

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

**Post\_title:** 09: Sutterton

**ID1:** 183

**comment\_author:** Longstaffs

**comment\_content:**

We have studied the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Public Consultation on Preferred sites for development (July 2016), and would like to support the inclusion of the site Sut 009 (encompassing sites Sut 010/011), as being one of the preferred sites in Sutterton. It is close to the centre of the village, and provides to form an enclosure of development of the village in this location. It is agreed that the site offers the opportunity for a comprehensive and masterplanned scheme, that may be able to better address local infrastructure shortfalls more effectively than could a series of smaller, individual sites. It is agreed that careful consideration of the layout and form of development will be have to given. Overall, on behalf of our clients, we very much support the identification of site Sut 009, as a 'Preferred housing site' on the SELLP Inset Map for Sutterton.

**Officer Comment:**

The support is welcomed.

**Officer Recommendation:**

It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 184 comment\_author: Debbie Blackman

## comment content:

New developments are welcome in Sutterton as it allows the village to keep growing and improving BUT flooding of green land and older lower properties in the village needs considering when building new houses - not just the land the new houses will be on (or building them higher so they don't flood) but their impact on existing drainage flows. The school must be expanded (the dog-leg land from the playing field could be donated to the school field). A new independent village hall should be built (on the green land adjacent to the school and Park Road, which would enable the school to expand on its current site and the new village hall would then be accessible throughout the daytime rather than just after 5 pm during the week and weekends. The hall could have a mother and toddler group, computers to aid access for vulnerable people and groups to prevent loneliness for the elderly and those in isolation. The current changing rooms on the playing field need demolishing and new bigger ones built. This would be beneficial to Boston United's youth teams who are using the playing field more. The current play park needs updating, drainage improved and any new s108 monies need to go into developing play areas and the school. Bus links needs improving so buses cone into the village later in the day. Houses cannot just be built without amenities being expanded and updated to accommodate the increase of people the developments bring. Houses bring people who need the doctors, who need recreational space, children need educating, people need work, water, waste water, surface water needs etc

## Officer Comment:

The development of the 'Preferred Housing Site' would need to incorporate sustainable drainage systems which would replicate natural systems (by collecting and storing surface water before slowly releasing it back into the environment) and prevent surface water impacting on neighbouring land. Thus, it is considered that new development can take place without creating or exacerbating surface water flooding issues. The County Education Department confirms that there is no capacity currently available at Sutterton Primary School and that extension to 1Form Entry will be required to accommodate current demand and that from proposed development (including 3 additional classrooms). The County Education Department indicates that the school has sufficient land to accommodate this expansion, although it estimates the cost of the expansion to be £2,505,693. Issues concerning a new village hall, improvements to the village play area, a new changing room, enhanced bus services, etc. can be considered at the time of a planning application. However, it is highly unlikely that the development of approximately 240 dwellings would realistically be capable making contributions that would ensure the delivery of such a wide range of infrastructure enhancements.

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that this comment justifies a change to Sutterton's housing requirements, and consequently it is considered that the Local Plan should continue to seek to identify housing allocations in Sutterton to provide for 300 dwellings between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2036.

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

ID1: 185 comment\_author: Mr Karl Vines

## comment content:

I find it very disappointing that views on lack of sufficient infrastructure to cater for the proposed development have not been taken in to account.

### Education

The Primary School is full to capacity, and already operates a waiting list. There is no room for expansion of the school site without loss of outdoor learning space which would be detrimental to those already using the school and go against the learning objectives of the new curriculum.

### Doctors

The Doctor's Surgery is already nearing capacity despite having only recently been enlarged. It is a well documented fact that this area has trouble recruiting Doctors and the Surgery is already having to operate a triage service to serve the patients already registered there. Financial contributions will not solve these educational and health issues.

