

Post_title: 25: Surfleet

ID1: 1600

comment_author: G R Merchant

comment_content:

has put forward a site for consideration, which is behind the new houses built on Main Road.

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Sur013 in the SHLAA

The SHLAA concludes that the site is suitable but not achievable. Although opening-up infrastructure costs are likely to be low, it would be unlikely to appeal to a developer of market housing given its relationship with the existing affordable dwellings to its east. The owners indicate that it is intended to be developed as an affordable housing scheme, which could be pursued as a rural exception scheme under policy 16.

Officer Recommendation:

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

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

ID1:

1601

comment_author: Trevor Rowbottom

comment content:

I strongly support the proposed SETTLEMENT BOUNDARY PLAN as viewed in Surfleet village hall on Tuesday 2nd February, as shown on plans No 63 and No 25 bringing the village of Surfleet together as a whole community.

I have family in both halves of the village, Brothers, Cousins, nephews and nieces and we have always considered the village to be one entity. Some of my relatives living on Seas End Road are closer to the amenities than those living at the top end of Surfleet, also the village has always been administered by the one local council.

I declare an interest in a site between 71 and 73 Seas End Road Surfleet listed on the South Holland Council site as SUR008. This site is within the new settlement boundary and if it were adopted would I trust be available for development. Since the housing has been allowed on the opposite side of the road the site is now an obvious infill. You have declared that there are no objections regarding the Environment/ Infrastructure/ Location/ or Transport where you have stated that the amenities can be reached by walking, cycling or by public transport. There is no flood risk on the site as shown in the accepted flood risk assessment submitted with application H17-0602-15 and the local village councillors have agreed that the site would be better developed rather than left derelict. This settlement plan if adopted would bring the whole village together and allow much needed housing in the village which you again have stated requires 135 houses over the next few years with no buildings agreed at the present time.

Officer Comment:

A number of people have responded saying that Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are one village and should not be split into two. The comments and reasoning relating to merging Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are accepted.

The settlement boundary and policy approach would support the principal of developing Sur008

Officer Recommendation:

Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are merged into one settlement called Surfleet.

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

ID1: 1602 comment_author: Cllr Sally Slade

comment_content:

I support the possibility of increased infilling in Surfleet Seas End and would like this to be recognised as part of Surfleet, not as a separate village. It is one parish.

Officer Comment:

A number of people have responded saying that Surfleet and Surfleet seas End are one village and should not be split into two. The comments and reasoning relating to merging Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are accepted.

Officer Recommendation:

Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are merged into one settlement called Surfleet.

ID1: 1603 comment_author: Mrs Elizabeth Jones

comment_content:

Sur006: The site is well suited for people who do not have a car (either elderly people who can no longer drive and young people who haven't got a car) as there is a bus stop near by. Surfleet needs more children to keep the school going.

Officer Comment:

The support for this site is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the approach is required.

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

ID1: 1604 comment_author: Amelia Rowbottom

comment_content:

I was pleased to see the "Settlement Boundary plan" for Surfleet with the boundary now embracing the whole village. I have lived on both sides of the A16 Road and while this d s run through the village I, as with all my friends and family, have always looked on the village as being one settlement looked after as it is by one local parish council. I think the boundary plan is good and hope to see it adopted as soon as possible.

Officer Comment:

A number of people have responded sayin that Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are one village and should not be split into two. The comments and reasoning relating to merging Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are accepted.

Officer Recommendation:

Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are merged into one settlement called Surfleet.

ID1: 1605 comment_author: G R Merchant

comment_content:

has put forward a site for consideration as a housing site which extends northwards from Sur011 and lies between the A16, Appeldoorn, Coalbeach Lane South and the A152.

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Sur018 in the SHLAA
The SHLAA concludes although it will not have adverse impacts on historical or natural assets, its development would have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - views of the village from the A16 and A152 are currently limited, but this site would extend the village as far as these highways, and its development would make the village far more 'visible' from these vantage points.

Officer Recommendation:

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

ID1: 1606 comment_author: Mr Graeme Smith

comment content:

The Policy Map for Surfleet (Figure 1) is not up-to-date as it does not contain dwellings constructed after 2011 (Figure 2). And the statement on Page 1 of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan: Housing Paper - Surfleet (January 2016) that only 'Four new homes were built in Surfleet between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2015' is factually incorrect as a total of 12 dwellings were constructed, all of which were Affordable Housing - 8 being constructed under a Rural Exception (H17-0555-13), the remaining 4 being constructed for South Holland District Council (H17-0179-13). Nor is the Crematorium (H17-1009-11) displayed on the map. Technically it may be argued that some of these properties are outside the strict settlement boundary of Surfleet but close proximity must be taken into account when reporting the changes to a settlement. It is suggested that Policy Maps are updated to show the actual street plan of each settlement, and to indicate differences from previous Settlement Maps by marking each completed, or proposed, change with reference to the associated Planning Application, as shown in Figure 2. Other information such as average traffic flows could also be shown on Policy maps.

