaping.

It is directly accessible via a main route through the village and is within walking distance of the centre. It is also next door to a medical centre.

The Council's response to the SHLAA consultation makes clear that the "scale is appropriate to the village's range of services". Although the Council's response to Kir004 and Kir005 raise some concerns with visual impact, this is based upon an analysis of those individual plots and ignores the potential of the larger parcel of land which the Council accept, in relation to sites Kir006 and Kir007, has "an acceptable relationship to the existing settlement" and that "it does not have an open countryside character, and visual impacts would be acceptable".

Existing water mains run along the northern edge of this land parallel with Bungley Lane. These would not be a fundamental encumbrance to development as it could accommodate either a service road or landscaping associated with the development.

The level of land available here could accommodate 182 units together with community benefits such as allotments, public open space or a farm produce shop. Land adjoining was previously provided by Ambrose

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Lighton to accommodate the GP surgery.
Kir001; Land at West End Road (2.38ha, 71 units)

This is a smaller parcel of land is well related to existing development. It lies to the south of West End Road and includes existing farm buildings which are not essential to the current farming operation.

Although this site was not identified as 'Developable' in the SHLAA it is considered that in the context of the current shortfall in housing land supply and the strong merits of Kirton as a focus for growth the potential of this site should be considered again.

These two land parcels are immediately available and could be brought forward immediately to contribute towards housing land shortfalls in the District.

Response_Number:

1222

Persons_Name:

Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

Medium Term Options

Kir002, Kir003 Land at Church Lane (6.97ha, 209 dwellings)

The land is enclosed by Church Lane and Woodside Road which form clear defensible boundaries. It is well related to the Centre of Kirton and potential employment opportunities on adjacent land. The Council support development of other sites in this part of the village and this land could provide a logical extension of these opportunities.

Fra001, Fra002, Fra003 (2.89ha, 87 dwellings):

The site would help round off this end of the village, tying the existing dwellings on the northern side of Middlegate Road into Kirton. It would not extend the perceived built up area of the village since the land is already seen against the backdrop of the existing houses on the southern side of Middlegate Road. It is also on a main road which has bus stops. It is on the northern side of the village with direct access to Boston, thus limiting traffic flows through the village.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1239

Persons_Name:

Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

Q27 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 6.5 – 6.48 under Approach to Identifying the Distribution and Scale of Additional Housing to be provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031 in the full consultation document? Please explain your view.

It is agreed that it is entirely appropriate to prepare a separate policy approach for Boston and South Holland governing the distribution and scale of housing development.

It is considered appropriate that the limited housing target of 4,520 dwellings (see earlier comments) is set as a minimum figure, albeit with the proposed limitation of 3,600 units in ROY zones this only would enable additional growth within less sustainable secondary locations.

The reference at paragraph 6.8.2 to the cap on development in ROY zones sits particularly uncomfortably within this section of the plan.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1240

Persons_Name:

Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

Q28 - The preferred policy approach 'Distribution and Scale of Housing Development across South East Lincolnshire (2011-2031)' contains proposed housing figures for several individual settlements. Are these about right, too high or too low? Please explain your view.

As outlined above, the overall housing target is considered to be at the lower end and could be considered too conservative, particularly if projections for inward migration are even partially accurate.

Paragraph 6.8.1 states that it would be unreasonable to appraise any option that considers the provision of less than 2,900 of Boston Borough's additional housing provision within the town itself. This is based on the historic delivery of 65% of the Borough's growth within the town. It is considered, also that the status of Kirton as the only main service centre in the Borough, should mean that housing is also apportioned on at least the same historical basis; this would mean an apportionment of 542 dwellings (12% of the minimum housing target). Land within Ambrose Lighton's control could help to address any current shortfall in supply to achieve this target.

The fact that large parts of Kirton are rated as significantly lower flood hazard to Boston, together with the close proximity of Kirton (a main service centre) to Boston, should make this a key focus for sustainable growth.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1241

Persons_Name:

Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

Q29 - What is your view on the proposal not to identify new housing sites in settlements below Service Village level?

Any significant growth in villages below the service village level would not be sustainable and would place a drain on the limited services and infrastructure that they do have. Smaller settlements should only grow organically in accordance with local need and it would be out of step with the wider strategic objectives to apportion significant growth to smaller villages, even where these would be outside of ROY zones.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1242

Persons_Name:

Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

Q30 - The restriction of development on ROY sites within the 'Rest of Service Villages' in Boston Borough to a maximum of 300 dwellings could potentially require significant development at Algarkirk, Bicker, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Swineshead Bridge, Wigtoft and Wrangle. Do you support this?

This approach would be out of step with the rest of the Plan (specifically the spatial strategy). In many instances would also be out of step with the site allocation criteria based policy. It is therefore not considered a Sound approach. As explained in response to Q19, many of these proposed service villages score badly in terms of sustainability and the Council's own SHLAA has identified limited opportunities for development within many villages.

Both Option A (400 to Swineshead and up to 800 in remaining villages) and Option B (up to 100 dwellings in all service villages) are considered to pose significant issues. The focus on Swineshead would see nearly double the historic rate of delivery and would put significant pressure on services and infrastructure. Swineshead does not have a secondary school, bank, library or police station, or fire station (unlike Kirton which has all of these facilities) and thus does not represent a sustainable location for further development.

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.16 which explains that this approach is required to deliver the 'cap'. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1243	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Brown	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Ambrose Lighton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q31 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? Whilst the provision of 420 units in Kirton is supported and the settlement is considered an appropriate focus for growth it is recommended that the role of Kirton as the only main service centre should be revisited. It is considered that the level of growth in Kirton should reflect as a minimum the historic rate of delivery; 12% which would equate to 542 dwellings, based on the proposed housing targets.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1244	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Brown	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Ambrose Lighton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q34 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest? It is concerning that “only one reasonable option for a broad location in Boston” with an approximate capacity of 1,900 dwellings has been identified. This leaves a significant shortfall of 1,000 dwellings to be provided within Boston on the basis of the current policy approach requiring a minimum of 2,900 units in Boston. A strategic level development of 1,000 units should be identified prior to the Site Allocations stage, even if just a broad location. Kirton is close to Boston and whilst it may not be possible to accommodate all 1,000 units there is land available including land within the control of Ambrose Lighton which could help to address this shortfall.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine whether it is more appropriate to identify a second broad location for housing growth in Boston or, alternatively, smaller allocations to be promoted through the Site Allocations DPD.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1245

Persons_Name:

Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

Q40 - Do you agree with the proposed affordable housing proportions?

