

# South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 Preferred Options Consultation May 2013

**Chapter\_Name:** 07 Economy

<b>Response_Number:</b> 13	<b>Persons_Name:</b> Mark Price	<b>Representing_Who?:</b> Himself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b> Lots of empty shops in Boston. Free parking would help, subsidised rents and encouragement to 'big chain' shops to re open, and open I Boston as shopping in Boston seems to be going down market.	<b>Officer_Response:</b> Comments noted. These issues are beyond the remit of the Local Plan.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b> Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan

<b>Response_Number:</b> 21	<b>Persons_Name:</b> Mr Des Ford	<b>Representing_Who?:</b> D Brown Builders
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b> Holbeach town centre.  Provision should be made within the plan to allow incentives to inspire the regeneration of the town centre. Parking provision should be discussed explored. Long Sutton works well because you can pull up and park and therefore use the local shops. Explore rate relief etc to encourage shop use. Look for an innovative parking solution/ traffic management scheme for the town.	<b>Officer_Response:</b> The Preferred Options Document explains that parking provision will be considered later in the plan-making process.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b> Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	22	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Carol M Burton	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Herself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
I refer to a letter which I wrote to a local newspaper some time ago:- The large area of private car parking which occupies the site of Spalding's ancient Priory makes a hole in the heart of the town. I would like to see compulsory purchase of the whole site; the site offered to the developer who wants to extend Holland Market, and a three or four storey structure built there, with a public car parking on ground level and two storeys of shops above, to offer the trade in town centre where it naturally belongs. Such a complex would serve to join up the Market Place and The Crescent, where the town is at present split in two.	Comments noted. Site -specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.		Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	24	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Linda Atkins	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Herself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
I do not agree that the Rail Freight Interchange be built at Deeping St Nicholas village as we have just had a by pass put in to go through to Peterborough, to make less traffic on the A16, so why make the village busier by putting a rail hub there!	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		
	The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.				

<u>Response_Number:</u>	25	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Linda Atkins	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Herself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>We have a school just over the railway lines which has been suggested may be harder to gain access to, if they close off this end of the village. The new suppose route will be going towards Spalding and back on the outskirts of Deeping St Nicholas.</p> <p>If the hub goes ahead trains will be running every 15 mins over the line, so there will be constant queue of traffic trying to get to work at Peterborough.</p> <p>The noise from trains and increase in lorries on the road would be detrimental to the quiet village life we have now.</p> <p>Wouldn't it be easier to pick a site that is not in a village location, where noise is expected, on an industrial estate for example.</p> <p>Surely our house prices will deteriorate if this goes ahead?</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions.</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	26	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr R Stimson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>I do not agree that Deeping St Nicholas village is the right place to build a Rail Hub as I am a home owner in Deeping St Nicholas</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	27	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr R Stimson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Why disturb a peaceful village location with lorries, trains, extra traffic. Wouldn't it be more welcomed in a city centre location. Our estate has many young families with small children going to school across the railway lines. It would be very inconvenient if it was blocked off as has been suggested in the past. Will this change affect our house prices? We live in this location because its quiet. Why should we have to move because the Council can't find somewhere more suitable that wont encroach on peoples lives?		This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	32	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Charles Sly	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Why do we need to make more jobs in the South Lincs Area? When we have extra labour, it comes from Peterborough, Wisbech or Scunthorpe (and its is travelled from the Baltic or eastern block) You will need to upgrade the roads even more. The rail is being done and for passing freight. More houses = more power stations more water works, more, more ,more At what point do you get off this wheel of construction and upheaval and enhance our surroundings.		The need for housing and economic growth is adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.	

Response\_Number:

35

Persons\_Name:

Mrs J R Cooke

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

However, my main concern remains the RFI planned for Deeping St Nicholas. I fear that if it goes ahead, it will become an even more expensive "White Elephant" than the Red Lion Quarter. At this point, I would like to point out that I live in Deeping St Nicholas but do not believe that the development would make much difference to where I live so this is not nimby-ism. If it is true that the major multiples are backing the proposal in order to improve their green credentials, will they all be putting rail links into their current Distribution Centres which have been built on motorways/major trunk roads?

The RFI is planned in an area where there are no vegetables grown and there are no food pack houses/food processors. Your representative from the Council did not appear to understand what a pack house is but he did intimate that you envisage other freight using the hub but had no idea what this might be. Perhaps, this could be made clear since there is not a lot of local industry and it is unlikely that farmers will be able to use it for corn or sugar beet!

At the last meeting at Deeping St Nicholas, the same Council representative advised that local packers/processors had been consulted. As a director of a large local packer/processor, may I suggest that you invite all the businesses that SHDC expects to use the RFI to a meeting to discuss the concept. Whilst there may be limited use for imported product from docks to be put on rail, it has to be said that the flexibility required when delivering to supermarket depots would, unfortunately, not be available from rail. Since suppliers are, without fail, penalised for either missing their slot, or late delivery (however good the reason), I feel there would be a distinct lack of enthusiasm.

I believe it verges on the criminal to plan something on this scale in open countryside on good agricultural land.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location.

Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Has no-one any thoughts on food security which is likely to become more of an issue as times goes by? There is also a certain irony when householders struggle to get planning permission for something simple and innocuous! Finally, SHDC should be spending time on working out how people from the west of Spalding are going to get into the town's already dying centre after (I believe) March, 2014 when the extra freight trains start to use the upgraded line. I am well aware this is a separate issue from the RFI as it is already happening but I feel that it is very important issue.

Response_Number:	50	Persons_Name:	Mrs J Hill	Representing_Who?:	Herself
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
<p>South East Lincolnshire has always been considered a farming area but now, since most of our produce comes from abroad, the production of our own produce is greatly reduced since the majority of it arrives in the U.K. by ships, planes and lorries, which greatly add to our carbon emissions. Instead companies are being encourage to bring their businesses here which creates a need for workers and the requirement to build more property to house them. We have seen huge amounts of what was agricultural farmland being given over to built industrial estates and it seems that this strategic plan is to use even more.</p>		<p>The need for housing and economic growth, whilst minimising the loss of South East Lincolnshire's high-quality agricultural land resource, is adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.</p>		<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>	

Response\_Number:

56

Persons\_Name:

Indigo Planning

Representing\_Who?:

Not specified

Respondents\_Comments:

Town and Other Centres  
Part B of the Policy on Town and Other Centres states:  
“Development in out-of-centre and edge-of-centre locations will, except where for purely local need, be tightly controlled.”  
Paragraph 24 of the NPPF states that LPAs should:  
“...require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre.”  
At present, the wording of Part B is overly restrictive as it does not allow edge and out of centre retail needs to be fulfilled by placing additional restrictions on such development and it therefore does not comply with Paragraph 24 or 182 of the NPPF. It is therefore recommended that Part B is amended to remove this sentence in order to ensure the Policy is consistent with the NPPF and therefore sound.  
Part C of the Policy sets out the convenience and comparison retail floor space provisions for Boston and South Holland.  
Paragraph 182 of the NPPF requires a Local Plan to be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy in order to be ‘sound’. Indigo Planning raise objection to the inclusion of figures for future retail floor space capacity within the Policy as this is unduly prescriptive and inflexible and therefore does not conform with Paragraph 14 of the NPPF which requires Local Plans to “...meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change...” The prescriptive nature means it has not been positively prepared; although the figures are based on the Council’s Retail Study, their inability to take into account material changes in circumstances

Officer\_Response:

A new 'South East Lincolnshire Town Centre and Retail Capacity Study' is currently being undertaken. In due course its findings will inform the next stage of the plan-making process. This objection will be considered in light of the findings of the study.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

identified in future retail study updates makes them neither justified nor effective. Overall, they are not consistent with national policy.

Moreover, the Planning Inspector appointed to critique the soundness of the South Kesteven Core Strategy DPD recommended the removal of specific retail floor space figures from the DPD, on account of it being “...insufficiently flexible to respond to changing needs for retail and other town centre uses”. A similar recommendation was also made by the Inspector appointed to consider the Redcar and Cleveland Core Strategy, who concluded at paragraph 5.11 that “...there does not appear to be any great benefit in setting a strict numerical limit on the quantity of retail floor space in the new centre; that would unduly reduce the flexibility of the strategy”.

#### Recommendations

As detailed above, we consider that the sentence within Part B identified above is unsound. Indigo Planning recommend removing this sentence in order to comply with the NPPF. In addition, the retail floor space figures set out within Part C should be omitted in order to allow the policy to respond to future retail needs identified in further updates of retail capacity assessments.

I trust that you will take these representations into account; however, should you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me.

---



<u>Response_Number:</u>	71	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Natural England	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Themselves
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	We note that the Sustainability Appraisal for this section states that the preferred site will not impact on any protected sites of nature conservation however we are not clear on what evidence has been used to come to this conclusion. We would wish to ensure that full assessments have been carried out on the environmental impact of this proposal including Habitat Regulations Assessment. We would be particularly concerned with any potential water related links with the proposed site to Baston Fen SAC (and Baston Thurlby Fens SSSI); Cowbit Wash SSSI; and Cross Drain SSSI.				
<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments noted. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account. A full HRA/AA will accompany the Submission Version of the DPD.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.				
<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).				

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	111	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Bird	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	I generally agree with the strategy and policies, in particular the Rail Freight Interchange, to keep HGV's off the road system.				
<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Support noted.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.				
<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Support - No change to the approach is required.				

---

Response\_Number:

116

Persons\_Name:

Mr H Kumar

Representing\_Who?:

Peterborough City Council

Respondents\_Comments:

We have no objection to the principle of a Rail Freight Interchange (RFI) in the Spalding area, but we think the broad location and scale identified in the Plan may have unintended consequences for traffic around Peterborough. The proposed location for the RFI is on the A1175 between Spalding and the Deepings and there is no major road network nearby to distribute freight vehicles to and from the rail terminal. The nearest suitable road networks are around Spalding to the north and Market Deeping, and into Peterborough, to the south. Along with the RFI, it is proposed to allocate up to 45 hectares of employment land for enterprises associated with it. This too will generate additional traffic movements.

It is not clear if a traffic impact study was carried out for the RFI and associated enterprises either by Intermodality or by the Council. Our main concern is that traffic generated by this proposal could lead to additional traffic movements around Market Deeping and into Peterborough. There is already congestion in this area especially at peak times and this situation could be made worse by the proposed RFI. Our concern could be alleviated if there was a traffic impact study clearly showing that the proposed RFI would not have any adverse impact on the road network around the Market Deeping/Peterborough area.

Please keep us informed of the progress of this document. We would be particularly interested in any traffic impact study carried out in connection with the proposed RFI and associated enterprises.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	144	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J S Birkett	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	It would be unfortunate if clause a) iii) were be interpreted in a way that prevented small shops being developed in Boston and Spalding (or even other towns) away from existing local centres. Corner shops are traditional in England and new ones should be allowed.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. It is not the intention of this policy approach to restrict the provision of small 'cornershops' providing for purely local need.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	154	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr H Kumar	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Fenland District Council
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Employment Land and Premises policy seems to be concentrating on protecting existing employment commitments and allocations and these are likely to be reviewed through the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD. There may be a need to take more proactive approach to allocating employment land in view of Strategic Priority 5 which seeks "to create a mutually-supportive hierarchy of vibrant self-contained centres providing employment, retailing and services for South East Lincolnshire by encouraging an appropriate scale of retail, leisure and other town-centre development". It would seem logical to concentrate development in centres where housing development are planned to take place to make these more 'self-contained'. This would restrict the need to commute to centres outside of South East Lincolnshire for employment and other services. Appropriate level of employment development in Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge would limit commuting to Wisbech	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The preferred policy approach 'Employment Land and Premises' is based upon the findings of the 'South East Lincolnshire Employment Land Review'.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

173

Persons\_Name:

Gregory Gray Associates

Representing\_Who?:

The Garden Centre Group

Respondents\_Comments:

Q49 – Q52 Employment Land and Premises  
The need to protect existing employment sites is accepted and the findings of the ELR, that no new employment land is required, are noted. However once again, by not promoting any new employment allocations it is considered that the Plan does not seek to encourage new sustainable development which would act as a driver for economic prosperity. As the Plan recognises, sustainable development balances three dimensions: the economic, environmental and social. In achieving new economic development which does not have a detrimental environmental or social impact, the need to prioritise use of previously developed land close to centres of population, is key.

Our client’s existing garden centre, whilst constituting a retail use, offers significant local employment within a main service centre. In the eventuality that the existing retail use should cease, it is considered that an employment generating use would provide a suitable alternative. Whilst, it is recognised that all existing allocations will be reviewed through the Site Allocations DPD, it is considered essential that the current SELP Strategy and Policies DPD should allow for new employment uses on appropriately located brown field sites.

Accordingly, it is requested that the preferred policy approach be amended to include “the sustainable development of appropriately located, previously developed sites for employment purposes will be supported where it accords with other policies within this Plan”

Officer\_Response:

The preferred policy approach for 'Employment Land and Premises' proactively encourages the protection of employment land and uses. It does not rule out the change of use from retail to employment, which would be dealt with on a case-by-case basis through the development management process.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	174	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Gregory Gray Associates	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	The Garden Centre Group
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	No specific objection is raised to the 'Approach to Town Centre Uses' outlined in the consultation document and the hierarchy of centres identified is considered appropriate and consistent with Government advice.  It is noted that the forthcoming Site Allocations DPD will address all existing retail-related boundaries and accordingly appropriate representations in relation to Crowland Garden Centre will be made at this time. However, our client again considers that specific consideration should be given to existing retail sites whose redevelopment would provide an opportunity for further food/non-food retail development to support the existing function of small town centres such as Crowland.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	179	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Angela Atkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Marine Management Organisation
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Although the port of Boston and ports/coastal activity in general is mentioned within supporting text, there is no specific policy involving coastal recreation for instance or infrastructure related to port operations.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	The consideration of a policy dedicated to ports is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. No specific proposals for the ports in the plan area have come forward.  Access to the coast is a part of the Habitats Regulation Assessment and policy proposals have been taken forward in the Local Plan.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response\_Number:

182

Persons\_Name:

GR Planning Consultancy

Representing\_Who?:

Musgrave Retail Partners

Respondents\_Comments:

My clients note that the Plan confirms that there is no requirement to identify any additional retail sites in Holbeach or increase the current retention rate of food spend and would fully support and endorse that approach.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

183

Persons\_Name:

GR Planning Consultancy

Representing\_Who?:

Musgrave Retail Partners

Respondents\_Comments:

Whilst my clients would also support the Preferred Policy Approach for 'Town & Other Centres' they are concerned with the local threshold identified in part 'd)' of this Policy and consider this figure to be too high.

In relation to 'Question 55' our view is that the threshold of 500 square metres is set to high for centres such as Holbeach. As you may be aware, there is currently significant demand from the main national food store operators for new sites to accommodate their 'C', convenience store, formats. Even small convenience stores if operated by one of the main food store operators can generate a high level of turnover and trade draw which if located in edge or out-of-centre locations can have a harmful impact on small independent food shops and centres, reducing footfall and potentially the viability of existing businesses.

For these reasons, the local threshold should be set at 250 square metres gross thus requiring all convenience store proposals to be properly assessed in terms of their trade draw and impact on existing local centre businesses as well as any planned investment in those centres.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. We agree with the need for a reduction in the NPPF default threshold of 2,500 sq m and believe that a figure of 500 sq m to be appropriate to the circumstances of South East Lincolnshire.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

202

Persons\_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Spalding Lifestyle owners

Respondents\_Comments:

Précis of objection.

The site is wholly within the development boundary for Spalding/Pinchbeck and is largely allocated as an employment site (for uses under save policy EC1 of the Local Plan). Yet it offers the opportunity for a more suitable development than B2 and B8 use given the close proximity to the new Hospital. This close proximity is unusual and warrants recognition that sites can be eliminated from future employment land allocations.

Summary of representation Consultation Q's 49-52

We do not agree with the options expressed in the separate Employment Land Review (ELR) as it does not  
❑ question the previous Local Plan boundaries nor  
❑ offer a detailed review of what sites are included or not in the Wardentree Lane employment area, and  
❑ benefit from consultation carried out beforehand. Paragraph 7.3.1. quotes a number of key issues, yet misses the opportunity to flag up the scope for changing employment land boundaries. Some latitude is sought in employment area boundaries to allow for alternative development where justified by site circumstances.