South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Housing Paper - Surfleet (January 2016) Site: Sur006 - The document indicates 'Access is proposed in that application to be taken as an extension of Sunnydale Close. The principle of this is acceptable in highway terms but that road may not be suitable to serve the whole of the identified site'. Given that a Perpetual Planning Obligation is in place (H17-0826-97) to prevent access from Sunnydale Close onto Sur006, and that the site does not include land that separates Sunnydale Close from Sur006 it is

Officer Comment:

1. Planning permission has been granted on part of Sur006 for a mix of bungalows and chalet bungalows. The site boundary is screened by buildings on three sides, which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church.
2. Sur006 is scored in last place with one green and four red impacts. However, it is considered that the allocation should relate to the planning application site only and not to the larger area submitted to the SHLAA for consideration.
3. The condition on the Sunningdale Drive planning permission will be overridden by the new planning permission. County Highways have said access is proposed to be taken as an extension of Sunnydale Close. The principle of this is acceptable in highway terms but that road may not be suitable to serve the whole of the identified site. Park Lane is not suitable to provide vehicular access to this site because of the narrow carriageway and lack of safe provision for pedestrians. Wood's Lane is also unsuitable to provide access.

Officer Recommendation:

Conclusions on site Sur006 – It is not considered that site Sur006 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet in its current form. However, if it is reduced in size to conform to the site with planning permission it is considered a suitable Potential Housing Site and should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It has planning permission for a mixture of bungalows and chalet bungalows on part of the original site, which is screened by existing development which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church. It is therefore more deliverable than other options.
- The highways department have advised that there are access issues that restrict the size of the original site.

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

unclear how any of this site can be developed, or indeed that it should be developed. A large number of objections have been lodged against the existing Planning Application for 26 dwellings on Sur006 (H17-0652-15) and this clearly demonstrates local resistance to any development on this site. It is therefore suggested that this site is removed from the list of proposed sites for Surfleet.

ID1: 1607 comment_author: Mrs A Bradbury

comment content:

I support the proposals but would like to see Surfleet considered as one village it has always been. I was born and bred in the part now called Surfleet Seas End and feel very aggrieved that it has been split in two by the Council planners. Surfleet is one village running by the River Glen with an area called 'Surfleet Reservoir' where locks separate the fresh water from the salt water of the River Welland. It has one parish council and a school attended by all the primary school children. The facilities are shared. I have had generations of relatives live in the village, and still do, including brothers, nieces, nephews, cousins and their families, who need new properties built to enable them to remain in the village. Therefore I am in favour of the proposed plan to treat both sides of the A16 under the same building development proposals for surfleet as a whole.

Officer Comment:

A number of people have responded saying that Surfleet and Surfleet seas End are one village and should not be split into two. The comments and reasoning relating to merging Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are accepted.

Officer Recommendation:

Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are merged into one settlement called Surfleet.

ID1: 1608 comment_author: Surfleet Parish Council

comment content:

We are disappointed to find Surfleet Seas End being detached from Surfleet. The whole area is one parish using the same facilities e.g. school and infrastructure, linked for pedestrians by an underpass under the A16. However, in general we agree with the 'red lines'. We question why, on map 63, on Seas End Road labelled Glen House Farm, is the red line not continued across leaving land alongside the road available for potential development? A precedent is set for this on Reservoir Road between Flexmill House and Old Lammas. It would make for consistent treatment.

We do not approve of the large housing development in a small village. Three potential development sites, currently farmland, a long Station Road have the merit of being relatively small scale and having access directly on to the Station Road. The potential development site on the very edge of Surfleet, between Surfleet Road and Park Farm has only one direct access to a road (Pack Drove), leading to Surfleet Road. Entry to the main road there is difficult because a drivers sight lines are blocked by the metal superstructure of Surfleet Bridge. If any development is considered on this potential site, the developer should have a condition to fulfil of replacing the bridge with a proper road bridge with pedestrian footpath on each side of the bridge, not the current railway bridge with pedestrian footbridge on one side only. This would make entry to the main road safer for vehicles and children walking to school on bus stops.