The general approach to allowing flexibility in affordable housing provision is supported.

Given the differences in housing markets between South Holland and Boston it is considered imperative that discrete policy approaches to affordable housing targets should be adopted in each area.

The 'one fifth' of total dwellings target proposed in Boston is at the lower end of the scale given the identified need. However, it is considered that any higher target would not be commercially viable.

Given the current financial climate it is agreed that it would not be appropriate to set a specific affordable housing target to be applied on each site but rather rely on assessment of delivery potential on a site by site basis.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1246	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Brown	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Ambrose Lighton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q45 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest?</p> <p>It is considered that there should preferably be a minimum density target set in order to maximise the potential of the limited sites available. Bearing in mind the wider restrictions in the Borough, a minimum threshold of 30 units per hectare would be appropriate and would still allow the creation of family housing at a reasonable density at the base level and could allow for higher densities in more urban locations.</p> <p>There should, however, be flexibility with any target to ensure that a mixture of units, sizes and development types are provided and that development in more rural locations can adapt to any characteristically lower densities.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Minimum density as a policy approach has been considered but not taken forward in the Local Plan. Assumed densities have been adopted (30 dpha in urban areas, 20 dpha in rural) for the basic assessment of site yields. However it is recognised that the viability and type of development could bring about different densities.</p> <p>Mixtures of house types and sizes have been included in revised policies.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. Detailed policy wording/SA scoring).</p>

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1247	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Brown	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Ambrose Lighton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q47 - Do you agree with the phasing of development outlined in the preferred policy approach 'Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period'?</p> <p>The approach to housing supply cannot ignore the need to secure a five year supply of deliverable sites in order to be Sound. Accordingly, to comply with the NPPF, sufficient sites must be identified to secure a five year supply (and in Boston's case a five year supply + 20% to reflect historic under delivery).</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>

Response_Number: 1248

Persons_Name: Mr J Brown

Representing_Who?: Ambrose Lighton

Respondents_Comments:

Q48 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest?

The only solution to ensure that the housing strategy would be compliant with the NPPF will be to identify additional land on deliverable sites to meet the five year housing land supply target.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1260

Persons_Name: Ms A Hewitson

Representing_Who?: Environment Agency

Respondents_Comments:

Q32 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 6.49 – 6.61 under Approach to Identifying Broad Locations for Accommodating Housing Growth and Boston and Spalding and Appendix 12 (Assessment of Broad Locations for Growth at Boston and Spalding) in the full consultation document? Please explain your view.

We have concerns that the methodology for identifying broad locations for growth has not been undertaken through a robust application of the flood risk sequential test. The Technical Guidance to the NPPF requires decision makers to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1). The Environment Agency's flood zones are the starting point for this sequential approach. Zones 2 and 3 are shown on the flood map with Flood Zone 1 being all the land falling outside Zones 2 and 3. These flood zones refer to the probability of sea and river flooding only, ignoring the presence of existing defences. These maps are to be used to test sites in the first instance and only where sites outside of the high probability area are not available will SFRA information be required.

The Guidance goes on to say that Strategic Flood Risk Assessments (SFRAs) refine information on the probability of flooding, taking other sources of flooding and the impacts of climate change into account. They also include the consideration of flood risk infrastructure (i.e. the with defences scenario, introducing hazard mapping which includes the relevant speed and depth of flooding). They provide the basis for applying the sequential test by exception. Only then, when there are no apparent flood risk variances of speed and depth between sites should „relative probability“ of flooding be introduced, informed by Local Flood Risk Strategies. We recommend a glossary accompanying the Local Plan explains the difference

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine the final approach to broad locations and site selection in Boston Borough.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

between the terms „probability“ within the NPPF and „relative probability“ within the Boston SFRA.

It is apparent from Appendix 12 that this process has not been followed. Although the hazard category, depth and velocity of flooding is recorded in the tables on pages 283-289, and it is acknowledged that “there is considerable variation in the flood hazard/depth/velocity to which they (the sites) are potentially exposed” the only differentiation criteria used for the assessment is that of relative probabilities, as detailed on page 291.

We cannot emphasize enough that „danger to people“ for new development combines both speed and depth to give the hazard. We note that your individual references to either velocities or depths have been categorised as low, medium and high for the broad locations assessment in Boston. These definitions are misleading when you separate them out into their individual components, as any increase in speed or depth increases the hazard. Can you provide your rationale behind these categories as they do not appear to have come from any national guidance or local assessment and we would, therefore, question their validity. We request that these entries are revisited, for example, B1 and B8 are said to lie predominantly in a „danger for most“ hazard area (this hazard category includes the general public). However, an „advantage“ for these sites records the velocity as predominantly low even though there are vulnerable areas at risk of velocities up to 1m/s – (at this speed the water level would need to be below 0.2m depth for it to be classed as low, for the same velocity with depths above 0.2m it is classed as „danger for some“ which is categorised as moderate) therefore you need to be very clear how you present part of the risk as it is currently misleading to record this as an „advantage“. For velocities of 0.3m/s the water depth again would need to be below 0.2m depth to have a „low“ impact on people, for the same velocity water depths only have to be 0.3m and 0.4m for it to be classed as „danger for most“ which is

categorised as significant. For clarity, we recommend inclusion of the hazard rating table within this section. Our advice in terms of appropriate mitigation to make residential developments safe varies depending on predicted depths of flooding and this could have implications for the viability of developing sites. For example, where predicted flood depths exceed 1.6m it is our opinion that they can only be considered „safe“ where they are a minimum 2 storey design with no ground floor habitable accommodation, i.e. by ensuring the habitable accommodation is above the highest predicted flood depth. Where predicted flood depths are between 0.5-1m finished floor levels should be set 1m above ground level with flood resilient construction used to a height 300mm above the predicted flood level.

Parts of site B9 are within a lower hazard (predominantly „danger to all“, some „danger to most“) and depth (predominantly 1-2m, some 0.5-1m) category than sites B6 and B8 and it could, therefore, be concluded that from a flood risk perspective this site is sequentially preferable. There may also be implications for viability/deliverability in areas where there are significant flood depths. It is our opinion that the process as currently detailed could lead to challenges to the soundness of your plan.

