

Post_title: **28: Whaplode**

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

ID1: 495 comment_author: D Brown Building

comment content:

Comments on Wha029 for paragraphs numbered:

3.1 don't forget that this is as we are coming out of a recession with poor bank lending to build and buy
3.2 11 of these permissions are to be constructed by D Brown building contractors over the next 18 months 4 houses and 7 bungalows. site currently on the market
3.3 wh029 is 33 dwellings already applied for on shdc planning no H23-0508-16 up until june earmarked as best site put forward site no 010 can only be accessed from 029

4.1 education at lcc has assessed it as requiring a 67 k education allowance all for uah holbeach £0 for primary and junior education

4.2 we have requested default levels which we will accept to remove their objection. We will also be working behind scenes to resolve tidal breach regs. Latest ea overegged river and reservoir flood scenarios are non existant. Drainage design for the site includes suds and run off at greenfield land run off rates shidb are happy with this hazard mapping has changed and the e a have advised default levels which will reduce the default levels. ea flood maps show whaplode river is not an issue but it will be proved as part of flood mapping

4.3 our ea surveys will provide this information which will have the overegged flood calculation criteria applied to it. Default floorslab heights from ea will mitigate this rob millbank advises that we will reduce this by carrying out the sequential tests. note south hollands sequential flood risk is a 2010 document that has been superceeded by ea requirements twice.

Officer Comment:

The planning application has been considered by the Planning Committee who authorised officers to grant permission, subject to a S106 obligation for a financial contribution towards education provision of £67,965 and 7 affordable houses.

Officer Recommendation:

It is considered Wha029 is a suitable housing site because it has been authorised, subject to a S106 obligation for a financial contribution towards education provision of £67,965 and 7 affordable houses.

4.4 sustainable urban drainage has been designed for the site at correct run off rates for greenfield to development scenario.

4.5 awa will not confirm this and we cannot address it until we have a planning approval our development is 33 and is already submitted when all other sites are not

4.6 a fee is payable to help them recover the cost of improving there `bourne ` asset improvement scheme again this will be covered via a formal quote after an approval

4.7 this is a nation wide issue turning doctors and dentists into businesses doesn't help as general practice is not that attractive . All planning applications would be better served by one council fund that could be used for affordable, education and medicinal. each housing development can only fund so much the cost of any of these items can be split whichever way you wish but not all can have a piece of that cake agree there is a shortage. government under funding for nurses etc major issue. doctors want to practice medicine not become business men !

5.2 has the same flood risk as 029

5.3 second best site further from the centre of the village same flood risk as 029. second best however the main rd still has to be crossed from north to south by children and adults to reach shops and services.

5.4 (1) cannot be linked together 029 already submitted cobgate has a traffic issue development further down cobgate than st marys gardens would be restricted the local councillor opposes any more than six dwellings of private driveways these four sites shouldn't be linked when being considered.

5.4(2) many of these issues have been addressed but wh009 is closest and therefore has a greater issue than the other four lfp have answered the many issues late

night movements , tractor storage etc.

5.5(1) ideally the developers of the site wanted this. Trying to get agreement delayed our planning application who10 can be accessed from 029 .who10 can have access for 6 houses of cobgate at the highways request. Wh010 cannot be accessed without 029

5.5(2) with all due respect this is an issue for shdc and lfp. The site has no restrictions because of its agricultural nature. Whilst shdc have an issue it is not a reason to turn down 029 land already submitted. In fact any association with 009 and 010 should be removed the site considered on its own and 009 removed creates a 105 metre gap "open space" between 029 and lfp works. lfp works have a bund between 029 and the works. lfp have ceased activity around the rear of their premises voluntarily even though there are no restrictions to the site 029 can have acoustic tests to prove the noise issued.

5.5(3) 090 will be the equivalent of on open space buffer for 029 most issues will have been voluntarily addressed. How many complaints are unresolved? this site is the third best rated 010

5.6 close proximity. Owner declined to commit to a land deal and seemed to indicate he would wish to have a fabrication shed on the land rather than housing agreed very close to lfp site.

5.7(1) very tight 019 has consistently objected construction down this rd 010 currently has no access from 029 although a full scheme has been created for this site by 029.

5.7(2) 029 only application prepared and submitted.

5.8(1) 002 and 029 have the same flood risk all of our submission for 029 was prepared before feb 19. 029 has accepted ea default floor levels and will prepare the sea breach tests which will (on the advice of rob

millbank at the ea) decrease these floor levels our flood list assessment was prepared on the advice available pre 19/02/2016 shdc sfrs 2010 and ea 2013 guidance. 029 submitted application is out of river and reservoir flood zones but these will also be proved by the flood plan prepared to address climate change. drainage has been prepared using suds and will cater for 090 and 010 should the owners wish to sell and noise concerns for both sites addressed.