### Drainage

Anglian Water have commented that the surface water network has major constraints and are advocating the use of SuDS to reduce the impact of additional flows on the drainage network. SuDS will only work if they are maintained. Who will take on the maintenance of these SuDS systems to ensure they will continue to address flooding issues in to the future? Anglian Water certainly are reluctant to at the moment, and private management companies are not the way forward. Without appropriate maintenance SuDS systems are not an effective solution to drainage issues unless the

## Officer Comment:

Sixty-one of the proposed three-hundred dwellings have either already been built or are committed in planning permissions, and the impacts of these dwellings on local infrastructure will already have been taken into account by the relevant infrastructure providers. However, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany the Local Plan will need to identify when and how the necessary improvements to the local infrastructure will take place to accommodate the additional demands that will be create by the development of the remaining 239 dwellings. Furthermore, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment will need to consider what scale of contribution the 'Preferred Housing Site' would be able to make towards these improvements. In more detail:

- The County Education Department confirms that there is no capacity currently available at Sutterton Primary School and that extension to 1Form Entry will be required to accommodate current demand and that from proposed development (including 3 additional classrooms). The County Education Department indicates that the school has sufficient land to accommodate this expansion, although it estimates the cost of the expansion to be £2,505,693;
- No specific local information concerning Sutterton Surgery has been provided, but the CCG suggests that currently there is some capacity to accommodate additional patients. However, it acknowledges that County-wide there is an increasing shortage of GPs, nurses and other healthcare staff which could affect future capacity should demand increase; and
- Anglian Water Services has indeed identified that the capacity of the local surface water network has major

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments concerning impacts on infrastructure justify a change to Sutterton's housing requirements, and consequently it is considered that the Local Plan should continue to seek to identify housing allocations in Sutterton to provide for 300 dwellings between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2036.

Sut009 - It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Sites Sut005, Sut007, Sut026 and Sut032 - No changes to the Plan are necessary in reponse to these comments.

Development Boundary - No changes to the Plan are necessary in reponse to these comments.

future maintenance is secured by their adoption by an appropriate authority. Justifying the level of flood protection by quoting fluvial and tidal levels does not take account of the issues resulting from surface water flooding, which is just as an important mode of flooding in the Fens.

I support the selection of site Sut009 as a Preferred Housing Site. I agree that the site offers the opportunity for a comprehensive and master planned scheme that may be able to better address local infrastructure shortfalls more effectively than would a series of smaller individual sites.

I fully support the decision that sites Sut005, Sut007, Sut026, and Sut032 have not been included as Preferred Housing Sites. I support the objections previously made by residents in relation to these sites.

#### Sutterton Development boundary

As the housing requirement in this plan covers the next 25 year period, I feel that it is important that the currently proposed village development boundary remains fixed for the same period. This will give residents of the village some assurance as to where the village is going, what development will take place, and where in the village it will happen. I cannot see how continually reviewing and changing the development boundary can be a good thing for long term planning and stability of the village, and therefore such changes should be resisted.

constraints, and that sustainable drainage systems would therefore need to be incorporated into new developments. The objector is correct that such systems will require on-going maintenance, and this will be ensured through the development control process. The Local Plan has taken account of tidal, fluvial and surface water flood risks.

Site Sut009 - The support is welcomed.

Sites Sut005, Sut007, Sut026 and Sut032 - The support is welcomed.

Development Boundary - The comments are noted.

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

ID1:

186

comment\_author:

Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire

comment\_content:

I have no objections to the proposals put forward on archaeological grounds.

Sut009/028 & proposed employment area: likely that these would require archaeological intervention/survey prior to a planning application being submitted, in line with the NPPF.

This advice is subject to change depending on the level of information available (for example, new information may come to light).

Officer Comment:

The comments are noted.

SU001 has full planning permission; all necessary surveys would have been considered prior to permission being granted.

Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut009/Sut028 - These comments do not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. It is therefore considered that site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

SU001 Enterprise Park is one of the more suitable employment sites in Boston Borough and should be taken forward as a Preferred Option Main Employment Allocation.

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

ID1: 187 comment\_author: John Samuel Maltby

## comment content:

### SUTTERTON VILLAGE

GENERAL - 4.1 Education - your comments make light of the problem of the now (7 year) anticipated intake at the local school. It is full. "But that it may be possible to expand" Where, without building on scarce land around the school? 4.2 Flooding - again, the comments make light of the problem highlighted. point 4.3 makes the point in question 4.4. on sewage is similar. 4.3 Health- your comment that there is some capacity at the local G.P. There is, max 200, but with Kirton being full and 150 houses being built next door, Sutterton is the next stop and assuming the norm of 2 adults and 2.5 children we are currently facing a problem - along with the known difficulties of finding doctors! We also need to take into cognisance the houses already being built in the village.