The following change is requested:

Add to 7.5.1

“The boundaries of the employment areas are not fixed, and the oversupply of industrial land allows boundary adjustment. For example, it is recognised that the Spalding Lifestyle site is an inappropriate area to retain in the Wardentree Industrial Area. Some sites like this could benefit from alternative housing development if the opportunity arose”. A new boundary for the employment land allocation is suggested.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Employment land allocations and boundaries will be reviewed through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.



The LPA may well take the view this change is properly the subject of a Site Allocations DPD. To the contrary, it is important now to ensure that the scope and reasons for boundary change is flagged up in overarching policies. As they stand, the policies advance the idea of preservation of key employment areas including their present boundaries.

The draft policies are only intended to be broad brush but they are heavily dependent on the conclusion of The South East Lincolnshire Employment Premises and Land Review (ELR) (2012). This has not been subject to consultation yet expresses preferences for sites and boundaries. Further we do not agree with the options expressed in the ELR as it does not question the previous Local Plan boundaries in detail and does not offer a detailed review of what sites are included or not in the Wardentree Lane employment area. The exclusion of this site as we suggest is justified by your Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report that records there is a significant amount of undeveloped allocated land available. The study concludes that, in quantitative terms, there is a more-than adequate supply of existing employment space to meet any of the estimates of future needs up to 2031.

---

Response\_Number:

240

Persons\_Name:

Woods Hardwick Planning

Representing\_Who?:

Wheatley PLC

Respondents\_Comments:

The reasonable option identified for meeting employment land requirements seeks to roll forward existing allocations and commitments. The assessment of need is based on the South East Lincolnshire Employment Land Review Report which was published in October 2012.

The NPPF states that with regard to employment land there is a requirement to set criteria, or identify sites to meet anticipated local needs. The emphasis in terms of local plan making is to ensure that an assessment of need is up to date. As the employment land review was published in October 2012, it is considered to be up-to-date.

The employment land review includes five different scenarios for estimating need, generating a requirement that ranges between 25.7 – 78.6 ha. The report also identifies a total of 227ha of undeveloped employment land available. Clearly supply exceeds demand.

The reasonable option of utilising current commitments to meet future demand is supported. There are a number of key findings within the employment land review which have implications for current employment land moving forward:

1. Annual development rates of new employment space over the last eight years or so have been reasonably high at a net 13,850 m<sup>2</sup> or so of mainly industrial space although rates have been lower since 2008;

2. 238 ha of available employment land currently exists across the area of which the great majority (165 ha) is within South Holland;

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

3. Demand for industrial space is generally strong although less than in the past due to depressed national economic conditions. Most demand is from local firms wishing to expand or upgrade premises and stay within the area, and focused on the Spalding and Boston areas. Future levels of demand are expected to be similar to the past and focused particularly on Spalding;

Points 1 and 3 are noteworthy as it states that market demand was generally strong. This suggests therefore that sites which have not come forward for development are not suitable to meet current commercial requirements.

The plan also highlights the fact that due to an oversupply of sites, there is enough supply to meet demand even if a number of significant sites fail to come forward. It goes on to say that given this oversupply, sites should be reviewed for release to other uses should this be deemed appropriate. This is proposed to take place as part of the Site Allocations DPD process and development management process. This is fully supported as it accords with paragraph 22 of the NPPF which states that:

Planning policies should avoid the long term protection of sites allocated for employment use where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for that purpose. Land allocations should be regularly reviewed. Where there is no reasonable prospect of a site being used for the allocated employment use, applications for alternative uses of land or buildings should be treated on their merits having regard to market signals and the relative need for different land uses to support

---

Response\_Number:

241

Persons\_Name:

Woods Hardwick Planning

Representing\_Who?:

Wheatley PLC

Respondents\_Comments:

In light of the representations made in respect of Question 49 and the evidence and findings of the Employment Land Review, there is no requirement to allocate additional land.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

242

Persons\_Name:

Woods Hardwick Planning

Representing\_Who?:

Wheatley PLC

Respondents\_Comments:

It is considered appropriate to protect employment land that is required to meet an identified need and which is determined to be suitable to meet that need. As part of the Site Allocations process and in line with national planning guidance, existing sites should be reviewed against an appropriate set of criteria and where appropriate, other uses should be considered for those sites where they can meet a need e.g. residential development land.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

250

Persons\_Name:

Jonathan Ireland

Representing\_Who?:

Irelands Farm Machinery

Respondents\_Comments:

The employment land and premises approach does not appear to provide a safeguard for sites in an existing employment use to be retained for such uses. Existing Brownfield employment sites may not have the benefit of existing allocations. The approach does not appear to offer any flexibility for future use of such sites which may be appropriate for alternative or expanded employment generating uses depending on the growth of individual settlements. For example Sutterton had a low employment rating in the sustainability assessment of settlements but with its other high ratings for services and public transport could prove attractive for certain employment uses benefiting from locating in a village with these other positive benefits as a place to live. My client's site could provide additional employment potential if the site is not considered as a potential housing site given the existing uses on part of the site. Those existing employment uses relate to activities that are well suited to the agricultural nature of the surrounding area and the opportunity to expand these or provide related and complimentary uses on the larger site is seen as an opportunity to safeguard existing employment opportunities in the village whilst providing an opportunity to enhance these and provide the potential for improved employment opportunities in the village.

Officer\_Response:

The preferred policy approach for 'Employment Land and Premises' proactively encourages the protection of employment land and uses.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

259

Persons\_Name:

A E Donkin

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

This letter is in response to the consultation on the content of the above plan and relates specifically to the proposal to locate a rail freight interchange in Deeping St Nicholas.

A number of representations have been made about this since 23rd March 2010 when the proposal became public knowledge via the local media, the Lincolnshire Free Press, before even the affected landowners had been informed. These representations included a full petition from the residents of Deeping St Nicholas.

My concerns about this development remain as originally stated. The essence of these concerns is that:

- The site selected fundamentally breaches a number of national and the Council's own planning policies, nor can now revoked regional planning policies be relied upon
- The Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy Guidance issued in November 2012 by the Department of Transport sets out very clear criteria for the location of such facilities – urban areas;
- The site selected is in the wrong location for access by heavy haulage and for the food industry in Spalding which is principally located to the north of the town
- The Intermodality report, upon which the site was selected, contradicts an earlier Intermodality report in 2006 which clearly stated that Deeping St Nicholas had been rejected as a potential site because of flood risk
- Other sites were rejected as part of the option appraisal e.g. Gosberton Cheal and Surfleet which are not now shown as being in ROY zones in the draft plan – they should be revisited
- More fundamentally, there has been no public expression of support for the proposal by any of the leading food producers or hauliers in the district

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

- There is no sound business case for this proposal, lessons have not been learned from the complete failure of the Red Lion Quarter venture as a food heritage centre
- The Council reached a decision based on a narrow range of criteria relating to economic considerations alone without any regard to other considerations for the landscape and amenity of immediate residents and the wider population of South Holland
- The Council's consultation process was fundamentally flawed and did not follow a fair and proportionate consultation on either the proposal or the site selected.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	275	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	M J Smith	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Employment in the vicinity is very limited and commuting routes to Weston and neighbouring all takes place through conurbations along what were once lanes. The plans propose some 7000 new homes. Where will those residents commute to along what routes? This is not dealt with in the plan.	Comments noted. It is beyond the remit of the Local Plan to indicate detailed patterns of commuting resulting from its proposals. These matters would be adequately addressed in a Transport Assessment associated with a particular planning application.		Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD		

Response\_Number:

277

Persons\_Name:

M J Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

The Rail freight interchange will choke the road system to the north of it unless significant upgrading of the road system is undertaken in conjunction with it.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.



Response\_Number:

280

Persons\_Name:

Peter Macro

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to register my dissatisfaction reference the proposed Rail hub to the North of Deeping St Nicholas. It is not that I am necessarily against the hub, but in the way it seems to be shrouded in secrecy without the views of local residents being taken into account.

Please see below for the content of a message I have sent to the MP for the Deepings the Rt Hon John Hayes which sets out how I feel about the situation.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Regards

Pete Macro

Dear Mr Hayes

I am writing to you as I am concerned about the Rail Hub that is proposed being sited to the North of Deeping St Nicholas, where I happen to reside.

I have to be honest, I do not know whether I am for it or against it as it could have potentially huge benefits. What I do know is it seems to be shrouded in secrecy. There was a meeting in the village last night, that had supposedly been widely advertised, where only a handful of people turned up, and they only found out about it by accident. It also seems that the residents of Deeping St Nicholas have only until Friday 28 Jun 13 to register their comments before it goes to planning.

As MP for the Deeping's please could I respectfully suggest you canvas South Holland Council to delay any decisions on this until at least a period of consultation

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

has taken place with the people who would be affected by this.

As I have said, I do not know if I am for or against the Hub, but how am I to make an informed decision without the necessary information. The Council might say they have advertised this, the question is where? For a project of the size it is rumoured to be, there will inevitably be an impact whether on the environment, increased HGV's in and around Spalding or the potential effect on house prices.

It also seems quite ironic that there has been a group who for some time have been trying to get the Littleworth Drove station re opened for passenger traffic, but it seems this has been ignored whilst the Rail Hub is getting steam rolled through.

Please do not let your constituents get "railroaded" (excuse the pun), without at least the opportunity to understand any positive or negative impacts on their way of life, by a Council who do not seem to want to engage with their electorate. Here is another question, what would be wrong with a survey of local people to gauge their opinions? It should not be too hard as they know who we all are and where we live especially when it is time to send out the Council Tax letter.

I think it should also be taken into consideration that many people decided to live in the environment we do because that is how we want to live our lives. This scheme, would alter them one way or another and I therefore believe we should be entitled to our say before big business decides to change our lives for us whether we like it or not. I have to say I am fed up with other people telling me what is good for me. I am a big boy now and given all the relevant information can make a decision for myself. We supposedly live in a democracy where everyone has a voice, let us prove in this case that is still true.

Response_Number:	303	Persons_Name:	Phillip Greswell	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
There are some big changes on the way, not least, the strength of the economy which I doubt is going to improve and so there may be little opportunity for contributions from developers and the private sector resulting from new developments through Planning Gains. I therefore think that a new approach is needed to secure funding and Councils and Government should actively consider how this can be done. THE LOCALISM ACT. Local people must be involved because Economy and Climate Change issues affect them and they are the ones that can make things happen if given the opportunity.	These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

Response_Number:	306	Persons_Name:	Phillip Greswell	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
PROMOTING THE RURAL ECONOMY The rural economy is quite strong and should be a source for future funding of essential services if possible. Services such as public transport and the provision of dwellings. Existing buildings should be converted to residential, if not likely to be needed for agriculture. There should be opportunity for infilling and providing new houses in such locations, as long as they are sympathetically provided and are not incongruous. There is in many instance room for improvement in design on many of the existing buildings we see in Lincolnshire. Linking with this and elsewhere to Housing and Transport, Councils should endeavour to get all empty properties occupied. A good public transport system would overcome the need for houses to be built where the jobs are, as people could travel by public transport to get to work from rural areas.	These issues have been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	350	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	C Slooten
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area, and in particular as it passes through Pinchbeck.		Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	354	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	M Fragale
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area, and in particular as it passes through Pinchbeck		Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	366	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	R Bingham
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area, including Quadring		Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).	The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.		Support - No change to the approach is required.
		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.			

<u>Response_Number:</u>	408	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mr R and Mrs J Warrick
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area, and in particular as it passes through Pinchbeck..		Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).	The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.		Support - No change to the approach is required.
		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.			

<b>Response_Number:</b>	413	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	P Borst
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area, and in particular as it passes through Pinchbeck..	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	418	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

420

Persons\_Name:

Matt Westerman

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

My comments regarding the Deeping St Nicholas Rail freight Interchange.

SHDC have approved the theory of the RFI on its site in Deeping St Nicholas, however, they've not taken in to consideration any of the surrounding infrastructure. During the meeting with the Senior Planning Officer, and the district councillor (Mon 23/06) they answered many questions about the actual site, but had no idea about how the site would link up with the surrounding area. The roads in the immediate area that will need to take on extra lorry traffic bringing goods to the RFI are unsuitable:

The new A16 link from Spalding to Peterborough is already full of lorry freight on a single carriageway road where other road users cannot overtake safely. Extra traffic will bring this road to a halt, especially at commuting times.

Because of the increased amount of traffic on the new A16 link, it is subsiding in places, and even delayed opening due to subsidence.

The A16 Spalding bypass is congested at the roundabouts outside of commuting times anyway. There will now be increased road freight traffic between Wardentree lane in the north to the proposed site of the RFI to the south.

The de-trunked A1175 (ex A16) through Deeping St Nicholas is also subsiding and requires constant repair through the village.

There is talk of a western relief road for Spalding. This is perfectly acceptable for those people who live, work, or shop in the town. However, it will make no difference to those driving past, or those people most affected by the site. Especially those who live in

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Deeping St Nicholas and commute in the opposite direction.

It was also brought up in the meeting that there is a similar site being proposed in Peterborough, half an hour journey from Spalding along the new A16 link road. It would make more sense to send goods by road from Spalding to this site, as the majority of goods vehicles travel to Peterborough anyway to join up with the motorway network via the A1. This will also keep jobs in the road freight industry.

The RFI proposal, taking up 15 hectares of land, includes a 45 hectare site for industrial units. This is far more warehousing space than is required to serve 15 hectares of RFI. To me, this sounds like it is being approved in case the RFI does not get used to its full ability, so the ground works and infrastructure going towards building that will be put in place to make this “fall back” easy to attract potential investors. This sounds like completely the wrong site to add these units when there is already an industrial site at Wardentree Lane which should be expanded, rather than using a completely new site.

Despite assurances that the site was looked at in balance with the wishes of the local people (85% of the residents of Deeping St Nicholas signed a petition against this site), SHDC still believe that this is in the best interest of the district. As one of the 85% of residents who signed the petition, I will be looking to move away from the area. I am sure that there are many more residents who will also look to move away. Local businesses will suffer. St Nicholas House will not get so much business with industrial units at the back of it spoiling the ambiance. The Boarding Kennels close by to the proposed site will be forced to close as no owners will take their pets there, as no Dogs will settle with building works and then the round the clock operation of the RFI and traffic going in to the new



industrial site.

Finally, we were assured that there was at least one business with money ready to put in to this project. However, surely if there were any business interested in the site, then they would be driving this project themselves. If this business desperately wanted the site to go ahead, it would make more sense to put the cash in up front to make sure it happened. I don't believe that there is the level of desire from businesses to get this site open for the RFI. I believe that the desire is there for a new industrial complex away from Spalding, closer to the new A16 link road where existing businesses will move from Wardentree Lane.

For the above reasons, I object to this Rail Freight Interchange project.

---

Response\_Number:

421

Persons\_Name:

Tracey Rogers

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

As a resident of this area I do not feel we have been consulted correctly, and the plans to create such a devastating hub will cause extreme damage to the environment, the access and amenities we have and the rural life we enjoy in this area.

With the planned building and infrastructure which is involved in such plans means most of us who have to travel daily to work will find we have to pay extra in our fuel costs and time taken to get to our places of employment. Had the station been opened this could have saved both on our times and the environmental costs in excess fuel use.

The hub is not something we want, it is in planning stages and clearly they have more plans that's what they are telling us, I mean it starts with a few trains, so why do we need to have the road closed? And a bypass put in, A couple of trains doesn't mean we are likely to have our roads clogged up with trucks every hour of the day and night, yet they are warning us the current road will be upgraded to allow access for the additional amount of traffic going to and from the hub.

Talk of an industrial estate, and the amount of land this is going to remove from the vital production of food resources produced here already which is greatly needed across the whole country. And yet they cannot even provide a community centre or suitable facilities on the existing estates.

I do not want to have this proposed hub because I feel it will damage the environment, cause massive disturbance to all who live and have to work in this area, and it will have other effects like de-valuing our house prices, cause noise and light pollution in the evenings and will affect the whole life styles we have in

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

such a beautiful rural area.

I have been asking how this is being funded and have they already started work on the project as we have been getting disturbances at night with people working on the railway lines less than 1km from our house? Again I believe this is happening anyway and to do with the rail line. Just happens to be upgraded when you want to go ahead with a hub.