Officer Comment:

A number of people have responded saying that Surfleet and Surfleet seas End are one village and should not be split into two. The comments and reasoning relating to merging Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are accepted.

Officer Recommendation:

Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are merged into one settlement called Surfleet.

ID1: 1609 comment_author: George White

comment content:

I understand why housing needs are projected, which in Surfleet's case has resulted in identification of four sites for at least 137 dwellings, 105 of which would be situate on just one agricultural site, Sur006. I do object to the proposed access to this single major site being via Sunnydale Close, which is a small cul-de-sac subject to a SHDC in perpetuity closure order, imposed to protect the amenities of residents from activities connected to the land now referred to as Sur006. It seems obvious to me that this small and narrow Close is unsuited to carry traffic flow from residential, service and construction vehicles catering to an estate of anything like 100 houses and if this were to proceed it would reduce the quality of life of residents and also result in the likelihood of traffic problems at the junction with Surfleet Road, which is already subject to an excessive and at times continual traffic flow. A current planning application for just 26 dwellings on Sur006 has already attracted considerable similar comment, including from the local Member of Parliament and the Parish Council, all of which is indicative of the genuine concerns felt.

Officer Comment:

1. Planning permission has been granted on part of Sur006 for a mix of bungalows and chalet bungalows. The site boundary is screened by buildings on three sides, which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church.
2. Sur006 is scored in last place with one green and four red impacts. However, it is considered that the allocation should relate to the planning application site only and not to the larger area submitted to the SHLAA for consideration.
3. The condition on the Sunningdale Drive planning permission will be overridden by the new planning permission. County Highways have said access is proposed to be taken as an extension of Sunnydale Close. The principle of this is acceptable in highway terms but that road may not be suitable to serve the whole of the identified site. Park Lane is not suitable to provide vehicular access to this site because of the narrow carriageway and lack of safe provision for pedestrians. Wood's Lane is also unsuitable to provide access.

Officer Recommendation:

Conclusions on site Sur006 – It is not considered that site Sur006 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet in its current form. However, if it is reduced in size to conform to the site with planning permission it is considered a suitable Potential Housing Site and should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It has planning permission for a mixture of bungalows and chalet bungalows on part of the original site, which is screened by existing development which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church. It is therefore more deliverable than other options.
- The highways department have advised that there are access issues that restrict the size of the original site.

ID1:

1610

comment_author:

Robert Doughty Consultancy Ltd

comment content:

I refer to my telephone conversation with your Mr Udy on Thursday 11 February 2016, regarding our client's land at Coalbeach Lane and Thary Lane, Surfleet. On considering the published consultation draft South East Lincolnshire Local Plan are concerned to find that of the four residential sites that we are promoting on the client's behalf through the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan process, none have been identified as potential allocations on the Surfleet Inset Map.

We also note with some surprise that of these four sites only the smallest the Walnut Tree Field (Sur009) is included in the 2016 SHLAA. The Walnut Tree Field for which outline planning permission (Decision No. H17-0063-15) was granted in May 2015 and is presently being marketed for sale, confirms our client's intentions to make the land available for building.

The omission of three of our client's four promoted sites from the 2016 SHLAA is wholly unexpected, and particularly so as in our response of 28 June 2013 to your invitation to comment on the Combined Preferred Options and Sustainability Appraisal Report we had specifically commented on behalf of our clients in respect of the four sites. I enclose a copy of our letter and the plan (Drawing No. 455/12 LPO1) that accompanied it.

Mr Udy advised that with regard to the Walnut Tree Field (SHLAA Sur009) it had not been identified as an allocation on the Surfleet Inset Map as it would accommodate less than 10 dwellings. With regard to our client's remaining three sites (Plots B, C & D as referred to on Drawing No. 455/12 LPO1 referred to above) he suggested that as the Local Plan Team was accommodating further site promotions we should

Officer Comment:

Sur003

The planning permission for five dwellings is on the front part of the site and leaves about one hectare to the rear, which would hold about 20 dwellings. Therefore the estimated capacity of 25 is still achievable.

Sur004

It is possible that a developer will wish to develop this site at a very low density but that is unknown at present. It could be higher. The capacity of this site, and all sites not in the sub regional centres, has been estimated at 20dph in order to provide a guide on capacity. This is quite low already and is consistent with an historical rule of thumb of eight to the acre.

Sur006

1. Planning permission has been granted on part of Sur006 for a mix of bungalows and chalet bungalows. The site boundary is screened by buildings on three sides, which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church.

2. Sur006 is scored in last place with one green and four red impacts. However, it is considered that the allocation should relate to the planning application site only and not to the larger area submitted to the SHLAA for consideration.

