

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

**Post\_title:** 30: Wrangle

**ID1:** 504 **comment\_author:** Mr Andy Carrott

**comment\_content:**

The following comments refer to the Preferred Housing Sites. If the status of any of the other sites changes or any other sites are added please re-consult with the Board.

Wra013 - a Board maintained culverted watercourse exists on the east side of Tooley Lane and could accommodate an attenuated surface water discharge.

In all cases Board's consent is required to discharge surface water to a watercourse (private or Board maintained).

**Officer Comment:**

The comments are noted.

**Officer Recommendation:**

These comments do not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Wra013 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

**ID1:** 505 **comment\_author:** Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire

**comment\_content:**

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

Wra013: likely that this site 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.

**Officer Recommendation:**

These comments do not call into question the site's suitability for allocation. Consequently, it is considered that site Wra013 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 506 comment\_author: Mr Roy Dickinson

## comment content:

Land adjacent to Ferndale, Church Lane, Wrangle, Boston PE22 9ET

I object to the decision not to allow planning permission on the land adjacent to my current home. part of the field is in the current village envelope, but you have refused the other half and acre without any specific reason. There is a clear boundary and clear access, and mains sewerage is provided. We cannot farm as the garden is too small at 1/2 acre. I am 75 years old and it is too large to maintain as a garden. I cannot use any spray as the adjacent farmers are organic. I would like a building plot.

## Officer Comment:

The part of this site that is shown as being within the Settlement Boundary is that which has the appearance of a domestic curtilage. The remainder has a rural appearance, and hence is shown outside the Settlement Boundary.

The South East Lincolnshire Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (July 2016) (SHLAA) classifies site Wra007 as undevelopable, because its development would have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area – i.e. It would create ribbon development, which would significantly change the area's character, without delivering significant numbers of new dwellings, and would create pressure for the spread of further development north-eastwards along Green Gate, as it is not contained by a strong north-eastern boundary.

## Officer Recommendation:

The SHLAA classifies site Wra007 as being undevelopable, and consequently the site was not put forward as a Potential Housing Site in the January 2016 consultation, nor as a Preferred Housing Site in the July 2016 consultation. The above objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Wra007 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

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

ID1: 507 comment\_author: Theodore Christoforou

## comment content:

Wra011:

In relation to issue identified of potential poor entrance visibility via 18ft wide drive between Saywell & Chrisdan properties:

### Appeal Prerequisites:

When we were looking at this last year we were considering partnering with neighbours and doubling up land for a much larger development...

The appeal we want to make is based on just the East (Access point 3) and happy to consider access on basis of just a single dwelling and/or up to a max of 5 dwellings. Wanting to make change to entrance as required.

What we ask for is advise from Council & HA officer as to what would be required to make visibility satisfactory for 1 and/or up to 5 dwellings max.

In correspondence from the council we received you indicate that if we were to consider widening access point to the east of Saywell (3) it would be possible to overcome constraints. Well we are prepared to change or bring down part of the existing boundary as we own both the boundary in question and the drive. We are just seeking guidance as to what is best required to make the visibility satisfactory and remove any concerns.

Also I would like to ask the dept to look at same visibility issue of the development (53.031896,

## Officer Comment:

The SHLAA classifies site Wra011 as undevelopable, solely because a satisfactory vehicular access cannot be identified. The Highway Authority has identified that the access is possibly wide enough to provide access to a single new dwelling, but would need to be widened to provide access for more than 1 dwelling. [This information has been provided directly to Mr Christoforou.] No proposals have been put forward to demonstrate that the access could be successfully widened and consequently the site continues to be regarded as 'undevelopable'. Even if the access could be widened sufficiently to support the development of e.g. 5 dwellings, it would not become a candidate for identification as a Preferred Housing Site, given that the 'minimum size' for allocated housing sites in the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan is 10 dwellings. It is unclear which planning permission Mr Christoforou is referring to but highway standards vary depending upon the scale and nature of the proposed use and the nature of the highway.