5.8(2) vehicles have been relocated back to the main area of the business and sprayers are stored there and exit onto high rd after 6 am. this is an issue between shdc and lfp. Any noise issues can be constructed out on this site and it will have the buffer from 090 as an "open space".

5.8(3) as above.

5.8(4) we presume 010 is the site but if that is the case then 090 would buffer the sound and is also protected by a bund 10 ft high this site can only be accessed from 029 if 029 can be approved then access as per highways request can be achieved planning has been designed but not submitted shows six units of a private rd and the rest accessed from 029.

5.9 planning has been designed but not submitted shows six units of a private rd and the rest accessed from 029.

5.10 we believe that this site has been advised to take only ten units. there is a question over the creation of access to the site that would be acceptable to lincs highways. Sewer connection may also be an issue as 010 connected onto a main 3.6 metres deep. highways suggest no more than 6 !!!

5.10(1) 029 does not require access from cobgate. 010 has a scheme designed for 6 of cobgate and the remainder through 029 not these sites are not linked

5.11(10) flood analysis is still irrelevant without a feb

2016 ea flood risk appliant sea breach analysis being carried out . so ea default would be applied and the ea would oppose it until proved bungalow slab levels are 750 mm and houses 450mm above ground level.

5.12 excaepting the fact that traffic will be objected too and the numbers are forecast as max 42 units min 27 is this not too many ?? This site has already been advised that ten will be the maximum allowed by shdc.

5.13(1) these sites are not linked and should be assessed on each of the site merits 029 is the most suitable site

5.13(2) 029 has been submitted to planning and is not linked to the 090 and 010 sites . However a scheme has been designed for 010 that provides 6 houses from a private drive on cobgate and the remainder from high rd as per highways request.

5.14(1) all should be considered seperately 029 provides access to 010. 029 has infrascture on the advice of lcc that will drain sustainably all three sites if 029 is constructed 010 could then adjoin onto the site three sites cannot be considered together as 009 is too close too lfp and 010 cannot be accessed without 029 sustainable drainage has been addressed on 029 planning application 029 application has no properties coming from cobgate. We have a schem designed for 010 that has six off cobgate and the remainder to high rd as per linc highways request

5.14(2) 029 will have a 105 metre "open space buffer" from lfp. acoustic test will prove the level of sound attenuation required. Which can be constructed out . High rd traffic will help screen the rd noise . The noise issue is for shdc to address

it is shdc and lfp issue lfp have unrestricted use the proposed refusal of 009 will provide an open space buffer 105 metres away !!!

5.14(3) 029 is 105 metres from site it can have any

noise issues built out pre start acoustic test will disprove this theory and any noise can be addressed lfp is shdc issue the site is far enough away at the rear and designed to enable the frontage plots to screen the noise from the site acoustic report will provide information for issues to be designed out

5.14(4) BEST SCORE !! plan submitted using out of date sfra shdc 2010 and ea p flood analysis 2013. Default flood levels will be applied and a sea breach flood test scenario taken out to reduce the slab levels of the property ea default levels have been accepted so there are no flood issues on the site planning application has been submitted for 029 010 drainage is allowed within the site

5.15 absolutely ridiculous the best site is removed because of the noise issue from lfp. it is not this sites issue it is shdc and lfp. if this site is the best we can construct out any noise issues. Flood is not an issue because we have agreed to default floor slab levels which will be reduced when submit the sea breach analysis this site with a permission this site will be built out within 3 years and could provide access to 010. not a reason to exclude the site as mentioned this site has an application in and none of the issues from lfp will be unaddressable.

6 our assessment of this draft.

6.1 our understanding is that the site is in for planning and it will be developed april 2017 should a permission be granted. The concerns over lfp are addressable after an acoustic report is issued on the site this will cover high rd whaplode noise along with anything across the rear of the site from lfp. flood risk has to be approved and we will accept the default levels in the interim and provide a new flood risk that covers the current worst case scenario mapping . one of the current sites will

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

not achieve the envisaged amount that is stated. 029 site ,high rd whaplode provides further access to site allows access to 010 and has been designed with drainage suit this scenario. our build programme for our site 029 means that 010 would only be built in 2020 at the earliest if 029 was given a permission

ID1: 496 comment_author: Mr John Cooper

comment content:

The site known as Wha010 was previously deemed as achievable. With the following explanation.