3. The condition on the Sunningdale Drive planning permission will be overridden by the new planning permission. County Highways have said access is proposed to be taken as an extension of Sunnydale Close. The principle of this is acceptable in highway terms but that road may not be suitable to serve the

Officer Recommendation:

Sur003

Conclusions on site Sur003 – It is considered that site Sur003 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet, and that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It is well located in the village and partly has planning permission. The site is one of two with the best Flood risk and has the best Sustainability score.

Sur004

Conclusions on site Sur004 – It is considered that site Sur004 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet, and it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It is well located in the village and is one of two sites with the best Flood risk. The Sustainability Appraisal scores the site second equal.

Sur006

Conclusions on site Sur006 – It is not considered that site Sur006 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet in its current form. However, if it is reduced in size to conform to the site with planning permission it is considered a suitable Potential Housing Site and should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It has planning permission for a mixture of bungalows and chalet bungalows on part of the original site, which is screened by existing development which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church. It is therefore more deliverable than other options.

- The highways department have advised that there are access issues that restrict the size of the original site.

write setting out the circumstances and supporting the sites in question. We have taken Mr Udy's advice and would refer you to the items as set out below.

Plot B Thary Lane 0.48 ha The site is available, although there is no planning permission and as yet no allocation. There are no legal or ownership problems as although there are two owners, they are acting together. It has good achievability, but it would accommodate less than ten dwellings if developed in isolation. It is possible that it could be developed together with Plot C which adjoins to the south west. In scale with the 150 dwellings which the emerging Local Plan seeks to be developed in Surfleet, Plot B is accessible to facilities and abuts the existing built up area on three of its boundaries. It also has an accessible road frontage to Thary Lane. Services and facilities are potentially accessible on foot, by bicycle or public transport.

Although Plot B is outside the Settlement Boundary so too are proposed allocations Sur004, Sur006 and Sur011 as shown on the published Surfleet Inset Map.

Plot C Coalbeach Lane South 2.15 ha This site is available although there is no planning permission and as yet no allocation. It is adjacent to Plot B and in the same ownership, and although there are two owners, they are acting together. The site has good achievability, and could accommodate 43 dwellings at 20 per hectare. Its development is in scale with the 150 dwellings which the emerging Local Plan seeks to be developed in Surfleet. The site abuts the existing built-up area, and has a boundary with Coalbeach Lane South allowing direct highway access. It is currently in arable use, and its development would not have an environmental impact on natural, built or historic assets. Services and facilities are potentially accessible on foot, by bicycle or public transport. Although Plot C

whole of the identified site. Park Lane is not suitable to provide vehicular access to this site because of the narrow carriageway and lack of safe provision for pedestrians. Wood's Lane is also unsuitable to provide access.

Sur011

It is possible that a developer will wish to develop this site at a lower density but that is unknown at present. It could be higher. The capacity of this site, and all sites not in the sub regional centres, has been estimated at 20dph in order to provide a guide on capacity. This is quite low already and is consistent with an historical rule of thumb of eight to the acre.

The site has two positive impacts in the Sustainability Appraisal, making it second equal with Sur004. It is well screened from the A16 and is a suitable extension to the area, in the same way Kingfisher Drive extended the village against Glen Gardens.

The sites have been registered as Sur015, Sur016, Sur017 in the SHLAA.

Sur015 The SHLAA identifies this site as undevelopable because it would have adverse environmental impacts.

Sur016 The SHLAA concludes it will not have adverse impacts on historical assets and, although it contains three mature trees which contribute significantly to the area's character, it appears possible to develop the site without their loss. The site's relationship to the existing built-up area is good, and it could be developed without undue harm to the character and appearance of the area. The Highway Authority comments that the carriageway of Coalbeach Lane is wide enough here to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed

Sur011

Conclusions on site Sur011 – It is considered that site Sur011 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet and that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It is a well screened extension to this part of the village which is in character with its surroundings. The Sustainability Appraisal scores the site in equal second place.

Sur015 The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sur016 The site should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Sur017 The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

is outside the Settlement Boundary so too are proposed allocations Sur004, Sur006 and Sur011. Plot D Thary Lane/Hungate 13.7 ha This site is available either whole or perhaps more appropriately in part together with Plot C. It is adjacent to Plot C and in the same ownership, and the two owners, are acting together. The site could accommodate 43 dwellings at 20 per hectare, and up to 64 at 30 per hectare. Plot C has access to Thary Lane and Hungate and, if developed in part with Plot C, would be able to access Coalbeach Lane. It is currently in arable use, and its development would not have an environmental impact on natural, built or historic assets. Services and facilities are potentially accessible on foot, by bicycle or public transport. Although Plot D is outside the Settlement Boundary so too are proposed allocations Sur004, Sur006 and Sur011.

