

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

Chapter_Name: 10 Transport

Response_Number: 6

Persons_Name: Carol M Burton

Representing_Who?: Herself

Respondents_Comments:

The town centre is often congested with traffic and I have indicated in a previous letter to Cllr Gambba Jones that I would believe some of it is caused by the conglomeration of food shops (i.e. Supermarkets) on one side of the town. This causes all who live on the other side of town to drive across the town centre instead of outwards in the other direction. We need at least one full sized supermarket in the area beyond Clay Lake where I believe commercial development is already approved. Previous planning policy with regard to Holland Market needs to be reviewed. With reference to congestion caused by street parking which is becoming a huge problem, why not make all the car parking free and charge substantially for parking on the street. Residents without a drive or a garage of their own could have an exemption license. The town bus Route needs to be extended to include the new Johnson Hospital on its regular route. The bus station needs to be refurbished with a waiting room provided and someone in overall supervision of the site.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. Parking fees and bus routes are not within the remit of the Local Plan. The preferred policy approach to 'Town and Other Centres' seeks to identify floorspace requirements for the plan period. The location of any new planned retail allocations will be considered in due course through the Site Allocations DPD.

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

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

9

Persons_Name:

Mark Price

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Parking charges cause people to shop at supermarkets. There should be free if not extremely cheap parking in Boston Town centre.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. The setting of parking fees is not within the remit of the Local Plan.

Officer_Recommendation:

Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan

Response_Number:

10

Persons_Name:

Mark Price

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Achieving shift of road to rail freight and choices for travellers at present having to use the car. Rail links should be improved, lines re-laid to areas lost to rail and better rail links to other towns and main lines so that more freight and people can use rail.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. The Local Plan is seeking to promote a RFI, which will aid in the shifting of freight from road to rail. However, the aspirations relating to the improvement of the railways in beyond the remit of the Local Plan.

Officer_Recommendation:

Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	11	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mark Price	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Achieving shift of road to rail freight and choices for travellers at present having to use the car. Rail links should be improved, lines re-laid to areas lost to rail and better rail links to other towns and main lines so that more freight and people can use rail.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. The Local Plan is seeking to promote a RFI, which will aid in the shifting of freight from road to rail. However, the aspirations relating to the improvement of the railways in beyond the remit of the Local Plan. The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan

<u>Response_Number:</u>	53	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mrs J Hill	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Herself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	You mention a Spalding relief road but is this going to be built BEFORE the developments or sometime in the future? You anticipate that sustainable of transport will be needed but because of the high fares it is more likely that people will still prefer to travel by car so in Spalding, for example, the roads will become even more congested and there is no space to increase parking within the Town to accommodate all these extra households coming in for their shopping. Also the railway crossing across one of the main roads into Spalding will continue to cause more delays especially if the line is used for freight and additional passenger trains.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	The need for housing and economic growth, the traffic consequences of providing for that growth and the role of the SWRR are adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. 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>	80	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Natural England	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Themselves
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Preferred Policy Approach Sustainable Transport and Accessibility Natural England generally supports policies aimed at sustainable transport modes helping to reduce carbon emissions. In addition pedestrian and cycle ways are an important part of the local green infrastructure network.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	81	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Natural England	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Themselves
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Natural England would need to see more detailed assessments on the environmental impact of the road, including the Habitats Regulations Assessment, before we can comment further on this proposal.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	An HRA will be produced alongside the Submission Version of the Strategy and Policies DPD. These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response_Number:

109

Persons_Name:

Mr A R Boyer

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

I was able yesterday to visit the Spalding offices of South Holland District Council to view the display on the proposed Local Plan for this area, and was a little surprised to see the proposed route for the Spalding Western Relief Road.

I have been resident in Pinchbeck for nearly twenty years – before the current Spalding by-pass (the present A.16) was built, and experienced the volume of heavy commercial traffic passing through the village. This was to some extent alleviated by the opening of the new by-pass, but in my opinion this still left part of the problem unresolved. Traffic coming from north or south of the town of Spalding can easily bypass the town now, whilst there is reasonable access to the east. However, traffic coming to the area from the west – from for example Bourne or Grantham or further afield reaches the outskirts of Spalding or Pinchbeck and then has to negotiate our narrow roads with parked vehicles etc. There was a partial attempt to alleviate this problem by building the 'link road' (now the A.152) from the A.16 to the former A.16 to the north of Surfleet, but from personal observation this does not carry a lot of commercial traffic.