The Sustainability Appraisal of this option is also misleading. Development of this scale would not have a neutral impact as it will result in more people living within a flood risk zone. Development of this scale also has the potential to increase flood risk to third parties, off site, if it is not properly managed. This increased risk should be acknowledged in the Sustainability Appraisal and consideration of the mitigation required to reduce that risk should be acknowledged.

Response_Number: 1261

Persons_Name: Ms A Hewitson

Representing_Who?: Environment Agency

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

Q37 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest?

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Gypsies, Travellers and Travelling Showpeople - We appreciate the difficulties associated with finding suitable locations to meet the needs of gypsies, travellers and travelling show people, which is particularly difficult in districts where the floodplain is significant. We have previously worked closely with South Holland District Council to identify suitable locations for these types of allocations and will continue to do so where exceptional need arises and it is demonstrated that low risk sites are not available. We support the policy, which secures the exceptional need criteria and requires appropriate mitigation to manage residual flood risk.

Response_Number:

1269

Persons_Name:

Mr J Hobson

Representing_Who?:

Chestnut Homes

Respondents_Comments:

Question 27 – Approach to identifying the distribution and scale of additional housing to be provided in South East Lincolnshire up to 2031.

We consider that the approach to the distribution of development between the settlements and the approach to distribution of housing to be provided within the District are strongly linked so we have addressed them as a single issue.

The options outlined in Section 5.12 relate to: Option A – continuing with the existing baseline hierarchy focusing developments in the Sub-Region Centres and Main Service Centres. Option B promotes a more dispersed approach to development which seeks to accommodate a greater level of development in the Service Villages. Whilst the preferred option has been identified as Option B, it is our opinion that Option A is a more appropriate approach to adopt particular insofar as supporting the role of Boston as a Sub-Regional Centre.

At Paragraph 6.7.1, it is proposed that two thirds of Boston Borough’s dwelling provision (i.e. 2,900 dwellings) will be directed to the town itself. This is based on evidence of historic development rates for housing over the last 35 years which shows the completion in Boston Urban Area have amounted to approximately 65% dwellings built (see Paragraph 6.6.2). In a similar vein to our concerns regarding the overall spatial option of choosing a more dispersed form of development, we are of the opinion that the proportion of the overall housing provision for Boston Borough being directed to the town is too low and should be increased in recognition of Boston’s important role and function as a Sub-Regional Centre.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

It is recognised that the emerging growth policies need to balance the need for a more cautious approach to ensure that on the one hand, future development does not increase the probability and severity of flooding whilst on the other hand, deliver growth that has been objectively assessed in the most sustainable and beneficial locations. As such, we are sympathetic to the approach of setting separate limits on the number of additional dwellings provided in the Red, Orange and Yellow (ROY) flood/hazard zones for Boston Borough. However, the Sub-Regional Centre of Boston is not only the place of choice for a substantial proportion of the plan areas residence and workers but also one of the major economic social and service hubs for South East Lincolnshire. For Boston to realise its economic potential as a 'Sub-Regional Centre' some fundamental shift in its economic profile will be required. The challenge is to create the conditions where future economic development and growth will need to be focused in order to bring the performance of the areas economy closer to the regional and national average. As a consequence, significant new opportunities and investments need to be identified particularly in potential growth areas such as Boston. We therefore consider there is an emphasis of importance to rely on future developments within Boston Town to create a reversal of fortune to improve the overall competitiveness of the Borough. Boston Town must look to build on and maintain existing economic assets as well as developing new assets that would make it an attractive location for new investment and encourage people to live, work and visit. Creating a more dispersed distribution of growth will not achieve a critical mass required to support the regeneration of Boston as a Sub-Regional Centre. Whilst we appreciate directing more growth to Boston would directly conflict with seeking to reduce growth within high levels of flood risk, we consider in overall terms an increased growth to Boston would achieve a more sustainable solution to regenerate the economy.

Paragraph 6.6.2 refers to the historic housing completion rates within the Boston Urban area for the last 35 years amounting to approximately a 65% of the dwellings built. We are of the opinion that only limited weight should be placed on the past completion rates since there is a danger that your authority seeks to plan in the context of the previous performance of the settlement which has been influenced by a whole series of factors such as priority towards developing on previously developed land and identification of unrealistic allocations. In contrast, acknowledgement should be given to the principles of NPPF which seeks to significantly boost housing supply. The historic performance therefore does not reflect the current pro-growth agenda and therefore we recommend approximately 80% of the Borough's housing provision should be directed to Boston town in readiness to respond to an upturn in economic conditions.

Response_Number: 1270

Persons_Name: Mr J Hobson

Representing_Who?: Chestnut Homes

Respondents_Comments:

Question 32 – 34 – Broad Locations for Housing Developments in Boston

We would agree that to accommodate the additional dwellings proposed for the Sub-Regional Centre of Boston the most appropriate approach is through the identification of a large scale urban extension opportunity. This would have the opportunity to deliver a critical mass of development that would be planned in a coordinated manner to achieve key sustainable principles together with appropriate levels of infrastructure provision.

We support the approach and methodology set out in Appendix 12 and concur that the identification of Site B8 as being the only reasonable location to deliver a broad location of housing development in Boston. Compared to the other sites assessed, we are of the opinion that the location of B8 has many planning and sustainable advantages particularly its ability to deliver well over 1,000 houses within the Plan Period and has a reduced probability of flooding.

It is also well related to the proposed alignment of the proposed Distributor Road. Whilst it is acknowledged at Paragraph 10.2.2 that the infrastructure provision of the Distributor Road is not critical to the delivery of growth for Boston, it remains an aspiration nonetheless and we are of the view that Site B8 would be best placed to enable it to contribute to the delivery of this infrastructure provision.

There is also another related area to the south west of Boston (west of the A16) known as Tytton Lane and it is unclear as to whether this has been considered as part of the site selection process. Given my clients land ownership control of the Tytton Lane site and the

Officer_Response:

Following consideration of the representations, further work will be required to determine the final approach to broad locations and site selection in Boston Borough.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

opportunity for strong planning, sustainability and transport links with Site B8 we would suggest that it forms an integral part of the wider project being promoted by Chestnut Homes to deliver the proposed 1,900 houses that have been identified within this broad location for growth area. In our view, the Tytton Lane land would be the first logical phase of the overall broad location for growth site identified as Site B8.