Having carefully considered the site allocations that have been proposed for Surfleet in the consultation draft - Sur006, Sur003, Sur004 and Sur011 we should also like to comment as follows:

Sur006 land to the south of Park Lane. Surfleet Sur006 is Grade 1 Agricultural Land and part of Sur006, all of which lies outside the Settlement Boundary, is presently the subject of an application (H17-0652-15) for planning permission for 26 single storey and one and a half storey dwellings. The application is in respect of about one third of Sur006 served by a single vehicular access which is then intended to extend eastwards into the remaining two thirds of Sur006! Vehicular access from the public highway into the site is by way of Sunnydale Close, a short narrow cul de sac with a single footpath, connecting the application site to Surfleet Road; it is however, likely that Sunnydale Close may not be suitable to serve the whole of the allocated site, indeed there is a strong local view that it

number of dwellings and the site's frontage is long enough to be able to accommodate an adoptable estate road junction. There is no footway on the site side of Coalbeach Lane but the road is sufficiently lightly trafficked for it to be safe for residents of the site to cross to the footway on the opposite side.

Sur017 The SHLAA identifies this site as undevelopable because it would conflict with the Plan's locational strategy, and have adverse environmental impacts.

is not capable of effectively providing vehicular and pedestrian access to the application site. Park Lane and Wood's Lane are the only other roads which run adjacent to Sur006 but Park Lane is not suitable to provide vehicular access to the site because of its narrow carriageway and the lack of safe provision for pedestrians while Wood's Lane is also unsuitable to provide access. Sur006 is the largest Surfleet allocation, intended to provide 105 dwellings depending on density, but it is substantially damaged by its restricted vehicular accessibility, with a possible reduction of as many as 79 dwellings, should the current application be granted planning permission.

Sur003 Land to the north of Station Road. Surfleet The anticipated density of development for this proposed allocation is 25 dwellings over a site area of 1.23 ha. In contrast, the current planning application (H17-O798-15), which is more in keeping with the location, is for five frontage plots only an anticipated shortfall of some 20 dwellings.

Sur004 land to the south of Station Road. Surfleet This site of 1.95 ha, also outside the Settlement Boundary, is expected to accommodate some 39 dwellings depending on density. However, should the land be released, it is more likely to provide a much smaller number of substantial dwellings, say 12 to 15 enjoying a river frontage, such as those to the immediate west of the proposed allocation. This amounts to a considerable reduction of between 24 and 27 dwellings.

Sur011 land off Station Road, Surfleet It is noted that this proposed allocation site comprises 1.3 ha of Grade 1 farmland, that the possible density for development is shown as varying between 26 and 39 dwellings, and that it is considered that the site will be acceptable only as an extension to Kingfisher Drive, to the west.

Kingfisher Drive which occupies a somewhat larger

area, contains some 32 dwellings at a lower density. It is suggested that the development of Sur011 is likely to result in a smaller number of dwellings more in keeping with the density of Kingfisher Drive itself, say perhaps 20; six less than indicated.

The emerging Local Plan seeks to develop 150 dwellings in Surfleet by 2036, and the development of the proposed allocations Sur003, Sur004, Sur006 and Sur011 as suggested in the January 2016 SHLAA will provide a total of 195. However, for the reasons referred to above we consider that the development of the four proposed allocations is likely to provide fewer than 70 dwellings over the plan period. It is our view that the SHLAA requirement for 150 dwellings in Surfleet during the plan period is reasonable, and to have sufficient land allocated to provide for a further 45 dwellings is also reasonable. However, to achieve this will, realistically, require additional land to be allocated and we would suggest that instead of being overlooked, our clients sites (Plots B, C and D as referred to above) should be included as allocations in the Surfleet Inset Map of the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan.

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

ID1: 1611 comment_author: Natural England

comment_content:

Site SUR004 at Surfleet is within 1km of Surfleet Lows SSSI which is one of the few remaining wet alluvial meadows in Lincolnshire that has not been subjected to agricultural improvement. Any proposed development should ensure that there is not an adverse impact on this designated site.

Officer Comment:

This site is further from the SSSI than Sur003, upon which no comment was received from NE. It is 730m away from the SSSI and there is intervening development. It seems unlikely that there would be an impact on the SSSI

Officer Recommendation:

Conclusions on site Sur004 – It is considered that site Sur004 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet, and it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It is well located in the village and is one of two sites with the best Flood risk. The Sustainability Appraisal scores the site second equal.