## Officer Recommendation:

The SHLAA classifies site Wra011 as being undevelopable, and consequently the site was not put forward as a Potential Housing Site in the January 2016 consultation, nor as a Preferred Housing Site in the July 2016 consultation. The above objection does not raise any issues that suggest that the previous approach taken to this site was inappropriate. It is therefore considered that site Wra011 should not be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

0.112734 - [plan provided by email]) given the green light going on just further down the road opposite M Baker Produce PE22 9HT with similar aspect to roadside but with more potentially we feel a lot more danger as 40mph proximity to M Baker, the Pub, the Farm next door and the nearby cross-road junction and turning off to Old Main Road to Old Leake. Also A52 road appears just as straight at both locations with high side borders.

As owners of both Saywell and the drive that goes down to the field we fully expect that we can apply to change the boundary between Saywell and field drive that runs down the East side of Saywell. We feel this would easily allow us to create the visibility required and certainly make it equal to or better than other developments given green light with similar issues:

- a) Reduction or complete removal of some of the Leylandii that taper down towards roadside. Line of growth is not straight causing narrowing.
  - b) Reducing down front garden wall hedging growing at front of Saywell.
  - c) Optionally remove small wall corner to the front section so the width of the opening could be in fact a further 3m+ wider than it presently is.
  - d) There is no pavement on our side of the street so above changes can be made without impact and perhaps we could request a pavement after.
-

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

ID1: 508 comment\_author: APB Planning

comment content:

The indicated level of provision for Wrangle is supported (100 dwellings).

Although the revised draft Policy 2 advises 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', there is in reality little opportunity for such 'infill' development to be delivered of a scale that would satisfy the residual and strategic objectives of the policy without harm to character, environmental, highway or heritage interests. Indeed, the logic of the settlement boundary being able to deliver a further 7 units through windfall sites is considered to be inconsistent with National Planning Policy and it is considered that the Planning Authority must identify sites alone which will at least meet the residual requirement for allocation of houses in Wrangle (and other identified settlements appropriately). To achieve the policy objectives, either further allocations should be identified or the settlement boundary altered to enable an appropriate level of further growth. There is a residual requirement for 52 dwellings to be accommodated within the village in order to satisfy the stated policy aspiration.

However, that residual figure of 52 should not be seen as an absolute limit or 'cap' to further development. Indeed, there is justification and policy support through the NPPF to boost significantly the supply of housing and promote the presumption in favour of sustainable development by ensuring a realistic prospect of

Officer Comment:

The support is welcomed.

The Settlement Boundaries Background Paper (January 2016) identifies that areas of amenity open space or recreational open space (which would, by definition, have a 'village' rather than a 'countryside' character) should be included within Settlement Boundaries. Site Wra016 is not considered to be amenity open space or recreational open space – it is agricultural land – and hence is shown as being part of the Countryside. Nonetheless, the site has amenity value. The SHLAA identifies that the site's development would have adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the area by increasing the intensity of development to the west of Church End, which generally serves as a strong 'stop' to the village. The Settlement Boundary in this part of Wrangle follows discernible features on the ground (fences, hedges, drains, etc.) and the fact that the A52 is located to the west of site Wra016 does not demonstrate any sort of inconsistency.

It is not agreed that an additional housing allocation or changes to the Settlement Boundary are required. The Plan does not assume that an additional 7 dwellings will be provided in Wrangle through the development of windfall sites – the trajectory at the end of the Wrangle Housing Paper (July 2016) estimates that the Plan's provisions will result in the development of 93 dwellings over the Plan period (i.e. 7 less than the 'target' set out in Revised Policy 12). However, the identification of housing sites is not a 'exact science' and it is not realistic to expect that an exact match will be achieved between

Officer Recommendation:

No change to the Plan is required in response to these comments.

achieving the planned supply of housing by providing choice and competition in the market for land.

It is noted that Site Wra013 is a favoured site and would be capable of delivering 45 dwellings.

Notwithstanding any debate as to the sustainable credentials for that site, the proposed single allocation only for Wrangle, therefore not only restricts choice but would not deliver the residual supply identified as needed by the supporting evidence. The stated policy aspiration would not therefore be realised. There is consequently an essential need for reasons of soundness and good planning to identify further development opportunity in the village.