In my opinion, therefore, this link road should be extended from the roundabout at the B.1356/A.152 junction, proceeding westwards to by-pass Surfleet, West Pinchbeck, and crossing the A.151 (Bourne Road) before connecting with the A.16, thus in effect providing Spalding and Pinchbeck with a circular by-pass. When such a relief road is opened the area within the circle should have a ban on H.G.V.s and the like except for access. We have to think of the impact that the proposed rail hub at Deeping St Nicholas with the associated additional H.G.V. traffic will have on un-bypassed towns and villages

Apart from the traffic problems outlined above, I also consider the land to the north of Vernatt's Drain (falling

Officer_Response:

A detailed Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) will be drawn up to support the Submission Version of the Strategy and Policies DPD outlining how necessary infrastructure to support growth will be delivered. As regards the extension of the SWRR, it is likely given that funding in the main will have to come from housing development, that such an extension would be wholly undeliverable. The County Council is presently working on a detailed route for the SWRR, which will be subject to public consultation. The preferred policy approach 'Broad Locations for Housing Development in Boston and Spalding' seeks to maintain a gap between the existing built-up area of Pinchbeck and the new development. Detailed site boundaries for this development will be considered through the Site Allocations DPD in due course.

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

within Pinchbeck Parish is not a suitable area for housing development. This short length of currently farmland provides an instantly recognisable boundary between Spalding and Pinchbeck, and if development is allowed thereon there is the risk of the smaller village being absorbed into the larger town to the detriment of the quality of life of existing Pinchbeck residents. We also have to consider the impact that such development would have on the infrastructure of the area – schools, medical facilities, waste disposal, sewage, and so on.

I trust the planning committee will give these comments their full consideration.

Response_Number:	125	Persons_Name:	Freya Trotman	Representing_Who?:	Herself
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
<p>This is a difficult issue to address. It might help to implement a "car Sharing database" and perhaps the council could make special provisions with insurers to help car owners utilise this without being penalised. The purple bus service is an essential part of rural life particularly for the young and elderly, but provision of service is patchy. Could this be extended. Also Extending the safe cycle and walking routes would be a good idea. Perhaps food processing firms and larger employers could provide buses which pick up points for employees.</p>		<p>Comments noted. These issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan.</p>		<p>Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD</p>	

Response_Number:

128

Persons_Name:

Freya Trotman

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

Road Safety. Most local people in South Holland district are very concerned about the lack of road safety in the area. There seem to be many road users who do not grasp or observe the most basic tenets of the highway code. This needs to be addressed very

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. These issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

129

Persons_Name:

Freya Trotman

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

Road Repairs. In addition to a deplorable record of road safety the roads themselves are in a desperate state of disrepair. How can the document comment on developing and providing new housing and planning when the supporting road network and transport infrastructure are so poor? The council and the Government at local level, upwards plead poverty at the very mention of road repairs to existing roads. Equally how can we hope to attract new business and investment to the area (let alone foreign investment) when our road structure is as disgraceful as any I have seen in the third world. If we were to seriously address the improvement of our roads this could be another area where the unemployed could help get us back on track for better economic growth. We are not currently providing sustainable development to meet the needs and growth of South East Lincs unless the state of our roads is what was meant in section 8 "the environment" I doubt that when the document states "minimising the need to travel", meant that some roads be allowed to become impassable.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. These issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

146

Persons_Name:

Mr J S Birkett

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

I would suggest that the need for better connectivity to national and regional routes outside SE Lincs should be identified as a 'Key Issue', even if there are no practical proposals to be brought forward at this time.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. The issue is identified in the 'Spatial Portrait', although as the representation suggests there are no practical means of delivering this through the plan-making process.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

147

Persons_Name:

Mr J S Birkett

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

It is surprising that, while there is reference to a relief road for Spalding, there is no corresponding reference to any strategy for improving accessibility within and around Boston, such as a 'distributor' road.