SITES Sut005, Sut026, Sut007 - all cover the same points! Severe flood risks, vehicular access/visibility. Sut007 encourages building on 005/026 which increases potential dangers as above, plus noise, light and vehicle activity on open countryside. 5.14/3 concerns me in particular because it has not taken in consideration of the neighbours concerns raised at the dismissed appeal and "the application had the support of the local planning officer". The only two comments in favour of the site are from the two people who have pecuniary benefit associated with this plan. 5.15 confirms yet again the flooding issues - "major constraints". 5.16 last paragraph "exposed to more severe flood risk" Following the appeal to the Inspectorate, the comment he raised as to the water being a civil matter, should the plan be raised again, then civil action will be

## Officer Comment:

Infrastructure Impacts - Sixty-one of the proposed three-hundred dwellings have either already been built or are committed in planning permissions, and the impacts of these dwellings on local infrastructure will already have been taken into account by the relevant infrastructure providers. However, the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany the Local Plan will need to identify when and how the necessary improvements to the local infrastructure will take place to accommodate the additional demands that will be created by the development of the remaining 239 dwellings. Furthermore, the Whole Plan Viability Assessment will need to consider what scale of contribution the 'Preferred Housing Site' would be able to make towards these improvements. In more detail:

- The County Education Department confirms that there is no capacity currently available at Sutterton Primary School and that extension to 1Form Entry will be required to accommodate current demand and that from proposed development (including 3 additional classrooms). The County Education Department indicates that the school has sufficient land to accommodate this expansion, although it estimates the cost of the expansion to be £2,505,693;
- Anglian Water Services has indeed identified that the capacity of the local surface water network has major constraints, and that sustainable drainage systems would therefore need to be incorporated into new developments. Enhancements to the capacity of the existing foul sewerage network will be required to accommodate the development of the 'Preferred Housing Site', and enhancements to the capacity of the Water Recycling Centre may also be required; and

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments concerning impacts on infrastructure justify a change to Sutterton's housing requirements, and consequently it is considered that the Local Plan should continue to seek to identify housing allocations in Sutterton to provide for 300 dwellings between 1st April 2011 and 31st March 2036.

Sites Sut005, Sut026, Sut007 - No changes to the Plan are necessary in response to these comments.

taken/considered.

- No specific local information concerning Sutterton Surgery has been provided, but the CCG suggests that currently there is some capacity to accommodate additional patients. However, it acknowledges that County-wide there is an increasing shortage of GPs, nurses and other healthcare staff which could affect future capacity should demand increase.

Sites Sut005, Sut026, Sut007 - These sites were not taken forward as 'Preferred Housing Sites'.

---

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

ID1: 188 comment\_author: Brown & Co

## comment content:

I act on behalf of the owners of sites SU27 and SU29 which were previously shown as potential housing sites in the last draft local plan consultation. I should clarify that the owners are the same for both sites and they also own the land between the two sites. On behalf of my clients I had put forward both sites as potential housing sites for your consideration and at the same time commented that the land between the two sites could also be made available for this purpose if you so wished.

My client has visited your presentation at Sutterton recently and spoken to one of your representatives. We have noted that in the latest draft plan that you have removed sites SU27 and SU29 as a potential housing sites and have allocated Site SU009, SU011 and SU028 as your preferred housing site for the development of the required number of houses in Sutterton until 2036.

☐  
On your invitation we would like to make comment on your choice and put forward our strong suggestion that you should reconsider sites SU27 and SU29 as your preferred housing site and include the land between them in order to assist the Council in achieving its housing needs for Sutterton.

I make the following comments:

1. Site SU009 is quite clearly situated between two, not insignificant, established commercial/industrial areas of activity. Development of site SU009, with residential

## Officer Comment:

Site Sut009 - ☐ is acknowledged that the site directly abuts a number of employment uses both to its north and east, and that these uses may potentially impact upon the amenities that would be enjoyed by any new dwellings on the site – the Borough Council’s Environmental Health Officer has commented that residential development close to the industrial uses should be avoided, and that a detailed noise assessment would be required to determine how far away houses would need to be and or how tall any earth embankments would need to be to provide adequate screening. However, the site is large in size, and it is considered that a residential layout could be designed that provides adequate separation between new dwellings and the employment uses, and/or incorporates other mitigation measures to prevent nuisance. The Parish Council has identified that it would like to see the part of site Sut009 immediately to the existing cemetery’s north used as an extension to the cemetery, and such provision might potentially be sought as part of a comprehensive and master-planned development of the site.