It is noted that the The Settlement Boundaries Background paper Jan 2016 confirmed that the intention for settlement boundaries was (amongst other things) to enclose 'areas of amenity and/or recreational open space, the appearance and character and/or use of which is worthy of protection. The SA report on site Wra016 advises that 'Development of the site would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area.' It is also suggested that the site has some 'amenity value' and it has consequently been 'scored' as 'likely to have a negative effect'. However, it is equally of note that the site is not included within the draft settlement boundary, nor identified as any form of protected green space; a situation which, by default, suggests that it is not an area of amenity, particularly sensitive or essential to safeguard settlement character. The alignment of the A52 to the sites western boundary further reinforces this inconsistency given that the Settlement Background Paper further acknowledges that 'in general, settlement boundaries have been defined using discernible features on the ground (e.g. a road-

the target and the provision in every settlement – a modest under or over-provision will not threaten the Plan's strategy nor the NPPF's desire to boost significantly the supply of housing. Furthermore, the capacity of the Preferred Housing Site Wra013 assumes that it will be developed at a density of 20 dwellings to the hectare. In practice, it is likely to be developed at a higher density and, should the density reach 23 dwellings to the hectare, site Wra013 would deliver 52 dwellings (the residual requirement).

It is not disputed that site Wra016 is available and achievable, nor that it could deliver open space, incorporate SuDS, and deliver a mix of housing. However, the SHLAA classifies this site as undevelopable, because it is unsuitable for development due to adverse environmental impacts (dealt with in the previous point) and because a safe vehicular access cannot be provided – the objector refers to a "safe access off Church End" but the site as submitted does not have a frontage onto Church End, and the Highway Authority considered that an additional junction onto the A52 would be undesirable. It is not agreed that site Wra016 would give better access and proximity to Wrangle's services and facilities than would site Wra013, because Wrangle's services are not concentrated in a single part of the village. Thus, whilst it is correct that Wra016 is located closer to the shop, church, public house and village hall, Wra013 is closer to the playing field, chapel, and primary school. This is reflected in the Sustainability Appraisal Report (July 2016) which gives sites Wra013 and Wra016 the same score (blue, ✓/x) in terms of sustainability objective 3, which is concerned with access to services. It is not accepted that the identification of a single Preferred Housing Site in Wrangle provides limited choice – the

line or drainage ditch)'. It is considered therefore that the sustainability and site assessment judgments are inconsistent with other evidence considered. The site should not be considered as having a level of amenity value that would be undermined by potential development. Indeed, it is entirely probable (and can be secured by establishment of site development principles or good practice development management considerations) that development would lead to environmental and character enhancement. That potential opportunity is effectively acknowledged in the Sustainability Appraisal whereby commentary advises 'The contribution, positive or negative, that the development could make to townscape would depend upon the quality of the design.'

In that respect and notwithstanding the size of the site promoted, Site Wra016 is an available and deliverable site that is eminently capable of being developed in a limited, contextual manner that would:

- deliver the residual need for housing in the village,
- provide safe access off Church End,
- provide for additional, needed open space (as recognised in the Sustainability Appraisal),
- safeguard and enhance the character of the area through careful design and landscaping
- incorporate SUDS
- deliver an appropriate mix of housing including affordable housing units (as appropriate).

Furthermore, site Wra016 is considered to be eminently more sustainable than the preferred site allocation, in terms of access and proximity to

Plan identifies a total of three locations for future housing growth (two Housing Commitments and one Preferred Housing Site).

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

significant local facilities and services in the village centre including the Post Office, Village Hall, Church and Public House.

As a consequence, it is considered that either, Site Wra016 should be considered as a further allocation, or the village settlement boundary should be redefined to include site Wra016 and enable delivery of an appropriate level of sustainable windfall development.

---

ID1:	509	comment_author:	Anglian Water
------	-----	-----------------	---------------

comment_content:	Officer Comment:	Officer Recommendation:
------------------	------------------	-------------------------

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

The comments are noted, and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will accompany the Local Plan will need to identify when and how the necessary enhancements to the water supply and foul sewerage networks will take place.

It is not considered that this comment calls into question the suitability of Wrangle's 'Preferred Housing Site'. Consequently, it is considered that site Wra013 should be taken forward as a 'Housing Allocation'.

---