Should I be asking for information under the Freedom of Information Act? Clearly someone is cover things up or trying to circumvent this planning application without our consent and without our knowledge. I know it has been put in the local press but lots of people including me don't buy a paper. Why not put leaflets through our doors to keep us updated.

---

Response\_Number:

422

Persons\_Name:

Elizabeth Westerman

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

My comments regarding the Deeping St Nicholas Rail freight Interchange.

The surrounding infrastructure is unsuitable and already has constant repairs needed.

The "new road" from Spalding to Peterborough has made no difference to the number of HGV vehicles that use the A1175. (ex A16) The new road (A16) is difficult to navigate due to the number of trucks going slow therefore increases the likely hood of accidents with overtaking. Outcome – more trucks = more accidents.

The A16 Spalding bypass is congested at the roundabouts outside of commuting times anyway. There will now be increased road freight traffic between Wardentree Lane in the north to the proposed site of the RFI to the south.

The "western relief road" will make no difference for the people that this RFI will affect directly that commute in the opposite direction.

Is there a requirement to have two rail hubs in close proximity? The Peterborough site has more access to suitable infrastructure than the Deeping St Nicholas proposal.

The RFI proposal seems like an excuse to have another industrial estate south of Spalding as the majority of the land (75%) is expected to be industrial units.

The RFI will affect a quiet neighbourhood, disturb wildlife, be a "blight" on the landscape, dissuade homeowners from purchasing in the area and causing problems for people selling their properties in Deeping St Nicholas.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

85% of the households in the immediate area are opposed to the RFI proposal.

The communication of the proposal has been very underhand and “put in local papers”... When you work in Peterborough the Spalding paper is not enough to spread the word. Why not house drop a leaflet explaining instead of looking shifty and secretive. You had the perfect opportunity in the council tax leaflet at the beginning of April where you could have added an extra sheet which would have cost you no more. The council are losing the respect of their constituents with underhand tactics and secretive under the table deals.

For the above reasons, I object to this Rail Freight Interchange project.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	423	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Ken Egleton	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
I would like to object to the inclusion of the R.F.I in Deeping St Nicholas and anywhere else in South Holland for that matter. Due to the simple fact the road network to service this facility is virtually non existent and extremely poor. We currently enjoy one mile of dual carriageway on the A15 at Market Deeping. And this alone is simply not enough of dual carriageways and will blight our lives and other residents within this area.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		
	The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.				

---

Response\_Number:

431

Persons\_Name:

Linda Atkins

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

I understand that the Rail Hub is still to go ahead in Deeping St Nicholas. My Partner and I both feel the residents views have not been taken into consideration at all. Deeping St Nicholas is a quite peaceful village, that is why we moved here 6 years ago. To have a Rail Hub here would spoil the village and inconvenience the residents as there are plans to cut off the road that goes over the railway line to Peterborough.

We have signed two petitions before but have now been told that it is affecting the house prices here now and residents that have had their houses for sale have had buyers, but when they have done their searches it has come up on the search they have backed out. So is there to be any compensation to us residents? And if not why not? If the council and Network Rail have decided this is the best area to have it, they must have known it would have a detrimental effect on the house prices.

When there are many farm fields and open spaces in other areas where there are no houses, why couldn't they have chosen a more suitable place to have it?.

The last meeting we went to at the school was held by the council, the people there were not interested in our concerns at all. How would you feel if this was happening to the place where you live?

We are both interested on your views

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

432

Persons\_Name:

Richard Evans

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

It has come to my attention that, there is a proposal for a rail hub to be located within Deeping St Nicholas, Lincolnshire?

There appears to have been a meeting to discuss this proposal but I have not received any notification relating to this meeting.

As a resident of Deeping St Nicholas I have concerns to the impact this hub will have on the village and surrounding area.

Please would you furnish me with details relating to the proposal and as to the reason why I did not receive any notification regarding the meeting?

I am confident in predicting that this will not be the only concern you will receive.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

434

Persons\_Name:

J Adams

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

I am writing to object to the proposed rail freight hub that is being proposed on land at Deeping St Nicholas.

The development of a Rail Freight Interchange on land so close to the village of Deeping St Nicholas will have a severe detrimental effect on the daily lives of the residents through the 24 hour planned rail freight activities. This will bring to the people air pollution, light pollution, noise pollution and also have an impact on the noise generated by the coming and going of heavy goods vehicles and trains. All of the afore-mentioned will impact severely and may cause stress to the local residents and a poor quality of life.

I am therefore strongly against the hub proposal.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.



Response\_Number:

437

Persons\_Name:

Mr and Mrs M Gay

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

I am writing with much disgust that you have allowed such unconstitutional and undemocratic decisions to be made within your areas of responsibilities. You have watched as a multi-million pound organisation has tried to steam role the unwanted and ill conceived idea that is putting a rail depot in a small rural village. Before the village was left to rot by the local and county councils, as well as both the Labour and Conservative parties, it had no amenities or decent roads and now it is a poor shadow of its former, pitiful self. I moved here for health reasons, but now I will have to listen to hundreds of trains a week steam role past my house, as well as having to put up with all the extra traffic which will block the poor road system which is a result of the neglect we have seen over the past years; all on your watch. I am not sure why you have sided with the multi-million pound company, rather than the hard working tax payers and voters who live in Deeping St Nicholas; however, I have my suspicions.

There has been no discussion with the residents of Deeping St Nicholas (undemocratic), no chance to vote (undemocratic) and no one has championed our voice (undemocratic). If you allow this rail hub to proceed without allowing the residents of Deeping St Nicholas to have their voice heard, then I would look closely at yourselves and ask what you think your role is as an elected official

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b> 438	<b>Persons_Name:</b> Mr and Mrs N Hamilton	<b>Representing_Who?:</b> Themselves
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b> I would like to express my opposition to the Rail Freight Interchange proposed for Deeping St Nicholas.  A development of this magnitude would swamp a rural village like ours and consume valuable agricultural land.  I also think that the increase in traffic volumes that would result and general deterioration of the environment would reduce the values of properties in this area and therefore expect compensation be paid to all residents of Deeping St Nicholas.  I hope the council and Government can rethink this idea.	<b>Officer_Response:</b> This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b> Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b> 439	<b>Persons_Name:</b> Elizabeth Williams	<b>Representing_Who?:</b> Herself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b> As a resident of St Nicholas Park , it is with disappointment to find the Rail Hub is once again being promoted by SHDC for Deeping St Nicholas. Until we know exactly what will be housed there, what impact this will have on our rural way of life, the impact on our roads and why DSN has been chosen I can't support such a venture. There is precious little information except for a map with a terrifyingly large piece of land earmarked for what's been called a Hub whose impact on our village we just don't know. There are noise, light and security issues that have not been addressed and yet we are to blindly support this project. You will not get my support until we know exactly what will be there and how large this project is going to be and just how you think DSN will cope with all the extra traffic that this will generate with a road system that is already crumbling	<b>Officer_Response:</b> This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b> Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

440

Persons\_Name:

Elizabeth Williams

Representing\_Who?:

Signers of Petition

Respondents\_Comments:

A 12 page petition has been submitted with 130 names from 98 addresses. The petition states "We the residents of Deeping St Nicholas do not support the plans for a Rail Freight Interchange which is included in the SHDC Plans. We do not feel that we have been consulted properly about the impact this will have on our rural way of life. We are concerned about the impact on our roads, the environment, noise and light pollution, security and the effects on our local schools and our property values. We would also like to know how this is being funded and why have been excluded from any decision making (Sic)."

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

441

Persons\_Name:

Mrs Suzie Allcock

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

To whoever this may concern,

I am writing to express my concern over the proposed Rail Hub in Deeping St Nicholas. I am very concerned about the impact such a huge project will have on our village. I have two young children, whose safety and well being is paramount to me. The extra heavy transport on our roads will make their village a dangerous place to live. The noise from the construction and ultimately from the trains is likely to effect our quality of life by polluting our currently quiet environment. The air quality of our village is also going to be affected by such an industrial project on such a mammoth scale.

The effect that such a busy, noisy industrial area will have on the value of our properties is bound to be detrimental. We bought our village property in good faith that we would be able to raise our family in a quiet safe place. This village was sold to us as a commuter village with good transport links, that would hold its house prices in the future. I don't believe that this will be the case should this proposed Rail Hub be built.

Please take this email as my expression of opposition to the Rail Hub in Deeping St Nicholas and consider my reasons against the proposals when considering the future of our village

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

442

Persons\_Name:

Paul Barrett

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

To whom it may concern,

The development of a rail freight interchange on land so close to my property in Deeping St Nicholas will have a detrimental effect on my family with the 24 hour planned activity of this operation. This will cause "air pollution, light pollution and noise pollution" this potential development will impact severely on our quality of life. According to the draft document dated March 2010 the proposal would require primary roads within 5km. The nearest primary route is the A16 and is currently subsiding in places within 3 years of operation. Further more there are no dual carriageway networks in South Lincolnshire. The village of Deeping St Nicholas is serviced by the A1175 which has now been de-trunked, also this is now the responsibility of LCC. Highways officers have always stated that roads in Lincolnshire may be very good for growing crops but are very difficult to build very good roads on. Whilst not against the additional trains passing thorough this project is not suitable for anywhere in South Holland due to the extremely poor road network and would be far better situated in Peterborough where the better road network already exists. Having spoken to a local farmer substantial amounts of additional, valuable farm land will be required to screen properties so as not to blight the lives of the local residents.

Any further questions please do not hesitate to contact me

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

443

Persons\_Name:

Jocelyn Kedzlie

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

This letter is in response to the consultation on the content of the above plan and relates specifically to the proposal to locate a rail freight interchange in Deeping St Nicholas.

This submission is on behalf of both myself as a potentially affected landowner and as Chairman of RAIL Campaign Group (Rally Against Industrialisation of the Landscape).

RAIL as a campaign group have extensively challenged South Holland District Council's Cabinet Decision to proceed with the concept of a SRFI (Strategic Rail Freight Interchange) in Deeping St Nicholas.

Since March 2010 when the proposal became public knowledge via the Lincs Free Press, (before even potentially affected landowners had been informed), RAIL have made a number of representations to SHDC, culminating in the presentation of a petition of 850 signatures – enough to secure a full council debate which took place in November 2011.

This significant presentation of local opinion against such a proposal has not been alluded to in any part of the consultation document.

Intermodality was the company responsible for presenting in September 2009 the concept idea of the RFI to SHDC and in identifying Deeping St Nicholas (DSN) as a credible site option.

For this document SHDC paid £50k.

With that sum in mind, the same site in DSN was in January 2006 identified by that same company – Intermodality – as having key weaknesses, not least that

- (i) new road and rail junctions were needed and
- (ii) the A16 (now A1175) is a single carriageway in a flood plain.

Intermodality in their closing recommendations to SHDC stated that -

“If consideration be given to progressing an interchange

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. It should be noted that this proposal is not for a Strategic Rail Freight Interchange (SRFI).

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

development by public and or private sector, the focus should be on development of a suitably robust 'need case' and alternative sites assessment. The local planning authority will need to be satisfied that there is not only an over-riding need for such a development, but that any preferred broad location(s) or specific site(s) have been identified through a rigorous site selection process".

RAIL is still of the opinion that this proposal is based on a fundamentally flawed/absent business case which is devoid of wide 'buy-in' by local and national food producers and distributors. There has been no public expression of support for the proposal by any hauliers/leading food producers.

Valuable lessons have not been learned from the complete failure of the Red Lion Quarter Venture as a food heritage centre re: business case.

Indeed SHDC moved straight to a site selection process despite Intermodality recommending further work on a business case. This business case issue has been raised by RAIL on more than one occasion with SHDC who declined to provide answers.

A proposed development of such magnitude, for a site allocation for inclusion in a local plan, extant until 2031 should be based on something more than flawed research carried out by Intermodality in 2009, it should be based on a sound business case.

An RFI cannot on any basis be justified, least of all developed on a large swathe of green field agricultural land, 50-60 hectares in this instance.

The 'Strategic Rail Freight Interchange Policy Guidance' issued in November 2012 by the Department of Transport sets out very clear criteria for the location of such facilities – urban areas.

The site selected fundamentally breaches a number of national and the Council's own planning policies, nor can now revoked regional planning policies be relied upon.

For the DSN RFI site, SHDC reached a decision based on a narrow range of criteria relating to economic

considerations alone without any regard to other considerations for local amenity of immediate residents and those of South Holland as a whole.

The Intermodality report concludes in paragraphs 8.6.3. and 8.6.4 that:

‘The challenge from a policy perspective will be to identify site(s) for interchange development, as this will need to reconcile conflicting objectives, primarily between:

- a. Minimising any adverse impacts on the local quality of life (e.g. Noise, visual and air pollution, road and traffic levels) and the environment;
- b. The sequential test, prioritising new development on previously developed land in the first instance;
- c. Minimising the loss of high-grade agricultural land’.

... The focus (for the Council) should be on development of a suitably robust ‘need case’ and alternative sites assessment. The local planning authority will need to be satisfied that there is not only an over-riding need for such a development, but that any preferred broad location(s) have been identified through a rigorous site-selection process, eliminating other alternatives as far as possible.’

SHDC have ignored all the conclusions above.

Indeed, I note with disbelief point 7.26.10 in the Lincolnshire local plan draft

7.26.10 Landscape – “there is opportunity to incorporate appropriate landscaping to ensure any impact is minimised”

It is hard to imagine what is ‘appropriate landscaping’ against 60 hectares of freight ‘shunting yard’, against 24/7 lighting and noise, added to the increased local HGV road traffic nuisance!

My concerns about this development remain unaltered since its coming into the public domain and I urge further urgent review before submission to the Planning Inspectorate.



Response_Number:	445	Persons_Name:	Mr and Mrs Hill	Representing_Who?:	Themselves
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>We would like to register opposition to the proposed Rail Freight Interchange at Deeping Fen/Deeping St Nicholas, Spalding, on the following grounds:-</p> <p>Loss of good quality agricultural land which this country needs</p> <p>Visual impact</p> <p>Noise impact from virtually nil to where there will be noise 24/7</p> <p>Loss of peace and tranquillity</p> <p>Inappropriate for rural and village locations</p> <p>Increased amount of rail traffic/ noise</p> <p>Increased down time on Littleworth crossing</p> <p>Increases in delays of emergency services access or to attend incidents and getting to hospital</p> <p>Increased noise on road from freight vehicles</p> <p>Effect on wildlife and visual disturbance</p> <p>Effect on house values</p> <p>Loss of homes due to compulsory purchase</p> <p>Loss of local school</p> <p>Air pollutions due to operations being 24/7</p> <p>Light pollutions due to operations being 24/7</p> <p>Danger of building in flood risk area</p> <p>Drain on declining water resources</p> <p>Immense disruption during construction phases</p>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions.</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>		<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>		

Response\_Number:

446

Persons\_Name:

Mr A and Mrs M Gaches

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

As a resident of Deeping St Nicholas, we would like to place on record that we are totally opposed to the proposed plans for a Rail Freight Interchange in our village.

Our reasons for this are

- We moved to DSN 10 years ago to raise our family in a quiet rural location away from town / city life. In this time we have encountered no problems and love the peace and quiet our village offers. This would be taken away from us by the noise that would arise from this new development.
  - How would house prices be affected. If property values were to fall as a result, are we able to claim compensation? If so, who from. Are we expected to live in a house with negative equity through no fault of our own.
  - The train crossing would be closed for longer periods which would affect our travel to and from work each day. Also my daughters trip to school each day would be greatly affected.
  - There would also be an increase in pollution and a greater risk to our security.
  - We have not been properly informed of this proposed site. All we have heard about it is via word and mouth, and the local village newsletter.
- Deeping St Nicholas as a community does want a Rail Freight Interchange!!!