Site Sut033 (Sut027 and Sut029 and the land between) - ☐  
The SHLAA concludes that site Sut033 is undevelopable because its impacts upon the character and appearance of the area would not be acceptable - it is a visually exposed site and whilst its impacts from the north would be acceptable, from the south its impacts would be considerable, extending the village's built-up area more than 200m westwards into the countryside. In contrast, the impacts of site Sut009/Sut028 are considered to be acceptable - it would consolidate

## Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut009 - It is not considered that the comments call into question the site’s suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a ‘Housing Allocation’.

Site Sut033 (Sut027 and Sut029 and the land between) - The SHLAA classifies site Sut033 as being undevelopable. This objection does not raise any issues that suggest that this assessment is inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Sut033 should not be taken forward as a ‘Housing Allocation’.



development, is obviously not going to fit comfortably with these established uses already on the ground. There is no doubt that a development of the use and density suggested is going to conflict with the existing commercial businesses and marketability of the residential units could be significantly reduced. SU011 is clearly the obvious cemetery extension for the village and the proposed use of this field should be reserved for this purpose.

2. Sites SU027 and SU029 and the land between would be a far more sensible location for the Council's allocation for residential development for the following reasons:

- a. The sites have suitable access opportunities off both Wigtoft Road and Spalding Road to the potential development. This is already acknowledged by the Highway Authority.
- b. The sites received relatively few objections and none of those objections raised issues that affect the potential suitability of the site for allocation.
- c. The situation of the site is such that connection to the sewage works could be made without the crossing of main roads unlike it is envisaged will be necessary to Site SU009. Generally the location of the proposed site would lead to the actual development of the site having less impact on the village and being less inconvenient to the existing residents during the periods of construction being slightly off centre from the centre of the village.
- d. Site SU029 has a crystallised commercial planning consent. We suspect many residents would prefer to

(rather than extend) the village's built-up area, & would have limited visual impacts because few public views are available. Views from the west would be those that would be subject to the greatest change, but even these are already dominated by the employment buildings off Endeavour Way & Love Lane. Whilst the SHLAA concludes that site Sut027 is developable, the Housing Paper – Sutterton (July 2016) considers it to be inferior to site Sut009/Sut028 because it would have more significant adverse impacts upon the area's character and because it is exposed to more severe flood hazard than Sut009/Sut028. Whilst the SHLAA concludes that site Sut029 is developable, the Housing Paper – Sutterton (July 2016) considers it to be inferior to site Sut009/Sut028 because it has a poorer Sustainability Appraisal score and is exposed to more severe flood risk than Sut009/Sut028. The South East Lincolnshire Employment Premises and Land Review (October 2012) and the Employment Land Technical Paper (January 2016) considered the need for industrial land in Sutterton over the Local Plan period, and concluded that allocations at Endeavour Way, Spalding Road and Love Lane would be sufficient to meet the village's needs. It is not considered that any of the arguments put forward by the objector outweigh these issues.

see this site developed for residential use rather than commercial use in the future with the associated amenity benefits it would bring to this part of the village.

e. Whilst there is a very small scale existing commercial activity to the south of site SU029 this would not impinge on enjoyment of the residential use of the adjoining proposed development.

f. Allocation of this site for houses would enable expansion of the established commercial areas in the village ie on SU009 without conflict with residential areas. This would provide employment for the new inhabitants in Sutterton.

g. Allocation of residential development on Sites SU027 and SU029 could include the allotments gardens to the west of SU027 which have not been cultivated for some time and have become somewhat dilapidated.

On balance I therefore believe we have put forward a number of sensible reasons, so further consideration should take place as to where the council should opt to locate their preferred housing site in the final version, for examination by the planning inspector in due course. We would therefore ask you to reconsider your current allocation. We believe that taking into account the location of existing uses in the village, when deciding this residential allocation, will provide many more opportunities for more sustainable development in the village.