ID1: 1612 comment_author: Mr G Tunnard

comment_content:

has submitted a site for housing development to the east of Sur006 that is contained by highways by 'Newlands Farm'

Officer Comment:

This has been registered as Sur019 in the SHLAA.

The SHLAA concludes although it will not have adverse impacts on historical or natural assets, its development would have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area - considered in isolation, the site has an unsatisfactory relationship to the existing village, and would create an incongruous estate of dwellings in the countryside. Considered in conjunction with site Sur006, the site's relationship to the village would be improved, but it would still represent a significant intrusion into the countryside, and would create a site larger than is being sought.

Officer Recommendation:

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

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

ID1: 1613 comment_author: Michael G Hammond

comment content:

As part of the Rowbottom family, I am the Son-in-Law of the late Joseph Rowbottom formerly of 71, Seas End Road, Surfleet. Marjorie, my late wife was his daughter, was born and raised in Surfleet I felt it important to give you my comments.

I am writing to support the proposed settlement plan as it applies to Surfleet Village including Seas End. I noted with considerable surprise that Surfleet Village and Seas End were being treated as two separate developments. There is only one Parish Council, School, and Cemetery etc. I have always seen Surfleet as one village with shared amenities. Operating as one community would ensure that any developments will benefit the whole village and not just part.

Finally I need to declare my interest in the site between 61 and 71 Seas End Road of which I am part owner.

Officer Comment:

A number of people have responded saying that Surfleet and Surfleet seas End are one village and should not be split into two. The comments and reasoning relating to merging Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are accepted.

Officer Recommendation:

Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are merged into one settlement called Surfleet.

ID1: 1614 comment_author: Cllr E Sneath

comment content:

I have recently attended the local plan consultations at Pinchbeck and Surfleet and the numbers of residents attending shows how concerned and interested residents are about this consultation and their comments to me show deep disquiet mainly about the plans for Pinchbeck...Surfleet fares a lot better than West Pinchbeck with some suitable and sustainable development being suggested in various areas of the Village, close to the School and on bus routes which is always very useful.

Officer Comment:

A number of people have responded saying that Surfleet and Surfleet seas End are one village and should not be split into two. The comments and reasoning relating to merging Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are accepted.

Officer Recommendation:

Surfleet and Surfleet Seas End are merged into one settlement called Surfleet.

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

ID1: 1615 comment_author: Historic England

comment content:

Site Sur006 has the potential to impact on views from the Grade I Listed Church of St Lawrence, which is not reflected within the Sustainability Appraisal. Again further assessment would be required,

Officer Comment:

1. Planning permission has been granted on part of Sur006 for a mix of bungalows and chalet bungalows. The site boundary is screened by buildings on three sides, which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church.

Officer Recommendation:

Conclusions on site Sur006 – It is not considered that site Sur006 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet in its current form. However, if it is reduced in size to conform to the site with planning permission it is considered a suitable Potential Housing Site and should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It has planning permission for a mixture of bungalows and chalet bungalows on part of the original site, which is screened by existing development which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church. It is therefore more deliverable than other options.
- The highways department have advised that there are access issues that restrict the size of the original site.

ID1: 1616 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

Overall, on behalf of our clients, we very much support the proposal to include the site Sur 006. It completes a form of development close to the village centre, and its development for housing will be a logical infill to the development already in the location, as routinely seen in rural villages, following which, the new housing and families will be able to further support local services. A part of the site is being considered under a planning application for residential development at the present time, in conjunction with a developer.

Officer Comment:

The support for this site is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the approach is required.

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

ID1: 1617 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

Overall, on behalf of our clients, we very much support the proposal to include the site Sur 003. It completes a form of development close to the village centre, and its development for housing will be a logical infill to the development already in the location, as routinely seen in rural villages, following which, the new housing and families will be able to further support local services. A part of the site is being considered under a planning application for residential development at the present time, in conjunction with a developer

Officer Comment:

The support for this site is welcome.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the approach is required.

ID1: 1618 comment_author: Mouchel Consulting

comment content:

Our client Lincolnshire County Council supports the general principles of the emerging South East Lincolnshire Local Plan (the Local Plan). However, we consider that the site, detailed in the attached location plan, which forms a 5.5 hectare (13.6 acre) relatively flat area of farmland to the northern end of Surfleet, should be considered as an allocation for residential development.