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	447	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr and Mrs N Robinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Themselves
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>My husband and I are outraged that this proposed rail hub is planning to go ahead.</p> <p>This hub will cause total disruption to our daily lives. The main road and Littleworth junction we cross everyday to school and travel to work will be heavily congested. We are also concerned about all the environmental factors including all the heavy pollution the hub will cause.</p> <p>This hub will be the ruin of our village and indeed will effect every individual living here.</p> <p>Our huge worry is that our property will loose money and in the future not sell. SHOULD THE RAIL HUB GO AHEAD AND EFFECT THE VALUE OF OUR PROPERTY WE WILL BE PERSUING LOSS OF MONEY AND DEMANDING COMPENSATION.</p> <p>I hope you consider the above very seriously.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not.</p> <p>Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions.</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	457	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	M J R Nell
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area, and in particular as it passes through Pinchbeck..</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	466	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Parigo Horticultural Company Limite
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area.</p>		<p>Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>		<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	479	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs C Stratton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area.</p>		<p>Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>		<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>	

<b>Response_Number:</b>	517	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr J Tester
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area, and in particular as it passes through Pinchbeck.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	535	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Roe Family
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the Spalding area.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

672

Persons\_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

I agree that sites designated as employment land could be released for other uses where appropriate if it is not required for that purpose.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

673

Persons\_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

I agree that loss of existing businesses should be avoided

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

674

Persons\_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

Retail floor space requirements between Boston and Spalding cannot be readily compared because of different approaches to categorization.

Officer\_Response:

A new 'South East Lincolnshire Town Centre and Retail Capacity Study' is currently being undertaken. In due course its findings will inform the next stage of the plan-making process and will ensure a consistent approach.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

---

Response\_Number:

675

Persons\_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

The proposed Spalding Rail Freight interchange has only one option so no comparisons can be made. Its proposed location at Deeping Fen is some distance from the sites which it will be serving, most being on the north side of Spalding.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

---

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Response\_Number:

700

Persons\_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

It is surprising that the Economy chapter as a whole, and the Town Centre section in particular, contains little reference to regeneration issues across South East Lincolnshire. The chapter and sections within it focus largely on the provision of employment and retail sites, without much indication of how regeneration issues will be tackled. The town centres in South East Lincolnshire, particularly Boston's, would benefit from a greater strategic approach within the Local Plan, including the Strategy and Policies DPD, to assist with their redevelopment. English Heritage has been engaged in heritage-led regeneration schemes in Boston, Spalding, Holbeach, Long Sutton and Crowland, and would expect a strategic approach to utilise the heritage assets of town centres to lever in investment and appropriate development. The town centres of South East Lincolnshire (particularly Boston and Spalding) may be well placed to exploit 'niche retailing' opportunities (e.g. independent and specialised retailing). The ongoing loss of national retailers from the High Street points to a longer term change in the make-up of town centres and opportunities for independent local businesses to take their place. There is a good relationship between niche retailing and historic buildings, as the special character and layout of historic buildings adds to the value and appeal of independent shops. There is also less pressure to standardise shop units and shop fronts to meet the demands of a national retailer. Niche retailing can also encourage residential living above the ground floor, creating a more diverse and vibrant town centre (particularly useful in South East Lincolnshire where the provision of brand new dwellings has significant flood risk considerations). The role of niche retailing has implications for the vision of what town centres can be, and for their overall management. At the present time, many niche retail quarters survive in spite of a lack of

Officer\_Response:

The consideration of a policy dedicated to regeneration is not an issue that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options document. As such, this represents a new option for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.



management, vision or strategy. Indeed, being left alone is sometimes the best that can be hoped for. Where a targeted investment is made in a niche retailing quarter that is also the historic centre of a town however, the results can be quite dramatic. Heritage-led regeneration schemes can act as a catalyst and help to boost local business and residents. We would like to see the next consultation document set out a strategy for the regeneration of town centres within South East Lincolnshire, with emphasis on the role that heritage assets can play. The role of niche retailing should also be considered. This would contribute to the Local Plan having a positive strategy for the historic environment (paragraph 126 of the NPPF) with relevant policies to deliver its conservation (paragraph 156 of the NPPF). We would be happy to advise further on this matter.

---

Response\_Number:

701

Persons\_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

We have previously commented on the proposal for a Rail Freight Interchange in our letter dated 22 April 2010. In that letter, we expressed concerns about the archaeological impacts of such development and the apparent lack of consideration of this issue. The location of the rail freight interchange is not clear from the consultation document, but the Deeping Fen area contains two scheduled monuments (revealing evidence of Roman settlement) as well as high archaeological potential overall due to the nature of the waterlogged fenland landscape. The Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record and our own archives (National Monument Record) will contain further evidence of heritage assets. There are also listed buildings within and near to Deeping St Nicholas. It is therefore surprising that the Sustainability Appraisal of the Rail Freight Interchange in Table 7.6 considers that the impact on the historic environment to be neutral. We disagree with paragraph 7.26.7 that "there are no historic assets in the broad location identified". As in April 2010, we recommend that proper analysis of the archaeological impact is carried out before the broad location is established in the Local Plan, along with assessment of potential impact on other heritage assets (e.g. listed building in Deeping St Nicholas). The emerging policy and supporting text should make reference to the heritage issues and requirements involved in the development of such a facility.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. However, The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

Response\_Number:

724

Persons\_Name:

Robert Kedzlie

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

This letter is in response to the consultation on the content of the above plan and relates specifically to the proposal to locate a rail freight interchange in Deeping St Nicholas and responds to consultation questions Q57-Q60.

I give the following reasons why a rail freight interchange should not be considered for South Holland specifically Deeping St Nicholas.

There is no economic case for this development.

A number of other rail hubs have been planned/considered – one is only about 12 miles away in Peterborough, a sensible location on the Felixstowe to Nuneaton rail line.

The proposed Peterborough Site is at a far more advanced stage than Deeping St Nicholas having been signed off by The Planning Inspectorate in February 2012.

The area could not possibly support 2 hubs in such close proximity.

There is no evidence that our added value food businesses will relocate. The questionnaire survey regarding interest in a rail hub sent by Intermodality to 55 companies locally was responded to by 17, a response rate of 31%. Of the 17 responses, 12 expressed a possible interest in a rail hub, 21% of the total approached. Of the same 17 responses, 5 expressed an additional interest in linked warehousing facilities, only 10% of those approached.

Road transport will decrease only marginally, if at all. Research undertaken for a similar facility in Corby shows that the majority of goods (mainly non perishable in that case) arriving and departing distribution centres located on rail connected sites will

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

be by road transport. Intermodal rail freight is also based on final road deliveries to and from the rail terminal, even when the rail freight industry is fulfilling its potential around 50% of inward goods will arrive by road and 75% of outbound goods will depart by road from a large scale warehousing and distribution hub. In the instance of Deeping St Nicholas this will be on a downgraded single carriageway road (A16 which is now the A1175) with no major arterial road network close by.

It is not fortuitous that Network Rail had independently undertaken to upgrade the Peterborough to Doncaster line via Lincoln; this has been planned for several years. South Holland District Council 'consulted upon' and allocated the site completely out with the normal Local Development Framework planning process in order to hit a planning deadline fixed by Network Rail.

By its actions the Council has constrained its ability to challenge the site selection and question whether its need and benefits outweigh the disadvantages. By its actions the Council have made it very difficult for itself to consider any application, which comes forward with an open mind.

The site breaches a number of national and the Council's own planning policies, nor can now revoked regional planning policies be relied upon.

The business case prepared by Intermodality that cost us the Council taxpayers £50,000, is in my opinion fundamentally flawed. It is a concern when the business case produced by Intermodality, and accepted by the Cabinet at SHDC, contradicted earlier assertions by them in 2006 that Deeping St Nicholas was not a suitable location for a SRFI.

The Council has now allocated the site in Deeping St Nicholas since 2010. It is a proposal that has blighted the village.

It has been stated by SHDC that no land is deemed to be blighted, by identifying DSN as a preferred site option for an RFI. Will this also be the case after the inclusion in the Local Plan? No where in the consultation document has the issue been addressed that residents are affected and there has so far been no regard given to the consequences of this massive proposed development on the village from an environmental, ecological, heritage, loss of amenity or noise and light pollution point of view.

If there is such a powerful economic case to “anchor existing businesses in the Spalding area and decrease the risk of businesses moving to areas of greater connectivity”, why as long ago as 2011 did SHDC refuse to match fund an offer from EEC growth funds to progress the development?

If there is such a powerful economic case for the hub, why aren't investors queuing up to develop the site and local producers/manufacturers demanding that it goes ahead?

I urge serious consideration of the above points before possible inclusion of the RFI into the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan.

---

Response\_Number:

727

Persons\_Name:

D D Wilson

Representing\_Who?:

Himself and Clients

Respondents\_Comments:

Chapter 7 Economy: New Employment Land  
The site allocated for new employment in Long Sutton has failed to produce a single new job over the last thirty to thirty five years. The allocation requires to be reviewed.  
There is nothing in the DPD to encourage our growers who together are the most important element of the local economy.

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. Site -specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer\_Recommendation:

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Response\_Number:

976

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

The land was promoted through the previous Local Plan Review in 2005. At the time the Planning Inspector considered the proposed policy LT4 and accepted the LPA's position that a marina should be considered as part of a South Holland Local Development Framework, now to be replaced by the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan.

The proposal remains to develop a marina with the majority of the land to be used for recreational purposes to serve 250 boats, alongside associated leisure facilities and residential development.

In his 2006 Report, the Planning Inspector states, "...The only candidate site promoted at the inquiry is to the north of Spalding, bounded by the River Welland and Vernatt's Drain. However, in the absence of any comparative assessment, it would be premature to conclude that this is the optimum site. PIC69 explains that the allocation of land for the marina development at Spalding would be undertaken as part of the preparation of the LDF. This gives a degree of certainty about the process and the timescale within which the search for a site would be undertaken. Considering the importance of this project and its long term nature, I do not find that an unreasonable approach on the part of the Council." (Para 7.5.2)

There was, therefore, a realistic expectation that the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan Strategy and Policies DPD would make reference to the potential for a marina at Spalding.

Officer\_Response:

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - Further work required which could result in a change to the approach.

Response\_Number:

1065

Persons\_Name:

Mr and Mrs D Wren

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

I am very concerned, however, to see that, if the plan is implemented, it could lead to industrial development in the Crowland area. Our small town has a long and interesting history and includes two buildings of major historical importance which, whilst we are not flooded with tourists, are of significant interest to ourselves and to others with items relating to the Abbey held in the British Museum.

Of equal importance is the fact that the town is surrounded on every side by very productive farm land. I can see no land upon which industrial development could take place other than as a result of the destruction of this farmland.

The proposal document refers to the preservation of significant countryside. There are those who regard the fen lands as being of little interest. I cannot agree. The very history of the fens is, of itself, of great interest with most drainage taking place around three hundred years ago. Of significant interest is the fact that drainage was begun in the area immediately surrounding Crowland, by monks of the first Abbey over twelve hundred years ago.

I am a new Crowlander, having lived here for a mere 27 years and, at 74, am unlikely to see the proposed changes for myself. Nevertheless, I care for the future of this attractive and ancient town and its preservation. It would unquestionably be grossly devalued by industrialisation, however much it may be needed.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. Site-specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.



Response\_Number:

1069

Persons\_Name:

Mr Brian Allcock

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

To whoever this may concern, I am writing to express my concern over the proposed Rail Hub in Deeping St Nicholas. I am very concerned about the impact such a huge project will have on our village. I have two young children, whose safety and well being is paramount to me. The extra heavy transport on our roads will make their village a dangerous place to live. The noise from the construction and ultimately from the trains is likely to effect our quality of life by polluting our currently quiet environment. The air quality of our village is also going to be affected by such an industrial project on such a mammoth scale.

The effect that such a busy, noisy industrial area will have on the value of our properties is bound to be detrimental. We bought our village property in good faith that we would be able to raise our family in a quiet safe place. This village was sold to us as a commuter village with good transport links, that would hold its house prices in the future. I don't believe that this will be the case should this proposed Rail Hub be built.

Please take this email as my expression of opposition to the Rail Hub in Deeping St Nicholas and consider my reasons against the proposals when considering the future of our village

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1086	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	M Cobbin
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the western parts of the Spalding area.		Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1090	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	R Chappell Esq.
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the western parts of the Spalding area.		Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1094	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding Rectory Feoffees
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the western parts of the Spalding area.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1099	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mrs M Johnson
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the western parts of the Spalding area.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1103	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	C Slooten
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q57-59. We consider the planned Rail Freight Interchange will increase the Rail network usage but possibly create further increased congestion, noise, and disturbance to the Spalding Town Centre, and the suggested area of Housing Development north of Vernatt's Drain falls close to this Rail line. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, however the intensification of the rail route, to alleviate the traffic on the East Coast Main Line, will result in added rail traffic on this Spalding line, which we believe will inconvenience the residents of the western parts of the Spalding area.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted. The upgrade of the 'Joint Line' is beyond the remit of the Local Plan, other than to attempt to mitigate its impacts (e.g. the SWRR).  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1113	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	R C Tinsley
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q57-59. We support the 'Hub' location being to the south of Spalding at Deeping Fen, and believe that the added infrastructure in this area, will result in Deeping St Nicholas becoming a larger settlement with the intensification of the rail route. We consider housing needs in this area will require more land for housing to be made available.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.  These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1151

Persons\_Name:

Louise McGuiness

Representing\_Who?:

Herself & Spalding & Peterborough T

Respondents\_Comments:

In response to question 57, 58,59,60 Broad Location for a RFI.

The principle of a rail hub is a good one if in the right location as it reduces long distance road traffic overall, and thus air pollution and carbon dioxide emissions. Projects on a smaller scale have proven to be of benefit, based on evidence both nationally and internationally hubs have been oversized and under used.

This area cannot sustain this size of development and my reasons are as follows.

The land selected for all four possible sites by SHDC three of which are in Deeping St Nicholas and one Gosberton Cheal are grade 1 and 2 agricultural land which under the RSS 8 Regional spatial strategy should be protected where possible.

This Government supports the protection of Green Belt land and after 2 X failed applications for Radlett RFI the decision to grant 300 acres of land is open for challenge in the courts costing more of tax payers money.

SHDC has already spent £50,000 of tax payers money commissioning the intermodality report, and the council has recently been under inspection and public scrutiny over the Red Lion Food Hall costing the tax payer.

While this area is not identified as green belt land in fact Lincolnshire has none? It is graded land.

Spalding has an industrial site to the east of Spalding and if the council were serious in job creating and benefits for the area they could have forward thought and planned a RFI on a smaller scale in that area. The track which has been on the cards for upgrade since 2000 could have been re routed in the costings putting the site in the actual place where would serve the industries more effectively making a positive contribution to local strategic transport objectives

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

including economic growth reducing adverse environmental impacts and support social and accessibility goals.

Boston is a port and already serves the east midlands well within two hours and has planned improvements to the infrastructure .

Boston has been highlighted in the state of freight strategy as one of the preferred locations.

Peterborough is a much more strategic site whom want a hub to support Magna Park.

The A16 existing / old A17 A52 roads serving Peterborough Lincoln Boston Kings Lynn are all single carriage way not designed for the amount of expected HGV traffic into the area.

The bridge across the river Nene has problems with the foundations (not in place correctly when first constructed) and already carries maintenance costs for existing traffic. The proposed increased HGV movement will increase these costs. LCC cannot meet the demand of keeping the roads in the area in good repair.

How will it cope with the increased HGV's in the area in particular the double sized lorry's already using our insufficient road system.

Deeping St Nicholas is a village which joins two bypasses and could have been considered for a bypass over 10 years ago where suggestions were made by locals which would have reduced the travelling on the route by a third for the new A16 road users formally the A1073.

These proposals for the routes were ignored and the route as we have today benefitted land owners of the time. Not the practicality of the users.

The same would apply to a SRFI in this area , the carrot of job creation for local people !!

Which locals heard when the power station went ahead.

It would be nice if the council used " local people " to carry out the maintenance work for the houses they own in the area rather than recruit from outside hiding under the umbrella of "tendering" and supported local people.

To support an international interchange , Sufficient landscaping of rolling hills as this area is flat which noise travels, would also support questions 61,62,and 63 answers. The most suitable site if one were to work would need to be situated near a port or close to a port with suitable infrastructure to support this. Consideration for a hub would be more viable if a more appropriate site in Spalding or surrounding area could be found and were proposed on a smaller scale. Location i.e. nearer Boston and not on the scale proposed by SHDC and Not on Graded agricultural land.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1154	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Louise McGuiness	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Herself & Spalding & Peterborough T
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>		
In response to Q71, 72, 73 Again a RFI will have adverse environmental impact and will affect the health and well being of residents in both DSN and Holland Park directly and surrounding areas.	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

Response\_Number:

1162

Persons\_Name:

Mr and Mrs D Hayers

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer Recommendation:

Paragraph 7.25.1:

Please explain how the preferred site discussed was rejected in the first instance.