Officer_Response:

The Preferred Options Document does make reference to the 'Boston Distributor Road.' This scheme remains an aspiration. However, the delivery of housing growth at Boston is not reliant upon its implementation. In the absence of any modelling work or technical evidence of need and costs, it is not possible to include a policy for delivering a Boston Distributor Road at present, as it cannot be evidenced that there is a reasonable prospect of it coming forward in the plan period.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

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

Response_Number:	273	Persons_Name:	M J Smith	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>Transport is one of my main concerns for the future. I am sure that somewhere in the guidelines for highways and estate development that there are relaxations for road construction that take into account the numbers / use of highways by agricultural vehicles and by a preponderance of HGVs (mostly articulated and foreign) in order to design to that capacity. I have been told that, in the past, Peterborough has objected to duelling and major improvements to the north of the city because they fear loss of trade and industry. I consider that premise both outdated and very dangerous in terms of user safety.</p> <p>A) It would be appreciated if the current road system was assessed in terms of capacity, fit for purpose, dimensionally acceptable and above all safety.</p> <p>B) "Rat runs" should not be permitted or encouraged as is the case now.</p>	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. These issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan.	Officer_Recommendation:	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD

Response_Number:	276	Persons_Name:	M J Smith	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	<p>There are no plans for road improvements that would significantly improve the attraction of South East Lincolnshire.</p> <p>A) Push for the duelling of the A17 and A52 for east to west, and the A15 and A16 north to south.</p> <p>B) Rail connections with east to west routes with better parking will be necessary</p>	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. These issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan.	Officer_Recommendation:	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD

Response_Number:

308

Persons_Name:

Phillip Greswell

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

As mentioned, albeit because of the present Law regarding the provision of public transport by the private sector this suggestion may prove difficult or impossible, a good regular rural bus service should be provided. Pressure should be brought on Government to make changes to the current regulations regarding this.

People should be encouraged to stop using their car. Indeed they may not be able to afford to use a car in the future

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. These issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

433

Persons_Name:

Martin Blake

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Having read the consultation documents on the Local Plan, I would like to make the following points about the proposed Spalding Western Relief Road:

1. The map suggests that the road will follow a line just north of Vernatt's Drain, joining Pinchbeck Road near the entrance to the Enterprise Way Industrial Estate. There is no indication as to how traffic from the Relief Road, a considerable proportion of which will be lorries, will then find its way onwards. Pinchbeck Road is already very congested during peak periods, and neither it nor the roads through the Industrial Estate will be capable of taking the extra traffic generated.
2. Vernatt's Drain and the farmland beyond, which it is envisaged will be taken for the new road, constitute an important wildlife habitat, particularly for birds. We currently have significant numbers of swans, heron, cormorants, tufted ducks and great crested grebe amongst the more common mallards and coots. In summer the banks provide a temporary home for large numbers of warblers, swallows, swifts and martins. Birds of prey frequenting the area include owls, kestrels, sparrow hawks and buzzards, doubtless soon to be joined by red kite. I have also on occasions seen little egret, shelduck and even a pair of white storks. The importance of the area as a wildlife haven right on the edge of Spalding needs to be recognised, but I have seen no acknowledgement of this in the consultation documents. What will be done to preserve the area for wildlife with a major road a few yards away?
3. It is proposed that the new road will cross the railway by means of a bridge, obviously a very large one. Those of us living near the railway line are already resigned to the

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The County Highway Authority has established the need for a SWRR. Once completed the impact of the road will be monitored and the need for any further road improvements will be considered. The final line of the road will be designed with a view to minimising environmental impacts.

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.

likelihood of a significant increase in freight traffic along the line from next summer, but the proposed road bridge will ensure in addition that traffic noise, at all hours of day and night, will be broadcast over a very wide area. Since it will also be highly visible, it will result in a significant loss of visual amenity. If the route for the Relief Road is to fall within the Corridor of Search as per the map, it is essential that the road crosses the railway by passing beneath it if residents in the surrounding area are to be left with any quality of life.

<u>Response_Number:</u> 582	<u>Persons_Name:</u> Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u> R S Earl
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u> The approach is supported.	<u>Officer_Response:</u> Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u> Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u> 583	<u>Persons_Name:</u> Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u> R S Earl
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u> There is sufficient detail.	<u>Officer_Response:</u> Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u> Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	584	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	R S Earl
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	635	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	A W Tindall
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:

636

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents_Comments:

There is sufficient detail.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

637

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:

678

Persons_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

LTP 3 is now out of date but as yet LTP is not in place. This makes it impossible to know what transport and road plans should be based around.