Proposed Policy 2: Spatial Strategy of the Local Plan identifies the settlement of Surfleet as a Minor Service Centre. It states for such areas that:- 'Within the settlement boundaries of the Minor Service Centres development will be permitted that supports their role as service centre for the settlement itself, helps sustain existing facilities or helps meet the service needs of other local communities' The evidence base to the Local Plan includes Housing Papers for each settlement where housing allocations are being proposed by the Council. This details which sites are being put forward as options, the Councils assessment of the suitability of each site, and an assessment of the likely impacts of their development on local infrastructure. The Housing Paper for Surfleet advises that approximately 137 dwellings are required for Surfleet between 2011 and 2036.

The Housing Paper identifies 4 potential allocations, these are the designated sites Sur003, Sur004, Sur006 and Sur011. The paper acknowledges that these sites have a number of constraints which are detailed below:-

Allocation No: Sur003 'Waste water requires upgrading for this site' Sewers cross the site and a pumping station is nearby Worst Flood risk, No developer

Officer Comment:

Sur003

The site is within the settlement boundary, has the best score in the Sustainability Appraisal and is mostly in flood zone 1.

Sur004

The site has development on three sides, is second equal in the Sustainability Appraisal and is in flood zone 1

Sur006

1. Planning permission has been granted on part of Sur006 for a mix of bungalows and chalet bungalows.

The site boundary is screened by buildings on three sides, which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church.

2. Sur006 is scored in last place with one green and four red impacts. However, it is considered that the allocation should relate to the planning application site only and not to the larger area submitted to the SHLAA for consideration.

3. The condition on the Sunningdale Drive planning permission will be overridden by the new planning permission. County Highways have said access is proposed to be taken as an extension of Sunnysdale Close. The principle of this is acceptable in highway terms but that road may not be suitable to serve the whole of the identified site. Park Lane is not suitable to provide vehicular access to this site because of the narrow carriageway and lack of safe provision for pedestrians. Wood's Lane is also unsuitable to provide access.

Sur011

Officer Recommendation:

Sur003

Conclusions on site Sur003 – It is considered that site Sur003 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet, and that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It is well located in the village and partly has planning permission. The site is one of two with the best Flood risk and has the best Sustainability score.

Sur004

Conclusions on site Sur004 – It is considered that site Sur004 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet, and it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It is well located in the village and is one of two sites with the best Flood risk. The Sustainability Appraisal scores the site second equal.

Sur006

Conclusions on site Sur006 – It is not considered that site Sur006 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet in its current form. However, if it is reduced in size to conform to the site with planning permission it is considered a suitable Potential Housing Site and should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It has planning permission for a mixture of bungalows and chalet bungalows on part of the original site, which is screened by existing development which will together prevent visual harm to the setting of the church. It is therefore more deliverable than other options.
- The highways department have advised that there are access issues that restrict the size of the original site.

involved Allocation No: Sur004 Waste water and foul network capacity requires upgrading for this site No developer involved

Allocation No: Sur006 Waste water and foul network capacity requires upgrading for this site Water mains and sewers cross the site and a pumping station is nearby Worst Flood risk No developer involved

Allocation No: Sur011 Waste water and foul network capacity requires upgrading for this site Sewers cross the site and a pumping station is nearby Worst Flood risk No developer involved

While this site is located in Flood Zone 3 we consider this is an issue that can be resolved. National Planning Policy Framework and its associated Planning Practice Guidance, along with proposed Policies 4 Strategic Approach to Flood Risk and proposed Policy 28 Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy, of the Local Plan, address development in flood zones. These policies allows for residential development to take place in Flood Zone 3, subject to its compliance with the required Sequential and Exception Tests.

The Sequential Test in essence, requires evidence that there are no other sustainable locations outside the flood zone. We would comment, as detailed on the Environment Agency's, Flood Maps For Planning (Rivers and Sea), that the majority of the surrounding land, and much of the land within the proposed settlement boundary lies within Flood Zone 3. As part of the supporting evidence for the plan the Council undertook a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. These assessments are designed to assist the Council in their choices for allocating development sites in sustainable locations, if possible away from flood zones.

The Council's by their allocation of sites in the flood zone (as detailed in the Housing Paper), which would have been based on the Strategic Flood Risk

It is possible that a developer will wish to develop this site at a lower density but that is unknown at present. It could be higher. The capacity of this site, and all sites not in the sub regional centres, has been estimated at 20dph in order to provide a guide on capacity. This is quite low already and is consistent with an historical rule of thumb of eight to the acre.