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

ID1: 189 comment\_author: Lincolnshire County Council

## comment content:

Sut026, Sut032, Sut005 and Sut007

The County Council own Sut026 and Sut032. Sut026 could be developed along with Sut032, Sut0058 and Sut007 for a comprehensive development. This would allow for halving the allocation of Sut009 ensuring that multiple developments could exist and increasing competition - ensuring delivery of some dwellings should one land owner not wish to progress during the plan period. The pond and woodland in Sut026 could be protected with access to the site being provided to the west of the pond although this would need to be assessed fully. This more balanced approach along with a smaller allocation on Sut009 would increase competition and go further in ensuring deliverability of housing in Sutterton.

## Officer Comment:

Sites Sut005, Sut007, Sut026 and Sut032 - These sites could indeed be developed together to deliver a single comprehensive scheme. However, the Housing Paper – Sutterton (July 2016) identified that these sites:

- Are exposed to more severe flood risk than the 'Preferred Housing Site' Sut009/Sut028; and/or
- Received a poorer Sustainability Appraisal score than the 'Preferred Housing Site' Sut009/Sut028.

Site Sut009 - It is acknowledged that this is a development site on a scale that is unprecedented for Sutterton, but it offers the opportunity for a comprehensive and master-planned scheme that may be able to better address local infrastructure shortfalls more effectively than could a series of smaller, individual sites. It is also acknowledged that, if unforeseen problems occurred with the site's delivery, there would be a danger that housing needs in Sutterton would not be met. However, the site's landowners have indicated that they intend to release the land for development between 2016 and 2021 and, should development not begin in a timely fashion, the site could be de-allocated and replaced with alternative allocations as part of a review of the Local Plan

## Officer Recommendation:

Sites Sut005, Sut007, Sut026 and Sut032 - The SHLAA classifies these sites as being developable, and consequently Sut005, Sut007 and Sut026 were put forward as 'Potential Housing Sites' in the January 2016 consultation (site Sut032 was submitted after this date). However, they were not considered to be among the best potential sites in Sutterton, and consequently they were not put forward as 'Preferred Housing Sites' in the July 2016 consultation. This objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to these sites was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that sites Sut005, Sut007, Sut026 and Sut032 should not be taken forward as 'Housing Allocations'.

Site Sut009 - It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 190 comment\_author: Environment Agency

comment\_content:

Based on the information the Environment Agency holds regarding discharge flows and permitted headroom at the Waste Water Recycling Centre serving this settlement, we would advise you to consult with Anglian Water Services regarding capacity to accommodate effluent from the number of dwellings to be allocated.  
Phasing of development to ensure that adequate capacity is available to deal with foul water drainage before new dwellings are occupied may be required in order to avoid environmental harm.

Officer Comment:

Anglian Water Services Ltd. has indicated that the Water Recycling Centre has capacity to serve the proposed growth.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the Plan is required.

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

ID1: 191 comment\_author: Dan Sullivan

## comment content:

With particular reference to the housing sites for Sutterton, I find it disappointing to see that virtually all sites have been excluded in favour of one large site.

I do not believe that this is a robust strategy to provide the number of houses required for the settlement, as it could turn that parcel of land into a ransom strip on the part of the landowner, knowing that it is there or no where. What happens should the landowner decide not to sell / develop ?

It also favours national housebuilders thus taking valuable finances out of the area.

A number of smaller sites would be more likely to deliver the number of houses required and keep valuable finances and employment opportunity locally.

It does rather appear that this is a way of pacifying the more vocal NIMBY brigade as those that generally are against something shout more loudly than those in favour, rather than looking for a more natural and even expansion of the village in all directions.

## Officer Comment:

¶ unforeseen problems were to occur with the site's delivery, it is acknowledged that there would be a danger that housing needs in Sutterton would not be met. However, the site's landowners have indicated that they intend to release the land for development between 2016 and 2021 and, should development not begin in a timely fashion, the site could be de-allocated and replaced with alternative allocations as part of a review of the Local Plan. Although it is in a single ownership, the site offers the potential to be subdivided into two or three smaller parcels with separate vehicular accesses;

## Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that these comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 192 comment\_author: The Lindum Group

## comment content:

The Lindum Group believe that land to the south of the A17 on Sutterton Roundabout should be removed from the 'Countryside' designation currently identified in the emerging South East Lincolnshire Plan and allocated for Mixed Use Development. The roughly 7.5 acre site is identified on the attached location plan with the Lindum Group having a long term option on the site.