Much is made of a developer interest, but to date, it has not been advertised that there is user interest in the development. Without such interest, surely this project should not proceed?

Paragraphs 7.26.1/ 7.26.11

The relocation of the A16 via Crowland has meant a down grading of the road, now known as the B1175. This has resulted in a huge reduction of heavy traffic passing through Deeping St Nicholas. The siting of the RFI as proposed will reverse this situation, resulting in an increase in traffic through the village. This increase impacts on the residents' environment by the increased levels of noise and carbon emission generated by the heavy vehicle traffic.

As the village has no local amenities, residents have to travel to, Spalding, Market Deeping or Crowland for essentials. With an increase of heavy vehicles accessing the RFI, there will be a negative impact on residents accessing essential amenities.

As the existing public transport services provided to the village residents is just about non-existent, the use of private cars is the only option available. This requires the use of the B1175, which under the proposal will now become more congested.

Paragraph 8.1.1 / 8.1.22

The siting and building of the RFI as proposed is only part of the issue. To support the RFI, there will be the requirement for storage / warehouse facilities, which shall cover a larger area than the rail hub. Most of these facilities will have to be refrigerated to allow for cold storage of goods prior to transport. These facilities will have a major impact on the environment through

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.



noise and light pollution as well as the carbon footprint of refrigeration plants.

Along with the increase in pollution generated by the rail hub and the warehouse facilities, the increase in heavy road traffic will add to the overall degeneration of the existing pastoral environment of the village.

If asked, the majority of the residents of Deeping St Nicholas, will state that the reason for moving to the village was for the environment. Open land, fresh air, peace and quiet, all feature in the reason to live in the village. Building a unnecessary rail hub will prove to have a negative effect on the residents.

To support the proposed RFI, there will have to be an upgrading of the rail line to Peterborough. This line crosses the B1175 and is controlled by a level crossing. With the RFI in operation, this level crossing will be closing far more frequently than at present. This will impact on the residents' access to Market Deeping which is key access to amenities.

In order for the RFI to provide the benefits proposed, there will have to be a great improvement to the road access to the site. It is assumed that this will be from the existing A16. In order to service the RFI there will be major development between the A16 and the site, leading to major disruption for residents trying to access Spalding and beyond.

In summary, the siting of the RFI will greatly impact residents through increased pollution and a deterioration in the quality of life presently being enjoyed by the all villagers.

---

Response\_Number:

1163

Persons\_Name:

Mr N Watts

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Proposed Rail Freight Interchange at Deeping St Nicholas

Most of the residents of Deeping St Nicholas live in Deeping St Nicholas because they would prefer to live in a village or in the country rather than a town or a city. A rail freight interchange would join Deeping St Nicholas up with Spading and make a very large town. We live in a village because we don't want to live in a town with all the hustle and bustle that it would bring with it. It would increase noise and bring us into an industrial area which would blight our lives.

I keep asking myself why do we want to double the size of Spalding, we have seen what can happen in cities only this week and none of us want that to happen around here. There have even been riots in Milton Keynes which is one of England's newest cities so we can't say it won't happen in a new city.

This rail freight interchange started off as a rail hub but of course it cannot be a hub because there are no spokes to go from the railway line. It is an excuse to place a new industrial estate in the middle of Deeping Fen.

Why do we or why should we want an industrial estate each side of Spalding, it would be better to increase the size of Warden Tree Lane and have all the industry in one area. An industrial estate would create so much traffic between the two industrial estates it would increase the traffic going around Spalding and the bypass is plenty busy enough now.

An industrial estate in Deeping Fen would mean a bridge would have to be built over the railway which would be very expensive

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal. The preferred policy approach is worded to ensure that a RFI facility must occur before associated land is developed, and also that any enterprises developing on the site must have an 'operational requirement to be in close proximity to the RFI'.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

The railways used to carry every type of produce and the first produce they dropped was perishable goods because they could not get the produce to its destination in time. Marshalling freight trains has long since ceased and so now only whole train loads are conveyed. If any one wants to put freight on to rail that person has to pay for the trucks themselves, that is the person who wants to receive the goods or the person who wants to dispatch the goods. Will it be the Spaniard, the Italian or the Englishman who pays for these trucks?

The railways in Spain where most of our fresh produce comes from are on a different gauge to France so that is another hurdle to jump over. The Spanish rail gauge is 5 ft 6 ins and the French and English gauge is 4 ft 8.5 ins.

Do we want a train load of fresh produce all at one time. If we do have a train load all at one time how long would it take to load it and how long would it take to unload the train. The people who grow the perishable goods cannot dispatch a train load of fresh produce at one time, the people who pack the produce cannot deal with a train load at a time and the supermarkets do not want a train load at a time, they need a truck load at a time.

With all these hurdles to jump over I cannot see the rail part of the development taking place, it is an excuse to have Industrial estate built in Deeping Fen. This will cause a lot of road movements between Warden Tree lane and this new development which is the opposite to what the site is designed for so why not just enlarge

---

Response\_Number:

1170

Persons\_Name:

Mr and Mrs CH Good

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Sirs, on behalf of my husband and I , we write to you to say how dismayed we are in that no consultation with residents in this location have been made. We are not happy with the idea of a Rail Hub being placed so near to our residential homes.

This will reflect in the value of our homes, the constant noise of the trains (even though it is said only 2 trains per day would travel along the track) That we find difficult to believe – it would not be cost effective for a start if that occurred! The safety aspect too in the area. We have an infants school in the village, there would be pollution.

When we moved into our home, when it was newly built – some 10yrs ago, there was even talk of a Halt being placed at Littleworth crossing – apparently there were already some funds being put aside. Now we are told there will NOT be a halt. This would have served our area well and it would mean less cars on the road travelling to and from areas such as Peterborough, Stamford to name two towns. Our concern is that our houses would be less valuable but the main concern is that at NO TIME have the residents been consulted!

We would very much like our views to be put forward and it is hoped that you Mr Hayes will collate all the complaints and information so that our complaint can be put forward to the appropriate people. It would be very much appreciated if we can be included in any meeting/consultation with the above. We are more than happy to be available should you wish to make contact.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1176

Persons\_Name:

Mr J Dadge

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs T Croxford

Respondents\_Comments:

Employment Land & Premises  
Question 52 – the preferred policy approach neglects rural employment opportunities. It is noted that the rural economy s mentioned elsewhere e.g. 7.1.4 relates to supporting the rural economy however the policy approach relates exclusively to existing employment commitments and allocated sites and the protection of existing business.  
The subject is so important that it should be covered in the main policy approach.  
Given the geographical distribution of smaller settlements and the emphasis that should be placed on rural employment opportunities one would have expected to see some reference to the positive encouragement approach and favourable consideration to small scale employment uses within the countryside where these are in or adjacent to the built up area of settlements.  
With the changes an in technology and an increase in emphasis on home working one would also have expected to see within the policy a permissive approach to the development of workplace homes/live work units in and adjacent to settlements in the countryside.  
Providing overarching policies to facilitate these is entirely consistent with the three dimensions of sustainable development.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. It is considered that national policy relating to the rural economy is sufficiently detailed so as to not require a standalone policy in the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1199

Persons\_Name:

Mr D W MacPherson

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

This development is totally unnecessary. It will be as big an eyesore as the power stations in Spalding and Sutton Bridge with its light and noise pollution, towers of containers to destroy the views for residents. Existing rail links of this kind are not operating at capacity now. This type of transport is not suited to the transportation of perishable goods too many transfers from rail to road and vice versa.

This development has been ill conceived and I feel is going to be a 'white elephant' with little improvement in employment figures.

Would any of you like to live with this on your doorsteps??? I guess Not.

Totally, totally, against this project.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1207

Persons\_Name:

Mr and Mrs D Steele

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange.

Responses to various Paragraphs.

7.23 Why is it necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI?

Firstly the Proposed RFI will be 5 miles from Spalding, by road, and 12 miles from Peterborough by road. The rail distances will be much smaller in both cases. In consequence to this fact is the RFI needed at all.

7.24 Reasonable policy options:

7.24.1 When originally putting up four options – 3 were in Deeping St. Nicholas and one was near Gosberton which sits on Grade 1 agricultural land, and in consequence this was ruled out, so only three options remained and they were in a similar place but aligned slightly differently.

The public consultation showed the village was against it, and we raised 850 signatures to prove the point. At this stage the RFI was not part of the local plan; so now the signatures can be ignored. We also asked if Blight was a valid point and we were told no because the RFI was not part of the local plan. Needless to say properties are not being sold at expected prices, because the RFI is known to be part of the future South Holland would like to see at Deeping St. Nicholas.

Looking at the fields in the last 7 years I have lived in the village the crops that are grown are mostly cereal, sugar beet, linseed, rape seed, and potatoes. This is hardly produce in the excepted word whereas North of Spalding cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, lettuce and daffodils are grown. Probably all crops that can sent by train easily.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

A new road has been built between Spalding and Peterborough and this is part of the new A16 and gives an easy run to Magna Park in Peterborough where the roads are not single carriageway BUT DUAL CARRIAGEWAY. Most habitation is hidden from the roads.

Network Rail have been asked by the Government to reduce costs and staff numbers so that we in UK can pay similar prices for fares as on the continent, currently we pay 25% more.

#### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal:

7.25.1 Air quality: The report shows any new development will have a minor positive / minor negative impact. As the intention is to bring large numbers of HGV,s through the village; the impact is more likely to be major negative for those of us who live in the village. Population about 2,400 including Hop Pole, Tongue End and Spalding Common, It could be more.

#### 7.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green infrastructure:

There are a number of Nature Reserves and Archaeological Sites within 10 kilometres which could be affected by ambient light and noise. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and English Heritage could help identify the sites.

#### 7.26.3 Climate change:

By definition a development will increase the greenhouse gas emissions within the village, as vehicles will come into the village to deliver products that are to go on the train. One of the purposes of the new A16 was to take gas emissions and noise out of villages.

#### 7.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: I do not



understand what this means as yet there is no reference to the number or types of jobs that may be provided.

7.26.5 Economy and Employment: We do not know what provisions for employment will be available, and we certainly do not know whether the transport fraternity will use the rail facility or decide to stay as they are.

7.26.6.Flood Risk As the land stands at the moment the risk of flooding may be a minor negative impact. Should 60 hectares of concrete and some extra tarmac be laid the developers will need to sort out good flood resilience. Living in Deeping St. Nicholas where there is no mains drainage and soil which is either silt or clay with a high water table getting rid of water, particularly as it has come in the last few years is not easy. Most of the septic tanks are emptied 2 or 3 times a year per house. This is due to the slowness of the water absorption into the soil. This depends on soil tests. The Deepings internal drainage board and the Environmental Agency are well aware of our problems

7.26.7 Historic Environment: We have two Bronze Age sites in the village. To see if there is a problem check with Lincolnshire Archaeology unit in Lincoln.

7.26.10 Landscape: Living in the fens means very little up or down movement in the land takes place. However light and noise travels a long way, and the RFI will have a detrimental effect on the ambient, which will prevent star-gazing.

7.26.11Transport: If the RFI is used its impact will be Major Negative for the village if the local transport companies decide to use the RFI. In the wider context it is possible that putting everything on the railway will make everything cleaner. The answer would be therefore, to find a site north of Spalding in an unpopulated area, rather than say to the residents of

Deeping St. Nicholas “we are going to make your life hell for the greater good.” This is not really what civilised society is about.

7.26.13. Conclusion. An RFI to handle all the produce is a wonderful idea, and there will be one we can use in Peterborough. Putting an RFI into Deeping St. Nicholas will only give the local council a few business but cause much upset physically and economically to the residents of the village. The new houses can still be filled with workers from Peterborough RFI and perhaps they will be able to catch a train from Spalding to Peterborough.

#### 7.27 Delivery

##### 7.27.1

The only option is not an RFI in Deeping St. Nicholas this is where the flawed thinking of the District Council. Having spoken to a Councillor in Peterborough, he and others in his Council thought that having two RFI's within 15 miles was not an economically viable. Perhaps in 20 years it may be necessary and then there would be experience and knowledge to make a sensible decision.

#### 7.28 Preferred Option:

7.28.1 Is not a reasonable option as explained in 7.27.1

---

Response\_Number:

1208

Persons\_Name:

M A and S O'Donogue

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange.

Responses to various Paragraphs.

7.23 Why is it necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI?

Firstly the Proposed RFI will be 5 miles from Spalding, by road, and 12 miles from Peterborough by road. The rail distances will be much smaller in both cases. In consequence to this fact is the RFI needed at all.

7.24 Reasonable policy options:

7.24.1 When originally putting up four options – 3 were in Deeping St. Nicholas and one was near Gosberton which sits on Grade 1 agricultural land, and in consequence this was ruled out, so only three options remained and they were in a similar place but aligned slightly differently.

The public consultation showed the village was against it, and we raised 850 signatures to prove the point. At this stage the RFI was not part of the local plan; so now the signatures can be ignored. We also asked if Blight was a valid point and we were told no because the RFI was not part of the local plan. Needless to say properties are not being sold at expected prices, because the RFI is known to be part of the future South Holland would like to see at Deeping St. Nicholas.

Looking at the fields in the last 7 years I have lived in the village the crops that are grown are mostly cereal, sugar beet, linseed, rape seed, and potatoes. This is hardly produce in the excepted word whereas North of Spalding cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, lettuce and daffodils are grown. Probably all crops that can sent by train easily.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

A new road has been built between Spalding and Peterborough and this is part of the new A16 and gives an easy run to Magna Park in Peterborough where the roads are not single carriageway BUT DUAL CARRIAGEWAY. Most habitation is hidden from the roads.

Network Rail have been asked by the Government to reduce costs and staff numbers so that we in UK can pay similar prices for fares as on the continent, currently we pay 25% more.

#### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal:

7.25.1 Air quality: The report shows any new development will have a minor positive / minor negative impact. As the intention is to bring large numbers of HGV,s through the village; the impact is more likely to be major negative for those of us who live in the village. Population about 2,400 including Hop Pole, Tongue End and Spalding Common, It could be more.

#### 7.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green infrastructure:

There are a number of Nature Reserves and Archaeological Sites within 10 kilometres which could be affected by ambient light and noise. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and English Heritage could help identify the sites.

#### 7.26.3 Climate change:

By definition a development will increase the greenhouse gas emissions within the village, as vehicles will come into the village to deliver products that are to go on the train. One of the purposes of the new A16 was to take gas emissions and noise out of villages.

#### 7.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: I do not

understand what this means as yet there is no reference to the number or types of jobs that may be provided.

7.26.5 Economy and Employment: We do not know what provisions for employment will be available, and we certainly do not know whether the transport fraternity will use the rail facility or decide to stay as they are.

7.26.6.Flood Risk As the land stands at the moment the risk of flooding may be a minor negative impact. Should 60 hectares of concrete and some extra tarmac be laid the developers will need to sort out good flood resilience. Living in Deeping St. Nicholas where there is no mains drainage and soil which is either silt or clay with a high water table getting rid of water, particularly as it has come in the last few years is not easy. Most of the septic tanks are emptied 2 or 3 times a year per house. This is due to the slowness of the water absorption not the soil. This depends on soil tests. The Deepings internal drainage board and the Environmental Agency are well aware of our problems

7.26.7 Historic Environment: We have two Bronze Age sites in the village. To see if there is a problem check with Lincolnshire Archaeology unit in Lincoln.

7.26.10 Landscape: Living in the fens means very little up or down movement in the land takes place. However light and noise travels a long way, and the RFI will have a detrimental effect on the ambient, which will prevent star-gazing.

7.26.11Transport: If the RFI is used its impact will be Major Negative for the village if the local transport companies decide to use the RFI. In the wider context it is possible that putting everything on the railway will make everything cleaner. The answer would be therefore, to find a site north of Spalding in an unpopulated area, rather than say to the residents of

Deeping St. Nicholas “we are going to make your life hell for the greater good.” This is not really what civilised society is about.