To avoid ambiguity and to clarify our assumption that the Tytton Lane land is included within site B8 it is recommended that the circle denoting this broad location for housing development in Boston within Figure 6.1 is slightly extended in size in a south east direction up to the edge of the A16.

(See attached amended Figure 6.1)

Whilst the principle of initially identifying the preferred location for large scale housing development to accommodate the level of growth required in a Sub-Regional Centre is supported, we raise concern regarding the suggestion in Paragraph 6.49.1 and 6.54.1 that the detailed proposals for the broad locations will be advanced through the Site Allocations DPD. We object to this approach and instead consider that the detailed process for assessing the suitability of the preferred broad location for growth should be accelerated so it become an integral part of the Strategy and Policies DPD and therefore it would ultimately be identified as a formal strategic allocation.

The single broad location will be a fundamental element in seeking to justify the soundness of the emerging spatial strategic framework and policies. By using a proportionate evidence base, the Council should ensure there is sufficient commitment, clarity and certainty that a specific strategic site is suitable and is able to be delivered in order to satisfy a Local Plan Inspector that the plan is sound without requiring the

introduction of contingency measures. At paragraph 6.54.1 there is no clear guidance as to how the Strategy and Policies DPD will assist in bringing forward a large scale urban extension to the Sub-Regional Centres. Instead, the reliance is placed upon the Site Allocations DPD and if a planning application is submitted before the Site Allocations DPD is produced, the onus would transfer to the development management process to deliver the growth.

As there is likely to be a significant lag time of over a year between the consultation process of the Strategy and Policy DPD and the commencement of the Sites Allocation DPD, it is unreasonable for a development opportunity that will have significant strategic implication to be reliant on the development management process in the intervening period. In contrast the upfront work required to demonstrate the suitability of a formal strategic allocation would seek to foster certainty and continuity. In our view it is important for the Strategy and Policy DPD to provide a strong framework with clear guiding principles and objectives to plan positively for the large scale developments particularly in terms of planning and infrastructure requirements.

It should also be recognised that the delivery of large scale urban extensions often have long leading times so that complex technical and infrastructure delivery mechanisms can be resolved. However, it is apparent that the release of these strategic sites would be required in order to make a meaningful contribution to the housing land supply within the first five years of the Plan Period. This is particularly the case since at Paragraph 4.2.1 it is recognised that Boston BC only has an estimate of 3.6 years supply of deliverable sites. It is therefore important that as part of the policy making approach up front master planning work should be encouraged as early as possible so that key decisions and priorities can be made that can correspond with

achieving the overall spatial strategy of this emerging DPD. In the circumstances, we recommend that the Strategy and Policy DPD should take the initiative and working in partnership with the relevant land owner/developers start to build upon the identified preferred Broad Location for housing development so that at the Pre Submission stage a proportionate evidence base (in the form of master planning work and the phasing and delivery of essential infrastructure) has been undertaken commensurate with the work required to support a strategic allocation at Site B8.

This would give all parties the necessary degree of confidence (including the Local Plan Inspector) to confirm that the development opportunity is suitable, available and achievable and can therefore contribute to satisfying the aims and objectives of the underlying spatial objectives set out within the Strategy and Policies DPD.

Response_Number:

1271

Persons_Name:

Mr J Hobson

Representing_Who?:

Chestnut Homes

Respondents_Comments:

Question 46-48 – Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period

It is unclear why a lower rate of housing target has been set for the first five years of the Plan Period i.e. 208 dwellings per annum between 1 April 2011 and 31 March 2016. It is appreciated that mortgage availability has been a constraint but the Government's New-Buy scheme has been designed in collaboration with lenders and house builders to address this problem. We are therefore unconvinced by the rationale for setting a lower target for the initial period. In our view the overall requirements should be averaged out over the whole of the Plan Period rather than seek to impose an artificial restriction particularly when the NPPF is seeking to significantly boost housing development in the short term.

The Council states that the lower target for the first five years is necessary to take into account the fragile nature of the housing market. We would question this. Delivery can be assisted in various ways and there are many positive planning measures that could be adopted to assist delivery.

Officer_Response:

This Policy has been deleted. It's purpose was never to put a limit on what might be developed in any particular period but effectively an assessment of what might come forward. The housing trajectory within the draft Local Plan replaces this policy approach

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1272

Persons_Name:

Mr J Hobson

Representing_Who?:

Chestnut Homes

Respondents_Comments:

Question 41 – Provision of Affordable Housing

The provision of affordable housing policy seeks to restrict Rural Exception schemes to Main Service Centres and Service Villages. However, we consider a more flexible approach should be included so that Rural Exception schemes can also be permitted on the edge of the built framework of Sub-Regional Centres subject to the criteria identified within the policy. This approach would allow a greater opportunity to increase the provision of affordable housing throughout the Borough in line with the evidence set out within the Strategic Housing Market Assessment.

We also consider it is reasonable to promote the principle of exception sites introducing a proportion of market housing in order to cross-subsidise the affordable housing element. The proportion of up to a maximum of 50% the total number of dwellings being market housing is considered a fair and reasonable approach to adopt.

Officer_Response:

The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions sites to be considered in relation to all settlements within a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

1277

Persons_Name:

Mr P Coathup

Representing_Who?:

Lincolnshire County Council

Respondents_Comments:

This chapter deals with the distribution, scale and phasing of new housing. The preferred housing provision for Boston Borough, as set out under Housing Growth and Flood Risk above is a minimum of 4,520 dwellings of which a maximum of 3,600 (80%) should be provided in flood risk areas. Of this, it is proposed that 2,900 dwellings should be located in Boston Town (all in flood risk areas) to reflect its pre-eminent role as a service centre and main location for new housing in the Borough (c. two thirds of recent completions). Whilst LCC concerns about the provision in flood risk areas are noted in Para. 10 above it is necessary that a high proportion of that should be in Boston Town to maintain its Sub-Regional role.