We consider the site to be suitable for commercial development including a Truck Stop with associated Petrol Filling Station and Food Retailing Building. The sites position directly adjacent to both the A16 and A17 roadways makes it the ideal location for the proposed use with significant levels of traffic passing the site. The site is currently underused agricultural land and before the option agreement was established the site was for sale on the open market as a commercial development opportunity. End users for all three elements of the proposed uses are in place helping to demonstrate the deliverability of our proposals. A proposed layout plan for the scheme is attached [layout plan provided by email] to help demonstrate the nature of the scheme.

This is not the first time that the site has been promoted for commercial use. Outline Planning Consent for a Petrol Filling Station, Roadside Restaurant and 41 Bed Motel was granted in August 2004 (Planning Reference B/04/0092). Whilst we accept this permission was granted under old policy guidance, we consider it important to note that the site has previously been deemed suitable for commercial development by Boston Borough Council.

## Officer Comment:

The preferred employment sites include sites that could be allocated for B1, B2 or B8 uses, as their primary use. A truck stop is sui generis; therefore it should not be identified as an employment allocation. The Local Highways Authority acknowledges that discussions have taken place with the promoters about a truckstop/fast food/petrol filling station development at the A16/A17 junction south of Sutterton. This is considered to be a suitable site provided all access is left-turn only off the A17 frontage and all egress is left-turn only onto the A16 with a solid central reservation to prevent un-authorised right-turn manoeuvres. Roadside services as such facilities offer the travelling public opportunity to take a break in their journey for rest and/or refreshment with the obvious benefits to safety. Truckstops offer not only the same sort of facilities for HGV drivers but also the opportunities for over-night stops in a secure location with a secondary benefit of not occupying space in roadside lay-bys that might be needed for un-scheduled stops. Truckstops can also offer facilities for internet connection and information points to provide drivers who may not be familiar with the area with location details of local businesses. A flexible policy framework within Policy 7 and Policy 20 will ensure that a proposal such as for those uses described could be assessed fully.

## Officer Recommendation:

No change required.

Pre-Application advice from the Borough Council was sought in May 2015, with a formal response received from Paul Edwards on the 30th July 2015 (full pre-app response attached [provided by email]). The response noted that 'the proximity of other roadside uses, the agricultural complex close to the site to the south west and the potential support from policy ED10 for elements of the use would certainly make this proposal worthy of an application'. This pre-application response clearly supports our view that the site is suitable for commercial development. We consider the nature of the surrounding land uses to have a urbanising nature on the roundabout on which the site is located, and do not consider the site and adjacent land to be typical of the open countryside designation in which it is currently included. This position is reflected in the pre-application response.

There is a real and identifiable need for the proposed development in this location. The principle element of our proposed scheme is the Truck Stop, with the only other facility of this nature some 15 kilometres along the A17 to the west of the site. After passing this Truck Stop at Fleet Hargate there is not another similar opportunity for truck services until past Sleaford, highlighting a genuine need for truck stop provision in this location. A truck stop provides a safe and secure rest location for truckers that is not provided by a layby and would provide a real benefit to truck users on the A17. At present when travelling along the A17 in this area a number of truck drivers can be seen to be using minor roads leading off the A17 for rest stops and parking, this is obviously not an ideal situation in terms of road safety and security for truck drivers. This position has been noted in informal discussions with the County Council Highways Department who

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

recognise the potential benefits of the development. Further to this on-going discussions with the County Council have highlighted their support for the regeneration potential of the roundabout.

Formal pre-application feedback has also been provided by the County Council in terms of the details of the proposed development. They have specified no objection to the proposed access into the site from the A17 and the exit onto the A16 with an indication that the scheme is generally acceptable to them.

As clearly demonstrated above, the land to the south of the A17 on Sutterton Roundabout should be removed from the 'Countryside' designation and allocated as a commercial development site. Not only is the site suitable and deliverable for commercial development but such a development would bring real and identifiable benefits both in terms of economic benefits and improvements to highway safety. These points have clearly been recognised in both a formal pre-application response from the Borough Council and informal discussions with the County Council.