Officer_Response:

Comments noted. These issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:

679

Persons_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

The policy approach must include an assessment of possible positive or negative impact of a distributor road for Boston.

Officer_Response:

The Preferred Options Document does make reference to the 'Boston Distributor Road.' This scheme remains an aspiration. However, the delivery of housing growth at Boston is not reliant upon its implementation. In the absence of any modelling work or technical evidence of need and costs, it is not possible to include a policy for delivering a Boston Distributor Road at present, as it cannot be evidenced that there is a reasonable prospect of it coming forward in the plan period.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

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

Response_Number:

680

Persons_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

Modelling should be carried out regarding the benefit or otherwise of a distributor for Boston, especially with respect to relieving congestion on the A 52, Sleaford Road and with regard to HGVs using unsuitable B roads in an attempt to avoid the town.

Officer_Response:

The Preferred Options Document does make reference to the 'Boston Distributor Road.' This scheme remains an aspiration. However, the delivery of housing growth at Boston is not reliant upon its implementation. In the absence of any modelling work or technical evidence of need and costs, it is not possible to include a policy for delivering a Boston Distributor Road at present, as it cannot be evidenced that there is a reasonable prospect of it coming forward in the plan period.

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

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

681

Persons_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing_Who?:

Herself

Respondents_Comments:

If there is no policy regarding a distributor road, then that will effectively ensure that one cannot happen.

Failure to include such a policy further threatens the economic viability of Boston as new businesses are reluctant to come to the town because of perceived / actual congestion issues. Others move elsewhere. Not only does this have a negative impact on economy and employment, it also encourages more people to travel to elsewhere from Boston to work each day.

This plan must include a broad search area for the route of a distributor road, at least as detailed as the one shown in figure 10.1. Without this there can be no possibility of a joined-up road ever coming into existence within the lifetime of this plan or beyond.

A plan must be drawn up and included at this stage so that should any contributions from developers be forthcoming in the future, they can be meaningful and directed to help start a section of the road.

Officer_Response:

The Preferred Options Document does make reference to the 'Boston Distributor Road.' This scheme remains an aspiration. However, the delivery of housing growth at Boston is not reliant upon its implementation. In the absence of any modelling work or technical evidence of need and costs, it is not possible to include a policy for delivering a Boston Distributor Road at present, as it cannot be evidenced that there is a reasonable prospect of it coming forward in the plan period.

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

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

709

Persons_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents_Comments:

We note the current position regarding the Boston Distributor Road and the lack of evidence to suggest that its implementation is critical for the delivery of Boston's growth to 2031 (paragraph 10.2.2). We have previously advised on this scheme in our letter to the county council's consultants dated 11 February 2008 (copy can be supplied if needed). The impact of the scheme on heritage assets around the western side of Boston could be considerable, particularly given the high archaeological potential of the landscape and the proximity of designated assets. There could also be impacts on views to and from St Botolph's Church, given that any road would need to be elevated to cross the railway line and several watercourses. At the same time, relieving traffic congestion through Boston town centre would be of immense benefit to the historic environment and help to repair severed streets and derelict buildings. However, whether a distributor road is the only option to relieve such congestion remains to be proven, and it is highly likely that other less intrusive and expensive options could also help. The requirements set out in the draft policy on sustainable transport all seem sensible.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

710

Persons_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents_Comments:

infrastructure?
We have previously provided advice on the SWRR in a letter dated October 2011. We do not have a strong opinion on the proposed road, although it may have benefits in terms of relieving traffic congestion through the historic core of Spalding. At the same time, the relief road will need to be carefully planned to avoid harming heritage assets along the route, particularly in terms of undesignated archaeology (but also designated assets such as the Grade II* listed Monk's House). It is therefore incorrect to say in the Sustainability Appraisal that the SWRR option has a neutral impact on the historic environment (paragraph 10.14.7). The draft policy and/or supporting text could make reference to the environmental issues that need to be addressed by the SWRR.