The other significant locations in the Borough are the main service centre of Kirton (420 dwellings, mainly in flood risk areas) and the service village of Swineshead (400) which is outside the flood risk areas... The remainder of the housing provision (1,200 dwellings) will be distributed across the service villages using the Site Allocations process. (Some of these have capacity outside the flood risk areas.)

In South Holland a minimum of 9,400 dwellings is proposed with a maximum of 1,200 (13%) in flood risk areas. This is a larger percentage reduction than in Boston. Spalding is earmarked for 6,000 new dwellings to reflect its role as a sub-regional centre, the availability of development land unaffected by flood risk and the requirement to provide the Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) to support growth and address increased rail barrier closures after the upgrade to the "Joint Line". This provision is broadly supported.

As the largest Main Service Centre, Holbeach is proposed to accommodate 1,000 dwellings which reflects the availability of suitable development land and its current role as the second largest settlement in

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

South Holland. The remainder of the new housing will be spread across Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge (150 dwellings each as entirely in flood risk areas), Crowland and Donington (300 dwellings each on land outside flood risk areas) and the service villages (a maximum of 25 dwellings per village). This is considered by LCC officers to be a sensible distribution of development which balances the competing issues of flood risk, land availability and service provision.

Given the large amount of housing to be located in Boston Town and Spalding, it is necessary to identify possible broad locations for development. A number of broad locations were evaluated, leading to the following reasonable options:

a) In Boston, only one preferred option is proposed in the south west of the town (see Figure 6.1 in the Preferred Options document) with a capacity of 1,900 dwellings. This leaves sites for 1000 dwellings to be defined in the Site Allocation process but with the possibility of a second broad location left open at this stage.

b) For Spalding, three broad locations along the western edge of the town, all related to the SWRR, are considered reasonable options but the preferred option is a site in the north west (between Holland Park and the A151) with a capacity of 3,750 dwellings (see Figure 6.2 in the Preferred Options document). With 2250 dwellings at Holland Park already permitted this makes up the entire provision of 6000.

Both locations are supported as they have more potential to support key infrastructure.

SE Lincolnshire has a need for affordable housing in Boston Borough and South Holland District, identified through Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMAs). Most of this will need to be built as part of new market housing developments and through the provision of affordable housing on "rural exception

sites".

Based on market information, viability studies and recent planning decisions separate affordable housing target proportions have been proposed, of 20% for Boston Borough and 33% for South Holland, to reflect differing circumstances locally.

6.2.2 – 6.2.13 Just to confirm, the SHMAs do provide key evidence here and the text is agreed. The following points could, however, also be noted:

- a) The SHMAs were produced at different dates, using different models, and this could be a factor in differing conclusions
- b) The Peterborough SHMA (covering South Holland) is now to be updated
- c) The last bullet point on Boston has since been superseded by the 2011 Census and an improved methodology for ONS population estimates.

6.6.2 This text repeats 6.2.40

6.69.2 Please clarify what is meant by "recent planning decisions". Presumably conclusions from the final Whole Plan Viability Assessment will be summarised in the Submission Draft.

6.87 Preferred Policy Approaches:

Distribution and Scale of Housing Development footnotes 2 and 3. It should be made clear wherever relevant earlier in the Section that New Allocations exclude existing commitments and that completions and existing commitments do not count towards the caps on development in ROY zones. (This does not significantly affect the proportion of all housing development in the ROY zones or therefore the comments in the Briefing Note.)

Housing Land Supply over the Plan Period

The earlier supporting text does not appear to explain the much greater back-loading of development in South Holland. Is this related to key infrastructure such as the SWRR? In any event the first 5 year delivery for Boston looks very optimistic compared to what has been delivered in the 1st year of the period.

Response_Number:

1313

Persons_Name:

Mr J Charlesworth

Representing_Who?:

Spalding and District Civic Society

Respondents_Comments:

At the risk of being presumptuous, not having read the SHMA report, we do find ourselves questioning how the predicted housing “needs” for Spalding have been arrived at. Not least because the figures presume the creation of an enormous number of local jobs. Is this realistic? Or is mass commuting envisaged? In which case, good-bye to sustainable development. Is it realistic, either, to envisage an average annual new-build rate of 407 in South Holland, when a mere 167 house were built 2001-2012? Para. 6.2.38 – We note that the evidence is “not conclusive”. Indeed, the paragraph seems to consist of a circular argument. The Spalding Western Relief Road is needed by the 3,750 houses north of the Vernatt’s, which are themselves needed in order to fund the road! Moreover, we simply do not accept that there is any suitable space in Spalding for another 3,750 houses on top of the 2,500 for which planning permission has already been granted on Spalding Common. To the east, rightly, the Coronation Channel has always been regarded as an unreachable boundary to development; to the north the Vernatt’s forms an equally natural boundary to sprawl. With the proposed relief road and a water-course between them and the rest of the town, there is no way the residents of the huge development proposed will feel themselves to be part of Spalding. How long before the pressure builds to run a road across that 500m cordon sanitaire to the closer facilities of Pinchbeck? It is wishful thinking that this huge development will not lead to the coalescence of Spalding and Pinchbeck. Further, with all Spalding’s sub-regional facilities located east of the railway line – industrial estate, large shops, secondary schools, hospital, doctors’ surgeries, council offices, library, South Holland Centre, swimming pool, sports hall, youth club, etc., etc. – what sense does it make to expand west of the line, piling further

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

huge pressures on to both the Winsover Road level crossing and the already overloaded Spalding Road/Pinchbeck Road?

The allocation of huge swaths of greenfield land for development will inevitably direct developers away from the regeneration of Brownfield sites, as greenfield pickings are easier than Brownfield, just as the allocation of extra employment land for the RFI at Deeping St Nicholas “could serve to undermine the successful development of existing employment land allocations elsewhere” (Para. 7.25.1). It’s the same for housing.

Thus, we cannot support this vast development proposed for north of the Vernatt’s.

Complicating the picture are the 14,000 seasonal workers, a housing problem the document makes no attempt to address, although the planning consequences are highly material.