'Good achievability. Values are relatively high, and opening-up infrastructure costs are likely to be relatively low. If it is allocated there is a reasonable prospect that it would be developed (assumed to begin in year 9, and be completed before year 15)'

When we had a meeting with highways regarding an access off Cob Gate we were informed that no major problems could be foreseen, provided that a new footpath would link back to Abbots Gardens. The current assertion that the site is not a suitable Potential Housing Site, we feel, is wrong and the land should be put forward as a Preferred Housing Site. How d s this site vary from Wha019, also off Cob Gate but with problems relating to visibility splays to any access between the existing dwellings and with potential overlooking of existing properties along Cob Gate.

Officer Comment:

1. There is no inconsistency between the Lincolnshire County Council comments in the July report, seeking a private drive off Cobgate and the majority of development off High Road, and the advice given at a meeting between them and Mr Cooper, referred to above. A footpath connection is appropriate. This site is one of three that fill in the edge of the village between High Road and Cob Gate from the employment site. They were all rejected as preferred sites owing to the potential impact of the employment site on them by noise, although one now has planning permission. There was a noise complaint being investigated by the Environmental Health Department at the time. Wha019 is within the settlement boundary and is different to this site owing to this site being outside the settlement boundary. It is also similar to Cobgate Close.

Officer Recommendation:

It is not considered that Wha010 is suitable owing to the potential for its residential amenity to be harmed by the nearby employment site. No evidence has been submitted to show that noise will not harm residential amenity and therefore it is considered the site should not be taken forward as a Housing Allocation.

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

ID1: 497 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment content:

Wha018/022, Land north of High Road, Whaplode

We have studied the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan - Public Consultation on Preferred sites for development (July 2016), and write to request reconsideration of the preferred housing sites for Whaplode, and to support the inclusion of the sites Wha 018/022, jointly, as being one of the preferred Housing sites in Whaplode.

It is understood that the sites are not being considered suitable as a Preferred housing site. However we note from the SHLAA, that it appears it is only the fact that the sites were being put forward individually and not jointly, that was the deciding factor in the sites being considered unsuitable for residential development.

We wish to ask for re-consideration of the suitability of the two sites, jointly as one site, and we re-iterate the benefits of the sites above others put forward:

1. The site is at the centre of the village.
2. The site completes a logical infill to the pattern of development that already exists for the village.
3. The access provided with combining the sites, meets Highways requirements for access onto High Road.
4. A footpath runs along the frontage of the site.
5. Defined and designed road crossing points are located adjacent to the site.
- 6.. The site is located within 50m of a main bus stop - route Spalding to Kings Lynn.

We do consider the amendment proposed to Policy 12 , which provides to decrease the allocation of new houses for Whaplode, to a level of 80, for the plan period 2011-2036, is a negative proposal. We

Officer Comment:

These two sites were not put forward as options in the January 2016 consultation. There were concerns about forming a suitable access on to the A151 without compromising the adjacent petrol station. It was also considered that encouraging further movements across the A151 was not appropriate. Although Wha002 is to the north of the A151 it is served from an existing road rather than creating a new one.

Officer Recommendation:

The objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Wra018/022 should not be taken forward as a Housing Allocation.

understand the driver for the proposed reduction is that there were too many large sites put forward which were potentially suitable, and it was preferred to reduce the allocation than have to increase it dramatically.

If it is agreed that sites Wha 018/022 are selected as 'Preferred housing sites, they would have a combined capacity of 57 dwellings at 20dph, this would provide for the total housing allocation for the village, together with sites WHA 002/019, close to the original proposed housing allocation of 150. This higher allocation will provide for the greater and more satisfactory level of growth for the village, which with its very good range of services and facilities, needs supporting by new housing for households and families.

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

ID1: 498 comment_author: Longstaffs

comment_content:

Wha021 - Land at Whaplode

We write on behalf of our above named clients. 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 Wha 021, as being one of the preferred Housing sites in Whaplode.

It is understood that the site is being considered suitable to be taken forward as a small Preferred Housing site for the village, with 5 dwellings stated as the capacity, being primarily infill development within the revised settlement development boundary. We agree and support these findings.

We fully support the allocation at this location, and being within close proximity of the village centre and services, is a logical and appropriate location for residential development.

Officer Comment:

1. The support is welcomed.

Officer Recommendation:

This site is a small infill plot that is not an allocated site owing to it containing fewer than 10 plots. It has been put inside the boundary owing to Wha002 being allocated.

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

ID1: 499 comment_author: Anglian Water

comment_content:

All of the proposed housing allocations in this area is expected to require improvements to the existing water supply and foul sewerage networks to enable development to come forward on these sites. Please refer to the enclosed spreadsheet for detailed comments relating to these sites.

Officer Comment:

The comments are noted and have been placed in the Housing Paper so developers and residents are aware of the issues.

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the approach is required.