The site has two positive impacts in the Sustainability Appraisal, making it second equal with Sur004. It is well screened from the A16 and is a suitable extension to the area, in the same way Kingfisher Drive extended the village against Glen Gardens.

This has been registered as Sur020 in the SHLAA which identifies this site as undevelopable because it would have adverse environmental impacts.

Sur011

Conclusions on site Sur011 – It is considered that site Sur011 is a suitable Potential Housing Site in Surfleet and that it should be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site because:

- It is a well screened extension to this part of the village which is in character with its surroundings. The Sustainability Appraisal scores the site in equal second place.

Sur020

The site should not be taken forward as a Preferred Housing Site.

Assessment, acknowledge that they consider the requirements of the Sequential Test can be met. With regard to the Exception Test, this requires that in essence the flood risk can be managed for the lifetime of the development. The site would suffer from tidal inundation flooding therefore, the principle issues are, to design the site and houses to incorporate flood prevention measures. This can be achieved by methods such as raising the ground levels so that the floor level of the houses are above anticipated flood levels, ensuring adequate flood evacuation measures are in place. In this case the larger size of the site will work in its favour, by making any flood mitigation to meet the requirements of the Exception Test, easier and more viable to provide.

Again the Council's proposed allocations means they consider appropriate flood risk mitigation can in principle, be provided. The site has options for access from Gosberton Road or Station Road or a combination of both. In relation to potential traffic and transport issues discussions have been held with the Highway Authority in Lincolnshire County Council.

They had the following comments:- Visibility splays may require third party land on Station Road, whilst those required on Gosberton Road may have an adverse impact on the SSSI. There are no other highway constraints identified depending on the Transport Assessment. A S106/s278 in the form of sustainable measures, footway connections, local bus services etc. Would be required. The site is accessible to facilities and is adjacent to the existing built up area (defined settlement limit). Additional factors relevant to any development on this site, are the nearby Grade 1 Listed Church of St. Lawrence and the adjacent Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (Surfleet Lows). We consider that any development on the site can readily address

these factors, through appropriate design and layout. This will ensure there will be no undue impact on the setting of the listed church or generate any adverse impacts on the SSSI. The development would therefore comply with proposed Policy 25: The Natural Environment and Policy 26: The Historic Environment. A much larger development site was considered as part of the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (January 2016). The site allocation reference is Sur002. While this site was rejected primarily due to its size, the majority of the Council's assessment remains valid for this much smaller site. These are detailed below. It was acknowledged in this assessment that if this larger site was allocated, there is a reasonable prospect that it would be developed (assumed to begin in year 10, and be completed before year 25). We consider this assessment remains equally valid for this smaller site. As the smaller site proposed is in the single ownership of Lincolnshire County Council, this further increases the prospect of development. This assessment also raised no issues with potential impact on the listed church, though as the larger site included the SSSI, concerns were raised regarding adverse impact on the SSSI. This proposed site while adjacent to the SSSI does not include it. As advised an appropriately designed development would avoid, or mitigate any impacts on the SSSI. The assessment considered the larger site would not place undue burdens on existing infrastructure such as open space or green infrastructure, but owing to its size there could be potential impact on community facilities. The smaller site we are proposing would address the concern of impact on community facilities, as it would not result in a development greater than the stated need of 137 dwellings. This larger site was considered accessible to

facilities and was considered to be adjacent to the existing built up area (defined settlement limit). We consider this view still remains relevant for this proposed site. The assessment considered that services and facilities are potentially accessible by foot, bicycle or public transport. This situation remains unchanged. The development of the site could also provide a significant provision of affordable homes in accordance with the requirements of proposed Policy 15: Affordable Housing and developer contribution in accordance with proposed Policy 6: Developer Contributions. The site would also assist in providing a wide range of house types, to ensure compliance with proposed Policy 14: Providing a Mix of Housing of the Local Plan?

In conclusion we consider the site is compliant with National Policy and the aims of the emerging Draft Local Plan. The site has fewer constraints to bringing it forward as a development than a number of the allocation's proposed in the Local Plan. The substantial reduction in size of the site from that assessed, by the Council as Sur002, of the South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (January 2016), addresses the principle concerns raised by the Council, that the site was too large and would adversely impact the SSSI. It is a highly deliverable site with no ownership issues, financially viable, in a sustainable location and would have clear social and economic benefits to the village.

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

ID1: 1619 comment_author: Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

comment content:

There is an error on this map as Surfleet Lows Site of Special Scientific Interest has been incorrectly shown as National Nature Reserve.

Officer Comment:

This will be corrected

Officer Recommendation:

A small change is required to the mapping.