Response_Number:	1314	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 27 – No, see above	Officer_Response:	The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:	1315	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 28 – Too high for Spalding	Officer_Response:	Comments noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1316	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 29 – Wrong. See our response to questions 18 and 20.	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u> 1317	<u>Persons_Name:</u> Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u> Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u> Question 30 – N.A.	<u>Officer_Response:</u> The respondent's interest does not cover the Boston Borough Council area.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u> These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

<u>Response_Number:</u> 1318	<u>Persons_Name:</u> Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u> Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u> Question 31 – See response to Para. 6.2.38	<u>Officer_Response:</u> This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u> Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1319	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Questions 32-34 - See response to Para. 6.2.38	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:	1320	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 35 – Yes	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1321	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Question 36 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1322	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Question 37 – Bullet Point 5 – typo “effect” should be replaced by “affect”		This has been amended in the draft Local Plan		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).	

Response_Number:	1323	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 38 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	1324	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 39 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	1325	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 40 – Yes	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1326	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 41 – Should be permitted at Main Service Centres and Villages, but not Sub-Regional Centres and Open Countryside. (See response to questions 18 & 20 above for redefinitions.)	Officer_Response:	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions sites to be considered in relation to all settlements within a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	1327	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 42 – P.153, Blue Box, Rural Exceptions Schemes – (In accordance with the redefinitions put forward in response to questions 18 & 20 above) rephrase: “... Main Service Centres and Villages ...”	Officer_Response:	The consideration of a policy which broadens the locations for accommodating rural exception schemes 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions sites to be considered in relation to all settlements within a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:	1328	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 43 – Yes	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1329	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 44 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	1330	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 45 – P.154, Blue Box, Para. 2 – Strengthen. Delete last 8 words		This Policy has been amended in the draft Local Plan		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).	

Response_Number:	1331	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Questions 46-48 – As we do not agree with the housing numbers allocated to Spalding (with regard to the huge development north of the Vernatt’s), we cannot accept these figures either.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1332	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 48 – P.156, Blue Box, Extra Bullet Point? Should there be a requirement that all infrastructure features for each phase of a development (such as roads, cycleways, pedestrian links , landscaping, etc.) are completed before the first houses are occupied.	Officer_Response:	This Policy has been deleted and is not taken forward in the draft Local Plan. In the provision of infrastructure the timing of delivery will be dependent on the type of infrastructure required. Legal agreements or conditons will normally set the timetable for provision.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - material considerations to be taken forward in the darft Local Plan.

Response_Number: 1365

Persons_Name: Mr D G Mountain

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

I write as a member of the public and Parish Councillor for Lutton Parish Council. Regards to the new plan to building permissions in the said village of Lutton. I and the main consensus of opinion of Councillors would like to see frontage quality houses on land east of Pudding Poke Lane and on Winfrey's Allotments site as it takes several allotments let to 1 - 2 persons as weak demand nowadays for allotments. I do declare a partial interest as I own a plot just west end of Pudding Poke Lane of which sometime shortly to be making application for affordable house or dwelling.

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number: 1366

Persons_Name: Mr J Wright

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

I wish to suggest the small field shaded green should be considered for housing development. This field is now becoming un-economical to farm as machinery grows in size. It has mature Lime trees along the north side, and mature beech trees to the west, all of which have preservation order. This is a very smart eastern end of Holbeach and would make an excellent site for business people who could afford a smart house and help boost Holbeach. Please give this consideration, an my wife owns this field.

Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1368

Persons_Name:

Sutton Bridge P C

Representing_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents_Comments:

Residential development should not be allowed South of the A17 by-pass, the Town is already cut in halves, there are no facilities South of the by-pass. A dangerous road has to be crossed to get to into the town of Sutton Bridge.

Further residential development should not be allowed period. The medical centre is hard pushed to cope with all residents at the moment. Further development would exacerbate the problem. Sutton Bridge is in a high flood risk area and it doesn't make sense to build another 180 houses in the area.

Officer_Response:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1396

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

The major influences on the demand for additional housing is the rate of demographic growth. The Census information confirms that the rate of population growth in the Plan area significantly exceeded that of the County. The Census return also identified trends in the pattern of and growth in the population and indicated that the demand for sufficient suitable employable labour would be exacerbated by changes in the population by age cohort. Their continues to be a significant increase in the annual birth rate . The formation of new households is influenced by the breakdown of family and partner relationships. The housing market in London and the Home Counties remains buoyant and the price differential between comparable housing by size continues to widen a factor that encourage older home owners to realise the capital gain in the equity of the homes and relocate. South Holland remains an attractive place to live. I am not persuaded that the target for new build will properly reflect demographic and social change

I am also concerned that the proposed allocation of new build dwellings will match the distribution of employment opportunities or people's preferences about where they choose to live. I support a prohibition of new build in areas of the highest threat from flood risk and maximum resilience flood protection for all developments in the orange and yellow flood risk zones. This must curtail new build in the rural areas. I am supportive of policies that enhance the role of genuine service villages and their associated isolated clusters of dwellings in the open countryside. To sustain the sustainability properly identified service more development should be permitted to prevent the slow strangulation of the rural hinterland.

The policy of directing new build development into

Officer_Response:

The need to undertake further work on 'objectively assessed housing needs' is recognised. The results of which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

large urban Greenfield extensions will require considerable investment in public facilities (schools, medical centres, community facilities and sports and recreation libraries/) and be able to attract commercial investment in retailing, pubs and personal services. It is not unreasonable to expect new developments which meet the needs of residents arising from organic population growth to be met in part by the developers through the new development levy.

There is still a requirement that the development levy should not be used as a subsidy to cover expenditure that arises from organic population growth and that there should be some geographic connection between public infrastructure made necessary by the development. These principles are the safe guard against developers bribing Planning Authorities into granting a planning consent. I am concerned that the number of new dwellings allocated to the major Greenfield extensions is being driven by the County Councils desire to fund a Spalding Western Relief Road rather than a distribution relevant to the needs of the whole district or the plan area.

Response_Number:	1397	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Q28 The number of new dwellings allocated to service villages over the time period of the plan makes no provision for organic growth, separates families particularly the young and the old from their family support group , erodes the educational and financial viability of the village school and all other facilities by inhibiting natural organic growth and is contradictory to so many other policies in the proposed plan .</p> <p>The necessity for limiting residential development in areas of high flood risk is a significant constraint. South East Lincolnshire is a living thriving vibrant rural economy which will be slowly strangled by this Plan. This is the opportunity cost of focusing development in large urban extensions. The numbers of new Build allocated to the service villages is too low.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.16 which explains that this approach is required to deliver the 'cap'. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>

Response_Number:	1398	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Q29 These settlements are unsustainable clusters of houses in the open countryside and should not be allocated any new build consents</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Support noted.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>

Response_Number:

1399

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q30 No these settlements are not service villages and without substantial addition new build will never have a sufficient consumer base to make commercial or public service facilities economically viable. Most of the named settlement are close to Swineshead which is already scheduled for expansion (as is Donington) Focus development in these two locations creating another main service centre.