7.26.13. Conclusion. An RFI to handle all the produce is a wonderful idea, and there will be one we can use in Peterborough. Putting an RFI into Deeping St. Nicholas will only give the local council a few business but cause much upset physically and economically to the residents of the village. The new houses can still be filled with workers from Peterborough RFI and perhaps they will be able to catch a train from Spalding to Peterborough.

#### 7.27 Delivery

##### 7.27.1

The only option is not an RFI in Deeping St. Nicholas this is where the flawed thinking of the District Council. Having spoken to a Councillor in Peterborough, he and others in his Council thought that having two RFI's within 15 miles was not an economically viable. Perhaps in 20 years it may be necessary and then there would be experience and knowledge to make a sensible decision.

#### 7.28 Preferred Option:

7.28.1 Is not a reasonable option as explained in 7.27.1

---

Response\_Number:

1209

Persons\_Name:

Mr and Mrs M Lamb

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange.

Responses to various Paragraphs.

7.23 Why is it necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI?

Firstly the Proposed RFI will be 5 miles from Spalding, by road, and 12 miles from Peterborough by road. The rail distances will be much smaller in both cases. In consequence to this fact is the RFI needed at all.

7.24 Reasonable policy options:

7.24.1 When originally putting up four options – 3 were in Deeping St. Nicholas and one was near Gosberton which sits on Grade 1 agricultural land, and in consequence this was ruled out, so only three options remained and they were in a similar place but aligned slightly differently.

The public consultation showed the village was against it, and we raised 850 signatures to prove the point. At this stage the RFI was not part of the local plan; so now the signatures can be ignored. We also asked if Blight was a valid point and we were told no because the RFI was not part of the local plan. Needless to say properties are not being sold at expected prices, because the RFI is known to be part of the future South Holland would like to see at Deeping St. Nicholas.

Looking at the fields in the last 7 years I have lived in the village the crops that are grown are mostly cereal, sugar beet, linseed, rape seed, and potatoes. This is hardly produce in the excepted word whereas North of Spalding cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, lettuce and daffodils are grown. Probably all crops that can sent by train easily.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

A new road has been built between Spalding and Peterborough and this is part of the new A16 and gives an easy run to Magna Park in Peterborough where the roads are not single carriageway BUT DUAL CARRIAGEWAY. Most habitation is hidden from the roads.

Network Rail have been asked by the Government to reduce costs and staff numbers so that we in UK can pay similar prices for fares as on the continent, currently we pay 25% more.

#### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal:

7.25.1 Air quality: The report shows any new development will have a minor positive / minor negative impact. As the intention is to bring large numbers of HGV,s through the village; the impact is more likely to be major negative for those of us who live in the village. Population about 2,400 including Hop Pole, Tongue End and Spalding Common, It could be more.

#### 7.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green infrastructure:

There are a number of Nature Reserves and Archaeological Sites within 10 kilometres which could be affected by ambient light and noise. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and English Heritage could help identify the sites.

#### 7.26.3 Climate change:

By definition a development will increase the greenhouse gas emissions within the village, as vehicles will come into the village to deliver products that are to go on the train. One of the purposes of the new A16 was to take gas emissions and noise out of villages.

#### 7.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: I do not



understand what this means as yet there is no reference to the number or types of jobs that may be provided.

7.26.5 Economy and Employment: We do not know what provisions for employment will be available, and we certainly do not know whether the transport fraternity will use the rail facility or decide to stay as they are.

7.26.6.Flood Risk As the land stands at the moment the risk of flooding may be a minor negative impact. Should 60 hectares of concrete and some extra tarmac be laid the developers will need to sort out good flood resilience. Living in Deeping St. Nicholas where there is no mains drainage and soil which is either silt or clay with a high water table getting rid of water, particularly as it has come in the last few years is not easy. Most of the septic tanks are emptied 2 or 3 times a year per house. This is due to the slowness of the water absorption into the soil. This depends on soil tests. The Deepings internal drainage board and the Environmental Agency are well aware of our problems

7.26.7 Historic Environment: We have two Bronze Age sites in the village. To see if there is a problem check with Lincolnshire Archaeology unit in Lincoln.

7.26.10 Landscape: Living in the fens means very little up or down movement in the land takes place. However light and noise travels a long way, and the RFI will have a detrimental effect on the ambient, which will prevent star-gazing.

7.26.11Transport: If the RFI is used its impact will be Major Negative for the village if the local transport companies decide to use the RFI. In the wider context it is possible that putting everything on the railway will make everything cleaner. The answer would be therefore, to find a site north of Spalding in an unpopulated area, rather than say to the residents of

Deeping St. Nicholas “we are going to make your life hell for the greater good.” This is not really what civilised society is about.

7.26.13. Conclusion. An RFI to handle all the produce is a wonderful idea, and there will be one we can use in Peterborough. Putting an RFI into Deeping St. Nicholas will only give the local council a few business but cause much upset physically and economically to the residents of the village. The new houses can still be filled with workers from Peterborough RFI and perhaps they will be able to catch a train from Spalding to Peterborough.

#### 7.27 Delivery

##### 7.27.1

The only option is not an RFI in Deeping St. Nicholas this is where the flawed thinking of the District Council. Having spoken to a Councillor in Peterborough, he and others in his Council thought that having two RFI's within 15 miles was not an economically viable. Perhaps in 20 years it may be necessary and then there would be experience and knowledge to make a sensible decision.

#### 7.28 Preferred Option:

7.28.1 Is not a reasonable option as explained in 7.27.1

---

Response\_Number:

1210

Persons\_Name:

Mr and Mrs G Wright

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange.

Responses to various Paragraphs.

7.23 Why is it necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI?

Firstly the Proposed RFI will be 5 miles from Spalding, by road, and 12 miles from Peterborough by road. The rail distances will be much smaller in both cases. In consequence to this fact is the RFI needed at all.

7.24 Reasonable policy options:

7.24.1 When originally putting up four options – 3 were in Deeping St. Nicholas and one was near Gosberton which sits on Grade 1 agricultural land, and in consequence this was ruled out, so only three options remained and they were in a similar place but aligned slightly differently.

The public consultation showed the village was against it, and we raised 850 signatures to prove the point. At this stage the RFI was not part of the local plan; so now the signatures can be ignored. We also asked if Blight was a valid point and we were told no because the RFI was not part of the local plan. Needless to say properties are not being sold at expected prices, because the RFI is known to be part of the future South Holland would like to see at Deeping St. Nicholas.

Looking at the fields in the last 7 years I have lived in the village the crops that are grown are mostly cereal, sugar beet, linseed, rape seed, and potatoes. This is hardly produce in the excepted word whereas North of Spalding cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, lettuce and daffodils are grown. Probably all crops that can sent by train easily.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

A new road has been built between Spalding and Peterborough and this is part of the new A16 and gives an easy run to Magna Park in Peterborough where the roads are not single carriageway BUT DUAL CARRIAGEWAY. Most habitation is hidden from the roads.

Network Rail have been asked by the Government to reduce costs and staff numbers so that we in UK can pay similar prices for fares as on the continent, currently we pay 25% more.

#### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal:

7.25.1 Air quality: The report shows any new development will have a minor positive / minor negative impact. As the intention is to bring large numbers of HGV,s through the village; the impact is more likely to be major negative for those of us who live in the village. Population about 2,400 including Hop Pole, Tongue End and Spalding Common, It could be more.

#### 7.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green infrastructure:

There are a number of Nature Reserves and Archaeological Sites within 10 kilometres which could be affected by ambient light and noise. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and English Heritage could help identify the sites.

#### 7.26.3 Climate change:

By definition a development will increase the greenhouse gas emissions within the village, as vehicles will come into the village to deliver products that are to go on the train. One of the purposes of the new A16 was to take gas emissions and noise out of villages.

#### 7.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: I do not

understand what this means as yet there is no reference to the number or types of jobs that may be provided.

7.26.5 Economy and Employment: We do not know what provisions for employment will be available, and we certainly do not know whether the transport fraternity will use the rail facility or decide to stay as they are.

7.26.6.Flood Risk As the land stands at the moment the risk of flooding may be a minor negative impact. Should 60 hectares of concrete and some extra tarmac be laid the developers will need to sort out good flood resilience. Living in Deeping St. Nicholas where there is no mains drainage and soil which is either silt or clay with a high water table getting rid of water, particularly as it has come in the last few years is not easy. Most of the septic tanks are emptied 2 or 3 times a year per house. This is due to the slowness of the water absorption into the soil. This depends on soil tests. The Deepings internal drainage board and the Environmental Agency are well aware of our problems

7.26.7 Historic Environment: We have two Bronze Age sites in the village. To see if there is a problem check with Lincolnshire Archaeology unit in Lincoln.

7.26.10 Landscape: Living in the fens means very little up or down movement in the land takes place. However light and noise travels a long way, and the RFI will have a detrimental effect on the ambient, which will prevent star-gazing.

7.26.11Transport: If the RFI is used its impact will be Major Negative for the village if the local transport companies decide to use the RFI. In the wider context it is possible that putting everything on the railway will make everything cleaner. The answer would be therefore, to find a site north of Spalding in an unpopulated area, rather than say to the residents of

Deeping St. Nicholas “we are going to make your life hell for the greater good.” This is not really what civilised society is about.

7.26.13. Conclusion. An RFI to handle all the produce is a wonderful idea, and there will be one we can use in Peterborough. Putting an RFI into Deeping St. Nicholas will only give the local council a few business but cause much upset physically and economically to the residents of the village. The new houses can still be filled with workers from Peterborough RFI and perhaps they will be able to catch a train from Spalding to Peterborough.

#### 7.27 Delivery

##### 7.27.1

The only option is not an RFI in Deeping St. Nicholas this is where the flawed thinking of the District Council. Having spoken to a Councillor in Peterborough, he and others in his Council thought that having two RFI's within 15 miles was not an economically viable. Perhaps in 20 years it may be necessary and then there would be experience and knowledge to make a sensible decision.

#### 7.28 Preferred Option:

7.28.1 Is not a reasonable option as explained in 7.27.1

---

Response\_Number:

1211

Persons\_Name:

Mr AJ and Mrs SJ Titcombe

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange.

Responses to various Paragraphs.

7.23 Why is it necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI?

Firstly the Proposed RFI will be 5 miles from Spalding, by road, and 12 miles from Peterborough by road. The rail distances will be much smaller in both cases. In consequence to this fact is the RFI needed at all.

7.24 Reasonable policy options:

7.24.1 When originally putting up four options – 3 were in Deeping St. Nicholas and one was near Gosberton which sits on Grade 1 agricultural land, and in consequence this was ruled out, so only three options remained and they were in a similar place but aligned slightly differently.

The public consultation showed the village was against it, and we raised 850 signatures to prove the point. At this stage the RFI was not part of the local plan; so now the signatures can be ignored. We also asked if Blight was a valid point and we were told no because the RFI was not part of the local plan. Needless to say properties are not being sold at expected prices, because the RFI is known to be part of the future South Holland would like to see at Deeping St. Nicholas.

Looking at the fields in the last 7 years I have lived in the village the crops that are grown are mostly cereal, sugar beet, linseed, rape seed, and potatoes. This is hardly produce in the excepted word whereas North of Spalding cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, lettuce and daffodils are grown. Probably all crops that can sent by train easily.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

A new road has been built between Spalding and Peterborough and this is part of the new A16 and gives an easy run to Magna Park in Peterborough where the roads are not single carriageway BUT DUAL CARRIAGEWAY. Most habitation is hidden from the roads.

Network Rail have been asked by the Government to reduce costs and staff numbers so that we in UK can pay similar prices for fares as on the continent, currently we pay 25% more.

#### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal:

7.25.1 Air quality: The report shows any new development will have a minor positive / minor negative impact. As the intention is to bring large numbers of HGV,s through the village; the impact is more likely to be major negative for those of us who live in the village. Population about 2,400 including Hop Pole, Tongue End and Spalding Common, It could be more.

#### 7.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green infrastructure:

There are a number of Nature Reserves and Archaeological Sites within 10 kilometres which could be affected by ambient light and noise. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and English Heritage could help identify the sites.

#### 7.26.3 Climate change:

By definition a development will increase the greenhouse gas emissions within the village, as vehicles will come into the village to deliver products that are to go on the train. One of the purposes of the new A16 was to take gas emissions and noise out of villages.

#### 7.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: I do not



understand what this means as yet there is no reference to the number or types of jobs that may be provided.

7.26.5 Economy and Employment: We do not know what provisions for employment will be available, and we certainly do not know whether the transport fraternity will use the rail facility or decide to stay as they are.

7.26.6.Flood Risk As the land stands at the moment the risk of flooding may be a minor negative impact. Should 60 hectares of concrete and some extra tarmac be laid the developers will need to sort out good flood resilience. Living in Deeping St. Nicholas where there is no mains drainage and soil which is either silt or clay with a high water table getting rid of water, particularly as it has come in the last few years is not easy. Most of the septic tanks are emptied 2 or 3 times a year per house. This is due to the slowness of the water absorption into the soil. This depends on soil tests. The Deepings internal drainage board and the Environmental Agency are well aware of our problems

7.26.7 Historic Environment: We have two Bronze Age sites in the village. To see if there is a problem check with Lincolnshire Archaeology unit in Lincoln.

7.26.10 Landscape: Living in the fens means very little up or down movement in the land takes place. However light and noise travels a long way, and the RFI will have a detrimental effect on the ambient, which will prevent star-gazing.

7.26.11Transport: If the RFI is used its impact will be Major Negative for the village if the local transport companies decide to use the RFI. In the wider context it is possible that putting everything on the railway will make everything cleaner. The answer would be therefore, to find a site north of Spalding in an unpopulated area, rather than say to the residents of

Deeping St. Nicholas “we are going to make your life hell for the greater good.” This is not really what civilised society is about.

7.26.13. Conclusion. An RFI to handle all the produce is a wonderful idea, and there will be one we can use in Peterborough. Putting an RFI into Deeping St. Nicholas will only give the local council a few business but cause much upset physically and economically to the residents of the village. The new houses can still be filled with workers from Peterborough RFI and perhaps they will be able to catch a train from Spalding to Peterborough.

#### 7.27 Delivery

##### 7.27.1

The only option is not an RFI in Deeping St. Nicholas this is where the flawed thinking of the District Council. Having spoken to a Councillor in Peterborough, he and others in his Council thought that having two RFI's within 15 miles was not an economically viable. Perhaps in 20 years it may be necessary and then there would be experience and knowledge to make a sensible decision.

#### 7.28 Preferred Option:

7.28.1 Is not a reasonable option as explained in 7.27.1

---

Response\_Number:

1212

Persons\_Name:

Mrs D Hare

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange.

Responses to various Paragraphs.

7.23 Why is it necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI?

Firstly the Proposed RFI will be 5 miles from Spalding, by road, and 12 miles from Peterborough by road. The rail distances will be much smaller in both cases. In consequence to this fact is the RFI needed at all.

7.24 Reasonable policy options:

7.24.1 When originally putting up four options – 3 were in Deeping St. Nicholas and one was near Gosberton which sits on Grade 1 agricultural land, and in consequence this was ruled out, so only three options remained and they were in a similar place but aligned slightly differently.

The public consultation showed the village was against it, and we raised 850 signatures to prove the point. At this stage the RFI was not part of the local plan; so now the signatures can be ignored. We also asked if Blight was a valid point and we were told no because the RFI was not part of the local plan. Needless to say properties are not being sold at expected prices, because the RFI is known to be part of the future South Holland would like to see at Deeping St. Nicholas.

Looking at the fields in the last 7 years I have lived in the village the crops that are grown are mostly cereal, sugar beet, linseed, rape seed, and potatoes. This is hardly produce in the excepted word whereas North of Spalding cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, lettuce and daffodils are grown. Probably all crops that can sent by train easily.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

A new road has been built between Spalding and Peterborough and this is part of the new A16 and gives an easy run to Magna Park in Peterborough where the roads are not single carriageway BUT DUAL CARRIAGEWAY. Most habitation is hidden from the roads.

Network Rail have been asked by the Government to reduce costs and staff numbers so that we in UK can pay similar prices for fares as on the continent, currently we pay 25% more.

#### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal:

7.25.1 Air quality: The report shows any new development will have a minor positive / minor negative impact. As the intention is to bring large numbers of HGV,s through the village; the impact is more likely to be major negative for those of us who live in the village. Population about 2,400 including Hop Pole, Tongue End and Spalding Common, It could be more.