---

ID1:	193	comment_author:	Anglian Water
comment content:	All of the proposed housing allocations in this area are expected to require improvements to the existing foul sewerage networks to enable development to come forward on these sites. Please refer to the enclosed spreadsheet [received via email] for detailed comments relating to these sites.	Officer Comment:	The comments are noted, and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany the Local Plan will need to identify how and when the necessary enhancements to the foul sewerage network will take place.
Officer Recommendation:		It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that Site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.	

---



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

ID1: 194 comment\_author: David Craven

## comment content:

I would first like to declare my interest as being 1/4 shareholder of the field to the west of the village between the Wigtoft Road and the Spalding Road that has been considered for housing recently. Trying my hardest to put this aside and think of the best solution for the village that I live in and with only the simple facts that are available to me I think the following should be considered.

The field I am referring to has or has had potential for industrial development, the village have objected strongly to this happening. I think this should move over to the area that is now proposed for housing to keep all the industrial development together. We need this development over time to provide jobs for the inevitable increase in population.

The small industrial units already established in our field could be removed and re-established in the new estate leaving our field available for a clean start.

The main roads at the top and bottom of our field offer excellent access especially if the unused allotment field was added to the plan. I do not know the owner of the allotment field but do not think it should not be considered simply because it did not apply.

There is a large underground water pipe running diagonally through our field but I don't think this should be a problem as there needs to be some open space and recreational area.

Our village needs to be large enough to attract a small super market and to give someone the confidence to open a public house both of which we are lacking at the moment.

I know this will not be the view of our Parish Council but it is mine.

## Officer Comment:

Site Sut009/Sut028 - The South East Lincolnshire Employment Premises and Land Review (October 2012) and the Employment Land Technical Paper (January 2016) considered the need for industrial land in Sutterton over the Local Plan period, and concluded that allocations at Endeavour Way, Spalding Road and Love Lane would be sufficient to meet the village's needs.

Site Sut033 - The South East Lincolnshire Employment Premises and Land Review (October 2012) and the Employment Land Technical Paper (January 2016) considered the need for industrial land in Sutterton over the Local Plan period, and concluded that allocations at Endeavour Way, Spalding Road and Love Lane would be sufficient to meet the village's needs. The SHLAA concludes that site Sut033 is undevelopable because its impacts upon the character and appearance of the area would not be acceptable - it is a visually exposed site and whilst its impacts from the north would be acceptable, from the south its impacts would be considerable, extending the village's built-up area more than 200m westwards into the countryside. In contrast, the impacts of site Sut009/Sut028 are considered to be acceptable - it would consolidate (rather than extend) the built-up area, & would have limited visual impacts because few public views are available. Views from the west would be those that would be subject to the greatest change, but even these are already dominated by the employment buildings off Endeavour Way & Love Lane. Whilst the SHLAA concludes that site Sut027 is developable, the Housing Paper – Sutterton (July 2016) considers it to be inferior to site Sut009/Sut028 because it would have more significant adverse impacts upon the

## Officer Recommendation:

Site Sut009/Sut028 - It is not considered that the comments call into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

Sut033 - The SHLAA classifies site Sut033 as being undevelopable. This objection does not raise any issues that suggest that this assessment is inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Sut033 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

area's character and because it is exposed to more severe flood hazard than Sut009/Sut028. Whilst the SHLAA concludes that site Sut029 is developable, the Housing Paper – Sutterton (July 2016) considers it to be inferior to site Sut009/Sut028 because it has a poorer Sustainability Appraisal score and is exposed to more severe flood risk than Sut009/Sut028. It is not considered that any of the arguments put forward by the objector outweigh these issues

ID1:	195	comment_author:	Sutterton Parish Council
comment_content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:	
<p>Sutterton Parish Council would like to repeat their objections from February 18th 2016, I attach a copy for you information [copy provided by email], to this they add</p> <p>An extension to Sutterton Cemetery is likely to be required in 20/30 years, and firm plans for its provision will therefore need to be set out during the Plan period. The most logical area of land to accommodate this extension is that part of Sut009 immediately to the cemetery's north.</p>	<p>Noted. These comments have already been considered.</p> <p>Such provision might potentially be sought as part of a comprehensive and master-planned development of the site.</p>	<p>No change to the Plan is required.</p> <p>It is not considered that this comment calls into question the site's suitability. Consequently, it is considered that site Sut009/Sut028 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.</p>	