Officer_Response:

The promotion of Swineshead to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1400

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q31 Create uniform classification of Regional Sub centres, Main Service Centres, Village Service Centres and Other Rural Settlements. Treat Other Rural Settlements as open countryside. Reduce the number of defined Service Villages and permit more new build particularly of affordable housing. Reconsider the policy of large urban extensions .

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Response_Number:

1401

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q32 What is the evidence that Spalding needs a Western Relief Road ? The alignment of the railway creates bottlenecks in the east to west and west to east traffic flows through the town. The aim of the Western Relief Road (WRR) is to relieve the anticipated road traffic congestion arising from increased use of the railway and the down time on the level crossing from each train pass. The proposed two large urban extensions to the west of the town will generate additional traffic flows into the town centre. The current traffic flow model assumes up to 20 vehicular movements per dwelling.

All the town centre facilities lie to the east of the railway.

To access these facilities vehicular traffic has to utilise the three railway level crossing in the town.

The implication in the Plan is that the WRR would not be completed until 2031. The Town is already a destination for most of the traffic flows into the town which is the largest centre for retailing (convenience and comparative,) professional services, educational and medical services , entertainment and leisure , public administration financial services , nodal point for traffic mode exchanges .

There are alternate routes for road through traffic . Building by 2031 @ 7000 new homes mostly to the west of the railway (+ any windfall site completion numbers) can only generate a considerable additional traffic flows into the town centre. The WRR may after it is completed divert some of the through traffic from the town centre. The addition new homes would result in significant additional inward flow of traffic into Spalding (at 12 movements per house @ 50000 + vehicle movements into the town centre). Most of the vehicle movements originating from the urban extensions will still cross the railway at the level crossings. If the WRR is completed the alternative

Officer_Response:

Further information on the delivery of the SWRR and the supporting housing developments is contained in the draft Local Plan and other evidence documents

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

routes to avoid the level crossings could quadruple the vehicle mileage each trip. Can anyone explain how new build to the west of Spalding is going to reduce the congestion in the town? Through traffic is not the problem; destination traffic is.

Do the housing allocations justify using development levy monies to finance the road or will the road reduce potential future traffic congestion in Spalding. Novel solution to a congestion problem create more congestion

Response_Number:

1402

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q33 Currently the town centre facilities in Spalding can be comfortably reached on foot in 20/25 minutes from the periphery of the urban area from any direction. The geography of the area direct that any major growth of the town must be to west. The alignment of the railway and the lack of a bridged crossing create urban expansion difficulties. These difficulties were appreciated three decades ago but achieving the potential solution was finally lost in the South Holland adopted plan. The solution; loop the railway to the west of the built boundary, Similarly the imaginative solution from resolving the road traffic flow problems have been identified and is not yet impossible to achieve. Relocate the port downstream in the haven and build an embanked eastern by-pass. At least the proposed urban extension for Boston could be Phase 1 of a potential solution. Spalding is stuck the its perceived problem. The land to the west of the current urban fabric and to the north of the Vernatt's Drain is the most appropriate for development. Any remaining sites to the east of the town could not accommodate the anticipated expansion of the town. (land to the east of the river ,south of the Coronation Channel and west of the A16 bypass falls within the yellow flood risk zone but has a high level of protection afforded by the embanked Welland Embanked Coronation Channel and the raised by pass route . It is well situated to access the Town centre facilities with the potential to accommodate up to 1500+ homes.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1403	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Q34 The plan proposes to count windfall sites as windfalls : addition new build homes in excess of the planned provision and as windfalls it is difficult to assess the number of new dwellings built as windfalls. There are in Boston and Spalding areas of run down dereliction. If those sites were identified as suitable for residential development (there is no shortage of sites for employment uses) it could encourage landowners and developers to consider re-development as residential zones. By their location most are well related to and can easily access the town centre facilities. Surely the re-development of such available sites should be a priority and if necessary the authorities should take the lead.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Comments noted. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.</p>

Response_Number:	1404	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Tensions between the settled population and the itinerant people are historical Today's 'travellers' are the sturdy beggars of the first Elizabethan Age and they share a common characteristic , they do not like and rarely do as they are told by the representatives of the settled community. They live on the fringe of legality. Their existence is a challenge to any planning system.</p> <p>Q35 The settled community has an obligation to provide support measures that give some stability to the existence of these our fellow citizens who by choice are travelling people.</p>	Officer_Response:	<p>Support noted.</p>	Officer_Recommendation:	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>

Response_Number:

1405

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q36 The criteria are appropriate for identifying suitable locations in all aspects but one. Differences in lifestyles make for bad neighbour relations when the settled community and 'travellers' live closely together. In my limited contacts with the travelling community I have learned that their preference is to live on land in 'common' ownership or which they own in the open countryside but with reasonable access to the community facilities they need. They also like the settled communities like their privacy. I would suggest that the concept of a cordon sanitaria reinforced by landscaping is insisted on as a planning consent condition to protect privacy and maintain good neighbour relations.

The development management process should robustly resist any unauthorised temporary or permanent travelling peoples encampments but should accept that any proposal to establish such a site which meet the plans consent conditions would carry a presumption of consent unless there were significant relevant material planning considerations of sufficient weight to justify a refusal. Travelling people should be encouraged not to purchase a site outright but to secure an option to purchase until that had received outline consent.

Officer_Response:

It is considered that this issue is adequately addressed by other preferred policy approaches in the Preferred Options Document, for example 'Development Management' and Design of New Development'.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

1406

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

What does affordable housing mean?
Q38 The opportunity cost of a hectare of potential building land compared to its next most valuable use very large.
That windfall gain only occurs because the planning system creates a shortage of land for development. There is no objection to transferring some of that gain in value to the public. The difficulty is in achieving this in ways that minimise any adverse effects on the housing market. As a society it is necessary to address the shortage of and the affordability of housing appropriate housing.