Officer_Response:

The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Response_Number:	723	Persons_Name:	Steve Williamson	Representing_Who?:	Mrs EA Wing, Mr JA Wing, Mrs A For
Respondents_Comments:	Transport Paragraphs 10.1.18 to 20 refer to the LTP3 assumptions that development land can help facilitate the possibility of a distributor road to the south west of Boston, and to a technical analysis that has shown that a distributor road is appropriate. These are opaque statements about an issue that must be openly debated in order to demonstrate political probity and have planning credibility. Reliance on these part analyses will be formally challenged if they remain as part of a justification for a concentration on developing to the south west of Boston. This position is reinforced by the statement in paragraph 10.2.2 that "...There is no evidence to suggest the implementation of a Boston Distributor Road is critical for the delivery of the growth strategy for Boston to 2031."	Officer_Response:	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. 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 considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	800	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	The approach is supported.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	801	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
There is sufficient detail.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	802	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
<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.	

Response_Number:	853	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	854	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
There is sufficient detail.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:

855

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.

Response_Number:

910

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is supported.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	911	<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>	
There is sufficient detail.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	912	<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.	

Response_Number:

969

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

The approach is supported.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:

970

Persons_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents_Comments:

There is sufficient detail.

Officer_Response:

Support noted.

Officer_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	971	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:	1021	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
The approach is supported.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	1022	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
There is sufficient detail.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:	1023	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No change is suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response_Number:

1155

Persons_Name:

Louise McGuiness

Representing_Who?:

Herself & Spalding & Peterborough T

Respondents_Comments:

In response to Q74,75 76

The budget for transport has been spent mainly on transport for schools due to the rural locations and dangerous roads leaving little over for public transport. It is my understanding the council regularly ask council residents to complete surveys with regards to transport (DSN). These results are not shared with Parish council or local groups such as Spalding and Peterborough Transport Forum and Pedals which would be of use. Lessons could be sought from Peterborough which was a sustainable travel demonstration pilot promoting travel plans, car share and cycling. These have been suggested to SHDC on many occasions via SPTF and Pedals.

Investment into the existing railway network would be more viable with integrated shuttle buses from the sub regional to the rural area's reducing the need to travel by car.

We are currently expecting a further 2 trains per hour to be increased to 4 when the upgrade is completed with the hub proposal we could be looking at 13 trains per hour which would not leave much capacity for improvements for passenger usage which is portrayed as a benefit for local community . Increased population which has already been identified a recent survey shows there is a real need for improvements on passenger services in the area as people are having no alternative to travel to work by car which is not sustainable. 41% of residents in DSN work in Peterborough without the feasibility study.

I would like to see Protection for existing passenger service and guarantees of improvements as well as new stations to support and encourage sustainable passenger travel.

Our line is being upgraded for freight trains by 2014.

This affords the opportunity for an improved passenger service – more frequent, longer period of operation and

Officer_Response:

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

Officer_Recommendation:

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

Sunday services. But (i) there is no certainty of this. So, would a freight hub bring that certainty by leveraging funds to improve the passenger service? this opportunity is not mentioned in SHDC's consultation leaflet we would like to see guarantees that a station is proposed for DSN at least as a minimum.

Response_Number:	1164	Persons_Name:	Cllr Richard Austin	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>Boston Distributor Road 10.2.2</p> <p>The statement that 'There is no evidence to suggest the implementation of a Boston Distributor Road is critical for the delivery of the growth strategy for Boston to 2031.' is misleading at best and should be deleted.</p> <p>It was very clear a few years ago that when there was severe traffic congestion the economy of Boston suffered greatly. I accept that since there has been some improvement in traffic flows there has been virtually no growth but this is because of a major national economic downturn. If the economy of Boston is to improve in the long term a distributor road and another major bridge over the Witham are key factors. These are long term aspirations. However this document there needs to include plans to work up suitable schemes in conjunction with developers. Thus when the economy improves they will be ready for implementation. This is what has already happened in Lincoln, Grantham and Spalding. It should now be happening in Boston.</p>	<p>The Preferred Options Document does make reference to the 'Boston Distributor Road.' This scheme remains an aspiration. However, the delivery of housing growth at Boston is not reliant upon its implementation. In the absence of any modelling work or technical evidence of need and costs, it is not possible to include a policy for delivering a Boston Distributor Road at present, as it cannot be evidenced that there is a reasonable prospect of it coming forward in the plan period.</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> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.</p>		<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>		

