

Post Title: 56: Lutton

Response Number: 233 **Respondent Number:** 2781 **Comment Author:** Mr E Atkinson **Client:** **Web Link:**

Paragraph Number: **Table/Figure:** **Comment Content:** **Officer Comment:** **Officer Recommendation:**

Policy Number: **Map Number:** 56 **Site Allocation Number:**

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

- Legally Compliant
- Sound
- Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

Including even more housing in and around Lutton, already inundated with housing none of which in the last 40 years fits the criteria of any local plan is just disgusting, add to this Lutton contains some of the most contaminated land in the county with more than 20 filled pits, subsoil watercourses and filed drains all of which the Council has allowed development on, The Council are in denial regarding the pits and other problems, but at one time sold photographs of them, the instances of reproductive system cancers within the village was assessed by Doctors and the local vicar at greater than thirty, hardly a surprise when the sold photos showed banned farm chemicals had been dumped in the pits. OS maps also provided by the Council, clearly show the locations of these pits. (now not included in submitted plans!) The number of properties built directly over the pits is around 11, in contravention of building and health regulations and over watercourses and drains, many more, the cost if and when it is revealed could be high as folk come to realise that their home is now worthless, the disregard of the public health and wellbeing has been referred to the environment agency and government who are mulling it over, around the latest property H12/0048//16 there are two pits close by + two on adjacent land (Ropers Gate) a subsoil water course runs under the property, from an area of subsidence which formed a large groundwater pond, drained by the owner, but the drain no longer functions, this can be proven by the photos, with the freeboard at 300mm it is next to a cemetery where the dead are buried at 1.8meters adding to the contamination include in all this that the proposed property is outside the local plan and the boundary of development tells its own story, especially when there have been three refusals on the same site, including one by the planning inspector, one of two recent sites refused then allowed by an unknown individual.

The Policy supports the Objector's concerns as it does not promote housing within the settlement other than that which can take place as infill and overcome the sort of concerns the Objector identifies (e.g. contaminated land).

No change to the Local Plan is required.

Post Title: 67: Weston Hills

Response Number: 339 Respondent Number: 935 Comment Author: Longstaff Client: R S Earl Web Link:

Paragraph Number: Table/Figure: Comment Content: Officer Comment: Officer Recommendation:

Policy Number: 2 Map Number: 67
 Site Allocation Number: Wsn 028

Do you consider that this part of the Local Plan is

- Legally Compliant
- Sound
- Prepared in accordance with Duty to Cooperate

Do you consider that the Local Plan is unsound because it is not:

- Positively Prepared
- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

Compliant, Sound, Duty to Cooperate explanation:

Proposed changes to make compliant or sound:

Participate in Examination:

Why wish to participate

We ask that a revision is made to the proposed settlement boundary to include the said frontage area on Austendyke near to Delgate Bank that was included in the 1998 Inset Map. We look forward to receiving your consultation response and to seeing a revision made to the Inset Map for the village prior to submission to the Secretary of State. [Appendices sent by email]

The proposed settlement boundaries will shape development in the local villages for the next 20 years, and if an error has been made in not following committee members views, this should be explained to the Inspector. If there are other rural villages in the area where similar error have been made, these should also be given consideration for correction now.

We write on behalf of our client with reference to the settlement boundary for Weston Hills as proposed in the South East Lincolnshire Plan Publication Version Inset map 67 attached as Appendix A. In the early stage emerging Local Plan documents, Weston Hills had been divided into two parts, Austendyke and St Johns, which followed historic planning treatment of the village, but in the latest documents, it is being treated as the one settlement it is, and called Weston Hills. The village is proposed to be classified as an Other Service Centre, and have a new development boundary within which, following proposed policies within the emerging Local plan for the settlement type Other Service centre, it will provide to allow for infill development in the proposed settlement boundary. At the present time, that settlement boundary as proposed, does not follow the agreed documented Committee member discussions. As stated above, Weston Hills Austendyke did not have a settlement boundary in the 2006 Local Plan. However in the 1998 Local Plan it did, Inset Map 43 (Appendix B) shows this, and the settlement development boundary included an area of frontage land on Austendyke Road near to Delgate Bank (being opposite to the village pub and shop), as well as a further area of frontage on Austendyke near to the Broadgate crossroads. It is noted from the SELLP Committee Agenda pack documents dated 11 September 2015, particularly pages 14-20 (relevant text highlighted and attached in Appendix C), that planning officers, when advising committee members on the proposed settlement boundaries for the various rural settlements, had followed criteria which stated that for the South Holland smaller rural settlements, they had used the settlement boundaries of the extant 1998 and 2006 Local plans. The Briefing Note document for the Workshop 5 refers that for Weston Hills Austendyke it was proposed to Retain boundaries but with no, or minor changes and minimal opportunities for infill development. (p18) This is distinct from the smaller settlement category villages, where the criteria used was to Retain boundaries but with significant changes removal of boundary for part of settlement or potential for change where non infill development would be encouraged. (also top of p18). The Note of the discussion states that there was confusion, and following further discussion it was agreed for the third and final group of Other Service centres and settlements no amendments would be made to the boundaries of which Weston Hills

The 1998 Local Plan map does show Wsn028 within the Settlement Boundary and shaded as a "Major Housing Proposal".

The map for Weston Hills Austendyke for the 11 September 2015 Committee shows the site excluded. The settlement boundary was drawn to mark the boundary between land with a built up character and land with an open character, farmed land, hence why the other site shown on the 1998 plan is shown inside the settlement boundary. The change is consistent with the quote 'Retain boundaries but with no, or minor changes and minimal opportunities for infill development', since it is a minor change for minimal opportunities for infill development. If the site had been retained it would have extended the settlement beyond its current built up character, a precedent that could be repeated many times across the plan area.

The minutes of the 11 September 2015 committee are contained in the following meeting's agenda pack for 27 November 2015. It says on page 6 that for 'Other Service Centres and Settlements' - Councillors indicated that they were content with the proposed settlement boundaries in this category and decided that the contents of the Appendices in the report be approved for public consultation. The map of Weston Hills has not changed in relation to the Settlement Boundary for the January 2016, July 2016 and March 2017 consultations.

No change to the Local Plan is required.

Post Title: 67: Weston Hills

(Austendyke and St John's were two named villages). It is considered therefore that a clear mistake has been made in the emerging Local plan proposed development boundary for Weston Hills, being that it does not replicate the 1998 Local Plan Inset Maps, as it was intended to do following the stated committee member discussion. Had it done, it would have included the frontage on Austendyke Road near to Delgate Bank, as well as the frontage on Austendyke near to Broadgate which has been proposed to be included.