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1407

Persons_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer Recommendation:

Q39 For those eligible to claim housing benefit almost any rental is affordable because your rent is wholly or partially paid for you by the benefit system. @ 60% of South Holland's council house tenants receive housing benefit.

These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

If affordable housing means low cost to build housing, then costs for new build can be reduced by reducing the internal and external spatial specification and fitments specifications.

The UK new build homes have the smallest spatial specifications among the developed world affordable housing is less profitable to build.

The J Rowntree Trust regularly surveys the size of house people want to live in. '20% want 4+ bed homes, @60% want 3 bed homes and @ 20% want a 1/2 bed hone. The annual completion returns show the 30% of completions are 4+ bed homes , 40% are 3 bed homes and 30% ate 1/2bed homes Not only are too many new homes small they are overcrowded and too many families live in homes with mortgage repayment levels they struggle to meet. The SEL Housing Survey returns indicate the extent of the latent demand for 3 bed dwellings.

Affordable Housing Obligations distorts the Housing Market. How many affordable did South Holland build in 2012 ?

Social engineering through mixed housing is not always successful however desirable it might be.

Site costs are a very significant element in the cost of new build. The housing affordable housing obligation could be secured through the transference if plot ownership or an equivalent cash payment to the

Council. The Council could then in partnership with Socially Responsible Landlords , Housing Charities (Spalding TOVSTI Husbands) or the SHDC's own housing company seek grant funding or raise money from the capital markets and build more of the size of affordable housing that is needed . These socially owned properties would lie outside the Housing Revenue Budget not subject to right to buy legislation or rent level restraint.

Response_Number:	1408	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
Q40 Any difference in the affordable housing obligation threshold will be exploited by the development industry . The lower to affordable housing obligation threshold the greater the attract to build . The affordable housing threshold should be equal across the Plan area.	A 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment' is currently being undertaken to cover both Boston Borough and South Holland. The results of this will inform the final drafting of the affordable housing policy, taking into account viability in the round.		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.		

Response_Number:

1409

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q41 Rural exception schemes should only be permitted in service villages. If a common definition for isolated clusters of rural dwellings as open countryside across the plan area and the reduction of settlements currently classified as service villages even when they have few services to offer as isolated dwelling clusters enhances the role of the remaining village service centres as the focus of a sustainable rural community. The current proposals severely restrict development in the service villages, It is important to maintain in rural communities the supportive familial and neighbour network if care in the community is to succeed. Villagers want their children to have the opportunity to remain in or near their home village. Rural exceptions policies with their occupancy criteria and affordability in perpetuity constraints would help service villages remain sustainable.

Any market housing to make a rural exceptions scheme affordable is likely to have different specifications and have no limitations on ownership. Second home ownership should if possible be discouraged as a major threat to rural sustainability.

Only in exceptional circumstances (familial support network) should rural exception new build be permitted in the open countryside

Officer_Response:

The restriction of the rural exception schemes policy to Service Villages only is not an option that has been considered 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.

Officer Recommendation:

The draft Local Plan would allow Rural Exceptions sites to be considered in relation to all settlements within a Settlement Boundary.

Response_Number:

1410

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q42 Build the type and size of affordable housing people need housing with space for their families to grow and small clusters of specialist 1/2 bed housing 2 to 4 units in or near housing into which older citizens and the disabled can continue to live independently with help from their familial or neighbour support network. Community Wellbeing??

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:

1411

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Q43 Fully supportive of the of Option B

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1412	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Q44 The evidence base for size of dwellings to be built on a particular site ought to be related to the size of individual building plots. Too many large plots will utilise too much of the land allocated for housing. Large plots may reduce the need to allow space for public facilities it is unlikely to diminish the need to traffic and utilities infrastructure It will still be necessary to generate the funding through the affordable housing obligation and the development levy to create the road infrastructure and the necessary public service facilities. A Master Plan approach to the development of the large urban extensions would have to set limits to the size and type of housing expected in each urban extension.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1413	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Q45 The development of the large urban extensions will be phased and while Option B ,which allows for some flexibility the overarching ideals of the Master Plan should not be allowed to fail by default. Linking the provision of public open space to a fixed number of dwelling units it is proposed to build can generate individual application just under the threshold that requires public space provision leading to an outcome of less than planned open space provision and what is provided being small pockets of unusable open space. The Text should require a Master Plan, drawn up in consultation with the strategic planning team, which will form the basic outline of the completed development. It is unlikely that any one developer would manage the completion such a major development from inception to the final release.	It is a proposal of the draft Local Plan that a masterplanning approach is taken on the delivery of major strategic sites		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).		

Response_Number:

1414

Persons_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

HOUSING LAND SUPPLY AND RELEASE OVER THE PLAN PERIOD

Delivery of housing will depend on the housing market or more accurately the mortgage market.

The access to credit and mortgages finance will be more tightly regulated by the Financial Services regulatory regimes for the foreseeable future, or at least the lifetime of this Plan.

The proposed release of land does not seem to have any correlation to projected population growth or the even more unpredictable supply of housing finance nor even the capacity of the local and national development industry.

The aim is to ensure that there is at least of 5 year supply of land that is available now in a suitable location and be achievable with a reasonable prospect of being completed with a five year period.

Available and achievable sites will be spread across the Plan area.

Because of the reliance on the 'housing market' there can be no certainty that the major public infrastructure projects dependant on the development levy for completion will be in fact be complete.

In Spalding the congestion the WRR project is designed to relieve might not be completed but if substantial development has taken place their will be congestion.

Even more alarming is the indication that there may not be a development levy in place or more alarming still that there will be different development levies in place as a tool to attract development.

Different affordable housing obligations, differing development levies would render most of the policies

Officer_Response:

These issues has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

contained in the Plan irrelevant.

Why have a south East Lincolnshire Development Plan at all?

Q46 Emphasis that the planned housing release figure are an inspirational target only.

Response_Number:	1415	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Q47 Not convinced that the planned release figure will reflect the actual need. Unless all new build properties contribute to a development levy and as these planned release figures ignore possible (small windfall site developments or a plethora of rural exemption proposals part market financed) site developments insufficient funding to deliver the promised infrastructure enhancements will be forthcoming.	Officer_Response:	Infrastructure in it's entirety 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.	Officer_Recommendation:	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.