Response_Number:

1197

Persons_Name:

Mr G Trueman

Representing_Who?:

Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Who deemed this development to be critical. Many do not, and if there is a need for this road why add more housing to clog it up?
What money will be set aside for compensating residents for road noise, construction noise and a reduction on living standards and house values. Spalding needs a much larger capacity in its sewage capabilities before any of this can go ahead. Why add to the problem?
Why be so vague about the area where housing is proposed? Broadgate builders bought Darley's out for £4million (more than intrinsic value) so an outline of that area would be more honest.
Will the road be noise shielded?
What environmental/ wildlife studies have been carried out?
What will be done to protect residents in quiet lanes from increased traffic?
How will you keep the Two Plan footpath open at all times? It is heavily used by many who are unable to afford a car.
How do the Council propose to give the go ahead to building on land that has no building covenants on the deeds?

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The County Highway Authority has established the need for a SWRR. Once completed the impact of the road will be monitored and the need for any further road improvements will be considered. The final line of the road will be designed with a view to minimising environmental impacts.

Officer_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1205	Persons_Name:	Mr and Mrs C Woods	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	How effective will the distributor road be for Boston? Not sure how Spalding ca justify a western bypass when we have nothing at all for a town of considerable size!	Officer_Response:	The Preferred Options Document does make reference to the 'Boston Distributor Road.' This scheme remains an aspiration. However, the delivery of housing growth at Boston is not reliant upon its implementation. In the absence of any modelling work or technical evidence of need and costs, it is not possible to include a policy for delivering a Boston Distributor Road at present, as it cannot be evidenced that there is a reasonable prospect of it coming forward in the plan period. 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 considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1218	Persons_Name:	Louise McGuiness	Representing_Who?:	Herself & Spalding & Peterborough T
Respondents_Comments:	The SWRR will only support an RFI and a bypass around Deeping St Nicholas which according to SHDC is 'here say only'. Where would the divert route be for such a road? For local traffic as indicated on Page 24 would HGV's not be encourages to use it? Will residents of Holland Park be expected to put up with "All traffic" when road maintenance takes place or the road is shut for other reasons such as a RTA. I would like to see more investment into Public transport rather than roads built for city status area's and keep rural Britain Rural and market towns restored. There are no motorways in the county of Norfolk nor urban sprawl.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. We as yet cannot speculate as to the potential benefits arising from a RFI in relation to passenger transport. This will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD. The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	Officer_Recommendation:	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD

Response_Number:

1279

Persons_Name:

Mr P Coathup

Representing_Who?:

Lincolnshire County Council

Respondents_Comments:

It is felt that the wording of the two Transport Priorities in Ch. 3 could be clearer, and that they need to refer more directly to public transport, cycling and walking. Also relevant sections now need to refer to the 4th Local Transport Plan for Lincolnshire.

LCC is pleased to see that the Document recognises the strategic importance of the Spalding Western Relief Road (SWRR) in a specific Preferred Policy Option and begins to consider some of the factors that will influence delivery.

The document notes that the Local Transport Plan and the Transport Strategy for Boston both refer to the possibility of a distributor road to the west of Boston. Such transport infrastructure could deliver benefits to the broad locations for development set out above if through its construction it reduces the consequence of flood risk, as well as wider benefits. Broad locations for development which are currently in flood risk areas may be influenced as a direct result of new transport infrastructure. The Environment Agency has stated, however, that it would not designate any such infrastructure as a formal flood defence.

Amplification of Para. 29, 1st sentence in Executive Councillor Briefing Note)

Priority 10 refers to "improve accessibility ... thereby minimising the need to travel". The link between these two statements is not clear. Improving accessibility is usually about enhancing transport networks/services to enable easier or quicker travel rather than actually reducing the need to travel, which is best achieved by locating new development adjacent to existing or proposed employment/education/services opportunities.

Similarly, Priority 11 mentions maximising "modal shift to sustainable forms of transport ... by seeking to improve Highway infrastructure". Again, the linkage here is not clear with most people interpreting

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.