#### 7.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green infrastructure:

There are a number of Nature Reserves and Archaeological Sites within 10 kilometres which could be affected by ambient light and noise. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and English Heritage could help identify the sites.

#### 7.26.3 Climate change:

By definition a development will increase the greenhouse gas emissions within the village, as vehicles will come into the village to deliver products that are to go on the train. One of the purposes of the new A16 was to take gas emissions and noise out of villages.

#### 7.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: I do not

understand what this means as yet there is no reference to the number or types of jobs that may be provided.

7.26.5 Economy and Employment: We do not know what provisions for employment will be available, and we certainly do not know whether the transport fraternity will use the rail facility or decide to stay as they are.

7.26.6.Flood Risk As the land stands at the moment the risk of flooding may be a minor negative impact. Should 60 hectares of concrete and some extra tarmac be laid the developers will need to sort out good flood resilience. Living in Deeping St. Nicholas where there is no mains drainage and soil which is either silt or clay with a high water table getting rid of water, particularly as it has come in the last few years is not easy. Most of the septic tanks are emptied 2 or 3 times a year per house. This is due to the slowness of the water absorption into the soil. This depends on soil tests. The Deepings internal drainage board and the Environmental Agency are well aware of our problems

7.26.7 Historic Environment: We have two Bronze Age sites in the village. To see if there is a problem check with Lincolnshire Archaeology unit in Lincoln.

7.26.10 Landscape: Living in the fens means very little up or down movement in the land takes place. However light and noise travels a long way, and the RFI will have a detrimental effect on the ambient, which will prevent star-gazing.

7.26.11Transport: If the RFI is used its impact will be Major Negative for the village if the local transport companies decide to use the RFI. In the wider context it is possible that putting everything on the railway will make everything cleaner. The answer would be therefore, to find a site north of Spalding in an unpopulated area, rather than say to the residents of

Deeping St. Nicholas “we are going to make your life hell for the greater good.” This is not really what civilised society is about.

7.26.13. Conclusion. An RFI to handle all the produce is a wonderful idea, and there will be one we can use in Peterborough. Putting an RFI into Deeping St. Nicholas will only give the local council a few business but cause much upset physically and economically to the residents of the village. The new houses can still be filled with workers from Peterborough RFI and perhaps they will be able to catch a train from Spalding to Peterborough.

#### 7.27 Delivery

##### 7.27.1

The only option is not an RFI in Deeping St. Nicholas this is where the flawed thinking of the District Council. Having spoken to a Councillor in Peterborough, he and others in his Council thought that having two RFI's within 15 miles was not an economically viable. Perhaps in 20 years it may be necessary and then there would be experience and knowledge to make a sensible decision.

#### 7.28 Preferred Option:

7.28.1 Is not a reasonable option as explained in 7.27.1

---

Response\_Number:

1213

Persons\_Name:

Mr K and Mrs D Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange.

Responses to various Paragraphs.

7.23 Why is it necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI?

Firstly the Proposed RFI will be 5 miles from Spalding, by road, and 12 miles from Peterborough by road. The rail distances will be much smaller in both cases. In consequence to this fact is the RFI needed at all.

7.24 Reasonable policy options:

7.24.1 When originally putting up four options – 3 were in Deeping St. Nicholas and one was near Gosberton which sits on Grade 1 agricultural land, and in consequence this was ruled out, so only three options remained and they were in a similar place but aligned slightly differently.

The public consultation showed the village was against it, and we raised 850 signatures to prove the point. At this stage the RFI was not part of the local plan; so now the signatures can be ignored. We also asked if Blight was a valid point and we were told no because the RFI was not part of the local plan. Needless to say properties are not being sold at expected prices, because the RFI is known to be part of the future South Holland would like to see at Deeping St. Nicholas.

Looking at the fields in the last 7 years I have lived in the village the crops that are grown are mostly cereal, sugar beet, linseed, rape seed, and potatoes. This is hardly produce in the excepted word whereas North of Spalding cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, lettuce and daffodils are grown. Probably all crops that can sent by train easily.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

A new road has been built between Spalding and Peterborough and this is part of the new A16 and gives an easy run to Magna Park in Peterborough where the roads are not single carriageway BUT DUAL CARRIAGEWAY. Most habitation is hidden from the roads.

Network Rail have been asked by the Government to reduce costs and staff numbers so that we in UK can pay similar prices for fares as on the continent, currently we pay 25% more.

#### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal:

7.25.1 Air quality: The report shows any new development will have a minor positive / minor negative impact. As the intention is to bring large numbers of HGV,s through the village; the impact is more likely to be major negative for those of us who live in the village. Population about 2,400 including Hop Pole, Tongue End and Spalding Common, It could be more.

#### 7.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green infrastructure:

There are a number of Nature Reserves and Archaeological Sites within 10 kilometres which could be affected by ambient light and noise. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and English Heritage could help identify the sites.

#### 7.26.3 Climate change:

By definition a development will increase the greenhouse gas emissions within the village, as vehicles will come into the village to deliver products that are to go on the train. One of the purposes of the new A16 was to take gas emissions and noise out of villages.

#### 7.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: I do not



understand what this means as yet there is no reference to the number or types of jobs that may be provided.

7.26.5 Economy and Employment: We do not know what provisions for employment will be available, and we certainly do not know whether the transport fraternity will use the rail facility or decide to stay as they are.

7.26.6.Flood Risk As the land stands at the moment the risk of flooding may be a minor negative impact. Should 60 hectares of concrete and some extra tarmac be laid the developers will need to sort out good flood resilience. Living in Deeping St. Nicholas where there is no mains drainage and soil which is either silt or clay with a high water table getting rid of water, particularly as it has come in the last few years is not easy. Most of the septic tanks are emptied 2 or 3 times a year per house. This is due to the slowness of the water absorption into the soil. This depends on soil tests. The Deepings internal drainage board and the Environmental Agency are well aware of our problems

7.26.7 Historic Environment: We have two Bronze Age sites in the village. To see if there is a problem check with Lincolnshire Archaeology unit in Lincoln.

7.26.10 Landscape: Living in the fens means very little up or down movement in the land takes place. However light and noise travels a long way, and the RFI will have a detrimental effect on the ambient, which will prevent star-gazing.

7.26.11Transport: If the RFI is used its impact will be Major Negative for the village if the local transport companies decide to use the RFI. In the wider context it is possible that putting everything on the railway will make everything cleaner. The answer would be therefore, to find a site north of Spalding in an unpopulated area, rather than say to the residents of

Deeping St. Nicholas “we are going to make your life hell for the greater good.” This is not really what civilised society is about.

7.26.13. Conclusion. An RFI to handle all the produce is a wonderful idea, and there will be one we can use in Peterborough. Putting an RFI into Deeping St. Nicholas will only give the local council a few business but cause much upset physically and economically to the residents of the village. The new houses can still be filled with workers from Peterborough RFI and perhaps they will be able to catch a train from Spalding to Peterborough.

#### 7.27 Delivery

##### 7.27.1

The only option is not an RFI in Deeping St. Nicholas this is where the flawed thinking of the District Council. Having spoken to a Councillor in Peterborough, he and others in his Council thought that having two RFI's within 15 miles was not an economically viable. Perhaps in 20 years it may be necessary and then there would be experience and knowledge to make a sensible decision.

#### 7.28 Preferred Option:

7.28.1 Is not a reasonable option as explained in 7.27.1

---

Response\_Number:

1214

Persons\_Name:

Mr and Mrs B Firmager

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange.

Responses to various Paragraphs.

7.23 Why is it necessary to determine an approach for promoting the development of a Spalding RFI?

Firstly the Proposed RFI will be 5 miles from Spalding, by road, and 12 miles from Peterborough by road. The rail distances will be much smaller in both cases. In consequence to this fact is the RFI needed at all.

7.24 Reasonable policy options:

7.24.1 When originally putting up four options – 3 were in Deeping St. Nicholas and one was near Gosberton which sits on Grade 1 agricultural land, and in consequence this was ruled out, so only three options remained and they were in a similar place but aligned slightly differently.

The public consultation showed the village was against it, and we raised 850 signatures to prove the point. At this stage the RFI was not part of the local plan; so now the signatures can be ignored. We also asked if Blight was a valid point and we were told no because the RFI was not part of the local plan. Needless to say properties are not being sold at expected prices, because the RFI is known to be part of the future South Holland would like to see at Deeping St. Nicholas.

Looking at the fields in the last 7 years I have lived in the village the crops that are grown are mostly cereal, sugar beet, linseed, rape seed, and potatoes. This is hardly produce in the excepted word whereas North of Spalding cabbages, cauliflowers, potatoes, lettuce and daffodils are grown. Probably all crops that can sent by train easily.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. Impact on house prices is not a material consideration in planning decisions. The SA will be revisited in the next stage of the plan-making process and the comments made will be taken into account.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

A new road has been built between Spalding and Peterborough and this is part of the new A16 and gives an easy run to Magna Park in Peterborough where the roads are not single carriageway BUT DUAL CARRIAGEWAY. Most habitation is hidden from the roads.

Network Rail have been asked by the Government to reduce costs and staff numbers so that we in UK can pay similar prices for fares as on the continent, currently we pay 25% more.

#### 7.26 Sustainability Appraisal:

7.25.1 Air quality: The report shows any new development will have a minor positive / minor negative impact. As the intention is to bring large numbers of HGV,s through the village; the impact is more likely to be major negative for those of us who live in the village. Population about 2,400 including Hop Pole, Tongue End and Spalding Common, It could be more.

#### 7.26.2 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Green infrastructure:

There are a number of Nature Reserves and Archaeological Sites within 10 kilometres which could be affected by ambient light and noise. Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and English Heritage could help identify the sites.

#### 7.26.3 Climate change:

By definition a development will increase the greenhouse gas emissions within the village, as vehicles will come into the village to deliver products that are to go on the train. One of the purposes of the new A16 was to take gas emissions and noise out of villages.

#### 7.26.4 Community, Health and Well-being: I do not

understand what this means as yet there is no reference to the number or types of jobs that may be provided.

7.26.5 Economy and Employment: We do not know what provisions for employment will be available, and we certainly do not know whether the transport fraternity will use the rail facility or decide to stay as they are.

7.26.6.Flood Risk As the land stands at the moment the risk of flooding may be a minor negative impact. Should 60 hectares of concrete and some extra tarmac be laid the developers will need to sort out good flood resilience. Living in Deeping St. Nicholas where there is no mains drainage and soil which is either silt or clay with a high water table getting rid of water, particularly as it has come in the last few years is not easy. Most of the septic tanks are emptied 2 or 3 times a year per house. This is due to the slowness of the water absorption into the soil. This depends on soil tests. The Deepings internal drainage board and the Environmental Agency are well aware of our problems

7.26.7 Historic Environment: We have two Bronze Age sites in the village. To see if there is a problem check with Lincolnshire Archaeology unit in Lincoln.

7.26.10 Landscape: Living in the fens means very little up or down movement in the land takes place. However light and noise travels a long way, and the RFI will have a detrimental effect on the ambient, which will prevent star-gazing.

7.26.11Transport: If the RFI is used its impact will be Major Negative for the village if the local transport companies decide to use the RFI. In the wider context it is possible that putting everything on the railway will make everything cleaner. The answer would be therefore, to find a site north of Spalding in an unpopulated area, rather than say to the residents of

Deeping St. Nicholas “we are going to make your life hell for the greater good.” This is not really what civilised society is about.

7.26.13. Conclusion. An RFI to handle all the produce is a wonderful idea, and there will be one we can use in Peterborough. Putting an RFI into Deeping St. Nicholas will only give the local council a few business but cause much upset physically and economically to the residents of the village. The new houses can still be filled with workers from Peterborough RFI and perhaps they will be able to catch a train from Spalding to Peterborough.

#### 7.27 Delivery

##### 7.27.1

The only option is not an RFI in Deeping St. Nicholas this is where the flawed thinking of the District Council. Having spoken to a Councillor in Peterborough, he and others in his Council thought that having two RFI's within 15 miles was not an economically viable. Perhaps in 20 years it may be necessary and then there would be experience and knowledge to make a sensible decision.

#### 7.28 Preferred Option:

7.28.1 Is not a reasonable option as explained in 7.27.1

---

Response\_Number: 1249

Persons\_Name: Mr J Brown

Representing\_Who?: Ambrose Lighton

Respondents\_Comments:

Q55 - Is it appropriate for the threshold for an 'impact test' to be set at 500 square metres for centres other than Boston and Spalding?

The NPPF explains that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres, which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, the threshold above which local planning authorities should require an impact assessment is 2,500m<sup>2</sup>. Although it explains that Local Authorities can set their own threshold, it must be "proportionate". The Council have not provided any justification for the threshold chosen, explanation of alternative thresholds considered, or evidence that the threshold chosen is proportionate. In the absence of this to justify a lower threshold the 2,500m<sup>2</sup> threshold in the NPPF should be adopted.

We are concerned that the proposals to lower the threshold for impact testing on sites outside the defined centres of Boston and Spalding will be counter-productive and rather than serving to protect these centres may actually stifle the growth and expansion of other locations. As well as inhibiting medium and larger scale developments elsewhere in the Borough which may generate a specific need for retail use which could also provide cross subsidy for housing.

We trust that these representations will be appropriately registered and given due consideration in the formulation of the next stages of the plan. We would be grateful if you could keep us informed of the next stages in the plan process and we would welcome the opportunity to be involved in any working groups or stakeholder participation event.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The preferred policy approach is seeking to protect lower order centres. Importantly, the policy does not rule out development of a larger scale in settlements other than Boston and Spalding.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1282

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Coathup

Representing\_Who?:

Lincolnshire County Council

Respondents\_Comments:

23. Lincolnshire is one of the most important agricultural and horticultural areas in England. However, it also supports other sectors of the economy such as tourism and manufacturing. Key issues emerging from the evidence base are:

- a. No need to identify additional employment land;
- b. A need to identify a network and hierarchy of town centres, primary shopping areas and surplus retail capacity (a Retail Study is in progress);
- c. A need to support existing businesses and new inward investment;
- d. How to promote the rural economy including tourism;
- e. Where and how to promote a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange (RFI).
- f.

24. The above issues will be addressed using a broad policy approach, including a proposal to identify a broad location for a Spalding RFI of up to 60 hectares in accordance with the findings of the Inter-modality Study and South Holland DC's decision following it.

ECC Economy and Culture note that whilst it might not be necessary to identify new sites now, this policy should be kept under close review so that future employment land can be identified at an early stage in the medium to long term. They also support the Rail Freight Interchange as an important opportunity to enhance economic growth, job creation and facilitate modal shift in transporting of goods.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.



Response\_Number:

1283

Persons\_Name:

Deeping St Nicholas P C

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

9.1.1 – To seek to improve the quality of life for everyone who lives, visits and invests in South East Lincolnshire by protecting and enhancing access to homes, employment, retail, education., healthcare, community and leisure facilities and open space To ensure that development contributes to the provision of necessary physical, social and green infrastructure to deliver planned levels of growth and mitigate its impacts on existing communities and the environment.  
The development of a Rail Freight Interchange on land so close to the village of Deeping St Nicholas will have a severe detrimental effect on the daily lives of the residents through the 24 hour planned rail freight activities. This will bring to the people air pollution, light pollution, noise pollution and also have an impact on the noise generated by the coming and going of heavy goods vehicles and trains. All of the aforementioned will impact severely and may cause stress to the local residents and a poor quality of life.

9.1.2 – The planning system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. Local planning authorities should create a shared vision with communities of the residential environment and facilities they wish to see. The local community of Deeping St Nicholas do not share the vision with the South Holland District Council for a Road Freight Interchange in the parish and would therefore request the proposal for inclusion in the South East Lincs Local Plan, be removed.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The railway line will be subject to more frequent use by freight trains as a result of Network Rail's upgrade of the 'Joint Line' irrespective of whether a RFI goes ahead or not. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1284

Persons\_Name:

Deeping St Nicholas P C

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

7.1.1. The following Local Plan strategic priorities are relevant:

- To provide the right conditions and sufficient land in appropriate locations to diversify and strengthen the economic base of South East Lincolnshire to meet the needs of existing companies.

Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council agree that the right conditions and sufficient land in appropriate locations is required to strengthen the local economy, but this will be at the detriment of the residents of Deeping St Nicholas through, as afore-mentioned, air, light and noise pollution on a 24 hour basis. This location is not the appropriate location and another more suitable location, away from the homes of residential properties should be sought by the District Council.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1285

Persons\_Name:

Deeping St Nicholas P C

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Q57 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 7.23 – 7.28 under Approach to the Identification of a Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange in the full consultation document. The choice on land in Deeping St Nicholas for the Spalding Rail Freight Interchange is still questionable. Historically it has been evident from the work and action of RAIL (Rally Against Industrialisation of the Landscape) as a campaign group. The decision by South Holland District Council to select this site for the Road Freight Interchange in light of objections from this group were not considered either from the offset or when a representation was made to the Council. A request was made to SHDC to “Call In” their decision on the land selected in Deeping St Nicholas, and the Councillors agreed to uphold their original decision. It has been clear from the offset that the people of Deeping St Nicholas did not want this land as being the identified site for the Rail Freight Interchange, and the people of Deeping St Nicholas Parish were ignored.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1286	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Deeping St Nicholas P C	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Themselves
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q58 - Do you support the development of a Rail Freight Interchange in the Spalding area as outlined in the preferred policy approach 'Broad Location for a Spalding Rail Freight Interchange?</p> <p>Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council would support the development of a Rail Freight Interchange in the Spalding area, if evidence was presented to show there is a need for such a rail interchange. Many supermarkets do not wish to use rail freight for the Lincolnshire sourced produce as it is not viable for some products to be in close proximity with each other prior to hitting the supermarket shelves. Also there would be the delay on loading all of the carriages, whilst the first loaded carriages could have arrived at their destination with their fresh produce by road, during the time all carriages are being loaded.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1287	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Deeping St Nicholas P C	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Themselves
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q59 – Do you agree that a Rail Freight Interchange should be built at Deeping Fen?</p> <p>The site at Deeping St Nicholas is not the most suitable location for the Rail Freight Interchange. The road A16 has been downgraded to the A1175 and this road and other local roads would not be able to accommodate the high volume of traffic that would be generated from this interchange.</p> <p>The siting of this Rail Freight Interchange would change this rural area/village to an urban district. People, who live here, did not wish to live in an urban area. This Rail Freight Interchange will change the landscape of this area dramatically.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1288

Persons\_Name:

Deeping St Nicholas P C

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Q60 – What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest?  
When projects such as a proposed Rail Freight Interchange or a proposed Power Station or other similar projects are pursued, all residents within the vicinity (say a 5 mile radius) should receive a letter outlining brief details of the proposals. This would therefore bring to each and everyone’s attention the potential life changing proposals set down by their local district council.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The Council is confident that it has undertaken adequate consultation measures in respect of this proposal.  
  
The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1289

Persons\_Name:

Deeping St Nicholas P C

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

1, Inclusion in the South East Lincs Local Plan states that 60 hectares of land will be utilised. 15 hectares for the Rail Freight Interchange with the remainder 45 hectares being used for associated businesses. The 45 hectares will evolve into an industrial estate, similar to that of Enterprise Park, Pinchbeck. The land at Pinchbeck was set aside in the original South Holland District Local Plan as land for commercial and industrial development, but this 60 hectares on land in Deeping St Nicholas is prime agricultural/horticultural land which could be used for the purpose that is as existing.

2. The Parish Council have to voice the concerns of the residents of Deeping St Nicholas, all of whom do not want this Rail Freight Interchange to be sited in the parish of Deeping St Nicholas. This will drastically change a rural, quiet village into a village that will be located adjacent to a 24 hour industrial Operation.. There will be consistent and continual noise, dust and light flooding through the village and the homes of the people who live in Deeping St Nicholas.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The preferred policy approach is worded to ensure that a RFI facility must occur before associated land is developed, and also that any enterprises developing on the site must have an 'operational requirement to be in close proximity to the RFI'.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1333	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Question 49 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1334	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Question 50 – No, but see response to question 60		This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The 45 hectares allocated at the RFI is in addition to existing employment land allocations.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.	

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1335	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>		<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	
Question 51 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1336	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>		<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	
Question 52 – P.180, Blue Box, Para 1 – Add to end of first sentence: “as existing commitments and allocations are more than sufficient.”		<p>These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.</p> <p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.</p>		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).	

---



Response_Number:	1337	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 53 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1338	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Question 54 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response\_Number:

1339

Persons\_Name:

Mr J Charlesworth

Representing\_Who?:

Spalding and District Civic Society

Respondents\_Comments:

Question 55 – Yes

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

1340

Persons\_Name:

Mr J Charlesworth

Representing\_Who?:

Spalding and District Civic Society

Respondents\_Comments:

Question 56 – P. 182, Blue Box – Para. 1, first sentence – As a sub-regional centre Spalding must of course be the location for those institutions which embody its status (e.g. local government, magistrates courts, etc.). Therefore, after “including” insert “administration”.  
P. 182, Blue Box – Para. 1, third sentence – Strengthen by replacing “be tightly controlled” with: “not be permitted”.  
P. 182, Blue Box – Para. 1 c) Tables – Need clarifying. “Convenience” and “comparison” in their technical planning sense are not generally understood by the layman; and we find “constant retention” and “rising retention” unintelligible. They all require glossing or otherwise making clear.  
Town and Other Centres - We are not sure whether this or the Environment section is the appropriate place for a policy that requires the local authority to produce design or development briefs for all large town centre sites that are vacant or obviously in need of redevelopment. (In Spalding, the former currently include the derelict land between the Crescent and the Market Place and the former Welland Hospital site; the latter the former Sorting Office and land north of the Bus Station). Without such briefs, the sites are at the mercy of the developer, who may very well produce proposals that are unsatisfactory but which no-one can find planning grounds for rejecting. (For example, what happened on the former Finning’s site in Westlode Street.) Planning authorities surely need to be more than merely re-active.

Officer\_Response:

These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1341	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>		<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	
Question 57 – The assumption underlying the whole of this section is unjustified. SHDC may have taken the decision, but that does not mean that it is necessarily right. Councillors now readily admit that their decision to allow the Holland Market development to face away from the historic centre was wrong (as the Civic Society argued at the time); and the former Urban District Council’s vote in favour of an ‘inner relief road’ that would have smashed the town centre apart to permanently entrench the A16 would have been a catastrophe, had it gone ahead. (It was the Civic Society that spear-headed the opposition and fought for years to secure the bypass that should have been proposed at the start.) The SHDC decision on the proposed RFI is obviously material, but not decisive. Second thoughts are sometimes wiser than first, and the draft Local Plan should be examining the issue independently.		This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.	
		These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.			

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1342	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>		<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	
Question 59 – If the RFI is to be built, then this seems to be the appropriate place.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	
		The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.			

Response\_Number:

1343

Persons\_Name:

Mr J Charlesworth

Representing\_Who?:

Spalding and District Civic Society

Respondents\_Comments:

Question 60 – We have not been able to discover whether the 45 hectares allocated for industrial development at the proposed RFI is included in the “more than sufficient” employment land already allocated for industrial development or whether it is additional. If the latter, then it is surely very relevant to the concern expressed at the end of Para. 7.25.1.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. The 45 hectares allocated at the RFI is in addition to existing employment land allocations.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1363

Persons\_Name:

P A & S E Chester

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

Whilst I have minimal issues with the rail freight hub, I have considerable concerns regarding what is, I believe, the final objective - that is, wholesale development of an industrial park on prime agricultural land in a village environment.

My Objections are as follows:

1 The vast increase in road traffic on what is a recently down graded, relatively minor, road, the A1175. This is barely 7 metres wide in places and not safe for two lorries to pass. It is certainly going to increase dangers for other road users and anyone unwise enough to cycle or even walk on the very narrow pavements.

2 Increase in air, noise and light pollution particularly from constructed units, lighting and traffic arriving / departing after dark. This will have an immediate impact on the rights of villagers to enjoy their properties (and a good nights sleep) in peace and privacy.

3 The use of prime agricultural land as a building plot at a time when the population world wide is increasing dramatically and food prices are rising. In the future, countries will have to be increasingly self sufficient in food production. I truly do not believe we can afford to build on such a large area of good quality land.

4 Whilst not wishing to be insulting, I wonder if sufficient research has been done, by specialists, into the need for this form of development, so close to other rail hubs and so far from main road / motorway networks. Are the proposed users fully aware of the implications of transporting any fresh produce by rail? I would hate to see the fiasco of the Red Lion Quarter repeated, at the expense of our countryside and people but repeated to a factor unimaginably greater.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process. The County Council as Highway Authority has, to date, not voiced indicated any highway concerns in relation to the promotion of this proposal.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1364

Persons\_Name:

Mr W Bishop

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

As a retired farmer and someone who has lived in this area for over Seventy years, I cannot understand my council considering the prospect of a rail hub here. We have some of the best farmland in England and feeding the future population is going to be the most important thing in the coming years. South Holland District Council should be leading a campaign to stop development on this precious land. You Should all take a look at the crops growing there now. S.H.D.C should aim to be remembered as the local council that helped to provided food for their grandchildren.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.

The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1367

Persons\_Name:

Sutton Bridge P C

Representing\_Who?:

Themselves

Respondents\_Comments:

I would like to suggest that the Wingland industrial site is de-allocated and withdrawn from the local plan , this is something Cllr Roger Gambba- Jones said we should have done beforehand if we did not wish to encourage undesirable industry. This site has too many residential properties adjacent to it and it too close to the Wash , which is an SPA, SSI and RAMSAR site and is a zone 3 flood risk area.

A more suitable site for industry is north of the A17 by-pass to the rear of Princes Food, this would allow traffic including the HGV's to access the A17 by- pass linking up with the round-a-bout and will deter traffic from travelling through Sutton Bridge.

Further development of the port should only be allowed if a new road is created to link up with the A17 at Little Sutton/ Princes Food site. This would protect the amenity of residents.

Leisure and tourism should be a priority, it would encourage new development, keep existing shops open and add to the quality of life for residents .

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. Site -specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.

These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer Recommendation:

Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD



<u>Response_Number:</u>	1416	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q49 Adherence to a Plan that identified employment land use on the basis of taking work to the people rather than encouraging people to move to their work has created the dereliction that blights so many areas in The UK.</p> <p>The 'raison de entre' towns and communities focused on extractive industry dies when the extractive industry runs out of, or the extraction materials become too expensive and the work moves. Public and private social capital loses its value.</p> <p>Unless an area has other attractive economic factors the community will die.</p> <p>The concentration of employment land in clusters creates opportunities for outsourcing fringe activities which creates opportunities for innovative entrepreneurs to develop out sourcing activities (i.e. Hot snack catering in Enterprise Park ) Small scale start up units are likely to remain small scale .</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments Noted	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1417	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q50 The total supply of land suitable for employment purposes (given the potential of the rail/ road freight interchange) seems sufficient but the clue will be in its location. Concentration of housing growth in Boston and Spalding implies that is where most anticipated growth in employment will occur (reducing the need of travel) It would be prudent to identify some addition sites for employment even if the Freight Hub fails to materialise.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Comments noted. Site -specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.</p> <p>The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1418	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q51 There are many examples of small businesses operating in the middle of older and even new residential developments. Businesses and homes do not always make good neighbours. Businesses need room and capital to grow and create new jobs. If businesses can realise the capital value of their site they can access cheap capital. Relocation to a more appropriate site in a business park can generate jobs. In the age of austerity cheap capital for growth is not always easy to come by. A business may be failing or cannot be sold as a going concern. This policy perpetuates the prospect of continuing poor neighbour relationships and will ultimate create an unsightly brown field site which will in the end be reclassified as potential residential land. Sites in a 'business park' have no realistic alternative use but for employment land. This policy is more likely to inhibit rather than encourage employment creation.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	It is considered that the preferred policy approach to 'Employment Land and Premises' addresses this matter adequately.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1419	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q52 A stronger indication that the plan would seek to provide additional employment land in Boston and Spalding and that the policy preserving existing employment sites as employment sites in perpetuity be abandoned.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Comments Noted	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1420	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr P Walls	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Himself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	TOWN AND OTHER CENTRES	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

The policies in this section are focused a preserving appropriate town centre uses after the horse has bolted.

The futures threat comes from on line shopping. The major retailers have realised that they can retain their and increase their share of the market by developing their online mix and reduces their costs by reducing the geographical spread of their retail outlets, for example Burtons tailoring In Spalding. It is no longer necessary for national retailers to maintain a presence in every high street. (online convenience shopping is now available at Sainsbury's in Spalding)

Q53 While I support the preferred option I am not convinced the Plan addresses the right issues

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1421	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr P Walls	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Himself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q54 The proposed hierarchy of centres is appropriate. It helps focus on the different needs necessary to sustain their commercial viability.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

1422

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Q55 The aim is Plan is to sustain the commercial viability of Boston and Spalding. While I supportive of the intention to require a impact assessment on any out of town development exceeding 500sq m for the centres other than Spalding, their roles as convenience and top up shopping centres must be protected. For any out of town retail development in excess of2500sqm it is appropriate that the NPPF default requirement that an impact assessment must be the minimum requirement.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1423

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Q56 The Plan thrust should be to protect the existing town centre usage Boston and Spalding. A first aim should be to tighten the current town centre boundaries and reclassify the primary and secondary retail street frontages. Town centre sprawl is no longer a sign of retail vitality. These tighter boundaries should facilitate proposals to change of use to offices or residential occupation of redundant retail units. Change of use within the town centres to encourage more evening economy activities to supplement day time economic activities. (Ex Starbucks in Burtons ) Robustly oppose the accumulative impact of too many fast food outlets , gambling outlets and charity shops. But primarily identify potential sites for car parking for visitors to the town centre and for people who work in the town centre. For visitors car parks need to be within 250m of the town centres offering well lit secure attractive covered walkways into the town centre's In Spalding the Plan envisages an increase of potentially 20000 additional residents in 7000+ new build homes for whom the town will be their nearest town centre . On a vehicle movement of 12 journey's per day per household ( no longer used by the county in predicting traffic flows) this is potentially an additional @60000 vehicular movements per day for many of which Spalding will be the destination. Identify potential car park sites now. The existing car parking facilities are just adequate. The most obvious location would be to allocate the semi-derelict land to the east of the railway line with its potential access from the Pinchbeck Road West Elloe junction.

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. Site -specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD. These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

Officer Recommendation:

Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1424	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr P Walls	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Himself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	RAIL/ROAD FREIGHT INTERCHANGE RAIL HUB	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Q57 A preferred site has been identified.  
There is no need to reopen the locational debate.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1425	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr P Walls	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Himself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q58 I have some reservations about the economic viability of the proposed freight interchange. The import of raw foods for processing and packaging remains the most important economic activity in terms of employment of the Plan Area. The preferred site is a nodal point for firms across the processing and packaging industry in the area and beyond. Most of the industries output is sold in the UK through a retail chain still wedded to road network distribution. For the foreseeable future the end products will be distributed by road. The economies of return loads are not likely as UK brands are not sold in significant volume overseas. The Plan area is too remote from the potential mass market for the 'Hub' to be a significant distribution centre for general imported comparative goods. The is a plethora of Rail/Road interchange proposals many in much more economic locations than South East Lincolnshire. I hope I am proved wrong.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document. There is currently no robust evidence to question the need for a RFI, nor to suggest a more suitable alternative location. Moreover, we are aware of continued developer and operator interest in this proposal. The detailed consequences of developing a RFI will be addressed through the Site Allocations DPD and the development management process.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	1426	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Q56 This site is the best nodal point location for the businesses the 'Hub ' would serve with the best road connection. This is the optimal location site.	Officer_Response:	Support noted.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	Officer_Recommendation:	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	1427	Persons_Name:	Mr P Walls	Representing_Who?:	Himself
Respondents_Comments:	Q60 If built the site should have a direct connection north via Pode Hole from the Hub to the A151 . This requirement should be a Planning Consent condition.	Officer_Response:	Comments noted. Site -specific considerations such as these will be addressed later in the plan-making process, specifically through the Site Allocations DPD.  The RFI Policy has been excluded from the latest draft of the Local Plan.	Officer_Recommendation:	Representations beyond the remit of the Local Plan or to be addressed in the preparation of the Site Allocations DPD

---