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

Officer_Recommendation:

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

improvements to highway infrastructure as meaning making better provision for the private car (although some infrastructure such as bus lanes and pedestrian crossing can encourage sustainable travel). Perhaps this would be better worded as "Lincolnshire's transport infrastructure" (which could then also encompass rail as well) or perhaps the two elements need separating into two (unlinked) priorities.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1290	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Deeping St Nicholas P C	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Themselves
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	REQUEST FOR INCLUSION IN THE SOUTH EAST LINC LOCAL PLAN Re-opening of Littleworth Station, Deeping St Nicholas It was expected that the re-opening of Littleworth Station, would be included in the draft South Lincs East Local Plan. A feasibility study has been carried out and the study provides the required evidence to support the re-opening of the station. A copy of the feasibility study is to be sent in a separate email communication. We would ask that the re-opening of Littleworth Station, Deeping St Nicholas be included in the South East Lincs Local Plan.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	The consideration of a policy dedicated to the re-opening of Littleworth Station is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
<u>Response_Number:</u>	1357	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Question 74 Yes	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1358	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 75 No. Omissions include: any reference to charging plug in facilities (although these are specifically referred to in the NPPF quotation at 10.1.6; the need for residential development to design-in car-parking facilities (whether within the houses themselves or discrete courtyards or designated and landscaped street bays. See designs submitted with the Holland Park planning application). Also incorporate in the Blue Box some such statement as; Breaking open existing urban fabric to provide car parks will not be permitted, and where it has already occurred means will be sought to rectify the damage without increasing on-street parking.	Officer_Response:	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

Response_Number:	1359	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 76 Blue Box Para 2 Expand to incorporate above issues.	Officer_Response:	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process. These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

Response_Number:

1360

Persons_Name:

Mr J Charlesworth

Representing_Who?:

Spalding and District Civic Society

Respondents_Comments:

Questions 77, 78, 70 The map on p.150 (and p. 28 of the summary) shows a significantly different route to the map on p .302 Which is correct?

The Spalding western Relief Road is going to create as many problems as it solves. At the north end the additional traffic generated will join already overloaded Pinchbeck Road at a junction near the Johnson Community Hospital. The existing roads will not cope at busy times.

We had hoped that the Vernatt's Drain would form the natural northern boundary to the development of Spalding, and that there would continue to be a separation between Spalding and Pinchbeck. The large extension of urban development to the north of the Vernatt's is not welcome. It appears this is being driven by the need to extract additional funds from the developers to build the SWRR. The SWRR appears to take precedence over the actual need for all this new housing. Has an artificial need been created to fund the SWRR?

The impact of the upgrade of the Joint Line may have been over-estimated. How many extra trains will there be? How fast will they travel? How long will they take to pass through? This information is required to make a judgement.

We are being asked to approve a proposal which has not been thought through and which requires more information and evaluation of rail traffic and road traffic impact.

Officer_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The County Highway Authority has established the need for a SWRR. Once completed the impact of the road will be monitored and the need for any further road improvements will be considered. The final line of the road will be designed with a view to minimising environmental impacts.

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

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: 1441

Persons_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer Recommendation:

TRANSPORT

Comments noted.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

The objectives of the County Local Transport Plan are laudable but are the achievable I note that the traffic modelling exercise concluded that the upgrading of the Joint Rail link through Spalding would create an unacceptable level of traffic congestion in Spalding town centre. The upgrading of the track and signalling systems is to be completed before the end of 2013 and that additional freight movements / passes through the town will start before the end of the year. All the town centre facilities lie to the east of the rail track. There are four level crossings in the urban fabric. The major residential developments have been sited to the west of the rail track and traffic modelling has show that the traffic from the Wygate Park residential development zone, with @ 800 homes with valid consents are yet to be completed , suggested that up to 80% of the vehicle movements would exit and egress the development over the Mill Green level crossing. On a projected vehicle movements of 20 per day per house that would suggest potentially up to another 12000 vehicle movements per day. Phase 1 of the WRR will be financed by a development levy on some 2250 dwellings but development has not yet started. Using the same base modelling projections the completed development potential generate up 40000 vehicular movements per day. The original studies envisage further residential development of up to 2500 dwelling units would generate sufficient S 106 monies to fund a connection between the Phase 1 distributor road and the A 151 creating 2 access / egress routes from an urban extension of @5000 + houses in total potentially generating some 80000+ vehicular movements. Were would all this extra traffic go. The bulk of these movements would be into Spalding town centre to access the town centre facilities, the schools. The

hospital and GP services, leisure and entertainment services; the nearest location for all these services. Utilising the A 16 Spalding by pass route would involve more than quadrupling the journey distance until the connection between the development and the A 151 was opened. (One of the objectives of the plan is to reduce the length of journeys) The proposal now suggests that the road from the already agreed in principle southern rail bridge will join the A 151 near Pode Hole eliminating the need for a further bridge over the Vernatt's Drain creating in effect a by-pass loop around Spalding avoiding through traffic adding to the congestion in Spalding . (At the request of the Spalding and District Access Group I submitted a response to the consultation on the Traffic Plan LPT3 suggesting this approach.

The Group was advised that our suggestion rose significant (but unspecified engineering problems) would inhibit farm access to their fields and would require demolishing properties leading to excessive compensation claims. What has changed?). The major urban extension north of the Vernatt's Drain will only proceed if the developer gives an undertaking to complete the WRR plus a rail bridge to join Spalding Road in Pinchbeck.

It seems that the congestion level will increase from 2014 with no possibility of relief until 2031 and even then no guarantee that the congestion will ever be relieved. The solution seems to be that to relieve congestion you need to create more congestion. Spalding is an expanding regional sub centre. As such it is and will increasingly be a destination for vehicular traffic flows. Much of that traffic will arise from inner urban traffic movements including from the addition 7000+ homes to be built to the west of the rail line. The anticipated concentration of employment opportunities in Spalding will add further to the congestion.

A selection of low cost but high tech measures could be introduced to address the problem. The existing road network from the north east south and west can direct traffic around Spalding without having to cross the railway. Insert in the SATNAV System a congestion warning for Spalding and encouraging drivers to use the preferred diversion routes.

Adjust the road signage to divert traffic along the preferred route using interactive electronic signage. Consider widening Park Road through to Hawthorne Bank then a new road parallel the rail track to join the Phase 1 road to the west of the proposed new bridge. The improved signalling system should reduce the existing time delay on each train pass The District Council could allocate semi derelict land north of the Holland Markets for car park development. There are solutions that could alleviate the problem before 2031.

Q74 There needs to be a credible solution to transport issues arising out of Spalding's Potential growth,

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1442	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	

Q75 Laudable targets which face a major two major obstacles. First peoples love the freedom that personal transport offers and secondly the cars ability to breakdown rural isolation. Travel Plans that fail to acknowledge these influences will never fully achieve their objectives. Travel plans in more urban areas can be more successful. Convenient comprehensive accessible cheap rural public transport over the course of this Plan's life remain a chimera.

Comments noted.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1443

Persons_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

Q76 This is the section of the Plan which cries out for a more innovative approach. Technology can be used to extend the capacity of the road infrastructure without heavy capital expenditure which the County does not have, From a zero budget base would this transport section be acceptable ??

Comments noted.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number: 1444

Persons_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing_Who?: Himself

Respondents_Comments:

Officer_Response:

Officer_Recommendation:

Q77 If the SWRR is really necessary or is the prospect of appropriating the development levy to attractive to miss out on. The scale of these urban extensions will require a significant investment in social capital to make life bearable for the residents the project population of the 'West Pinchbeck ' development could be 9000+ and will require significant expenditure on new schools (primary and secondary,) new medical facilities, new community facilities, new recreational and leisure facilities. How would these facilities be paid for? As the existing consents are built out and the Spalding common scheme generates completions the local schools GP services will not be able to cope. This social investment will have to be financed

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.

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

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

Response_Number:	1445	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Q78 See previous answers. I believe that there are alternatives that could be used to address the projected congestion in Spalding.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted.	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1446	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Q79 rethink and re write The NPPF quite clearly states that a development proposal should not be subject to policy obligations or subject to development levy's that render the development proposal commercially unviable If the SWRR is necessary the County Council should borrow the money now and build it.	Officer_Response:	This is understood. 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. The level of infrastructure required will be balanced against the viability of development proposals in the round through a 'Whole Plan Viability Assessment', which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process. These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.
