

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

**Chapter\_Name:** 05 Sustainable Development and Spatial Strat

**Response\_Number:** 7

**Persons\_Name:** John Honor

**Representing\_Who?:** Himself

**Respondents\_Comments:**

The settlements of Saracens Head/Holbeach Bank/Holbeach Clough should be considered one village and be included in the Service Village category. The villages of Saracens Head/Holbeach Bank/Holbeach Clough are contiguous and function as one complete settlement which is larger than some already included service villages. They share common facilities: school, village hall, Pub, Garage, Agricultural engineers and a limited bus service. Recently a mains sewerage system has been installed serving all three villages as one. Without the infill development allowed in Service Villages there would be no newcomers to invigorate the population and the services will gradually decline and be lost. The post Office, shops and butchers have already gone. The status of service Village gives a better chance of gaining improved services and funding, e.g. bus service, school, village hall. If you are including Deeping St Nicholas, Moulton Chapel and Swineshead Bridge as Service Villages, then our settlement must be a candidate for similar treatment. We have three separate names and cross parish boundaries but we are one village.

**Officer\_Response:**

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

**Officer\_Recommendation:**

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.

Response\_Number:

8

Persons\_Name:

Mr M J Leatherland

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

In the proposal to re-classify a number of settlements as service centres Kirton End sits alongside villages such as Fishtoft, Quadring and Bicker to name just three. Kirton End differs from many of the other proposed settlements in that it is little bigger than a hamlet. It has no shops, no public transport, no village hall or organised social structure and no churches or chapels. Furthermore the sewage system has only recently been installed to many properties, still leaving a good many on the fringes of the village with no mains sewage due to the impracticalities of vacuum pumping over further distances. It is likely that significant development would require a disproportionate effort in upgrading the super structure of the village compared to the rewards in relation to the plan as a whole.

I would consider that maintain the existing option A strategy of continuing the baseline hierarchy would be preferable to promoting these villages, or if option B is to be considered it might be pertinent to remove some of the settlements with fewer existing services from the option.

On the Boston relief road it is clear that this is being included as a long term consideration but I do not fully understand from the outline corridor drawing firstly how the road would get access through an already heavily populated area of Wyberton and why it would also cut through area B8, one of the few areas identified as a reasonable proposition for significant housing development.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

Response\_Number:

15

Persons\_Name:

Bob Merchant

Representing\_Who?:

David Alexander

Respondents\_Comments:

Housing allocation in all rural villages (infill / brown field sites). Rural villages need to be allowed to have a small amount of development to enable the existing facilities to be retained.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number:

30

Persons\_Name:

Paul Tame

Representing\_Who?:

NFU

Respondents\_Comments:

We agree with option A and the list of development set out in the fourth bullet point on page 76. Other planning policies do not unduly restrict development in the allowed categories.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

42

Persons\_Name:

Martin Bagshaw

Representing\_Who?:

Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy

Respondents\_Comments:

Our client wishes to object to the preferred Option B (dispersed growth) as a strategy for growth as this pattern of development would result in numerous small sites being delivered without the benefit of critical mass needed to deliver infrastructure improvements. Such a pattern of development is also contrary to Part 4 of the NPPF in that it does not make best use of established services, facilities and public transport or discourage use of private motor vehicles.

Option A in contrast provides for a strong settlement hierarchy based on a thorough and quantified assessment as to the sustainability of each settlement and provides a much more robust basis for growth. The established Sub-Regional Centres and Main Service Centres would remain the principal locations for new development in the plan period as the most sustainable settlements to accommodate the proposed level of new housing development.

Officer\_Response:

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.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	43	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Martin Bagshaw	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr and Mrs Mc Carthy
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Our client wishes to object to the preferred Option B (dispersed growth) as a strategy for growth as this pattern of development would result in numerous small sites being delivered without the benefit of critical mass needed to deliver infrastructure improvements. Such a pattern of development is also contrary to Part 4 of the NPPF in that it does not make best use of established services, facilities and public transport or discourage use of private motor vehicles. Option A in contrast provides for a strong settlement hierarchy based on a thorough and quantified assessment as to the sustainability of each settlement and provides a much more robust basis for growth. The established Sub-Regional Centres and Main Service Centres would remain the principal locations for new development in the plan period as the most sustainable settlements to accommodate the proposed level of new housing development.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	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>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	57	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Cllr F Biggadike	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Himself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	I agree that Holbeach should remain as a Service Centre because it has good transport links and can provide for large developments. I do not believe that Tydd St Mary should be classed as a 'Service Village' due to its location and it would be expensive for the Council to deliver necessary services. I agree that Deeping St. Nicholas should be a Service Village due to its location on the main Doncaster-Peterborough rail link.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	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>	117	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Hollie Howe	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	St John's College
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>		
We support the identification of Holbeach as a Main Service Centre, and believe that as a result of this it should provide an adequate level of housing to support this role. We also support Whaplode in its designation as a Service Village. We support the analysis that these areas have the potential to provide development opportunities for housing that would not be subject to the 'cap' proposed in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter (5.2.7).	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<b>Response_Number:</b>	118	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Hollie Howe	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	St John's College
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>		
Paragraph 5.12.1 sets out that development will be focussed to the Sub-Regional and Main Service Centres, with a restricted amount of new development in the Service Villages and Other Villages. We support Option A which seeks to continue this. We believe that Option B will result in a dispersed pattern of development which is unsustainable.	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.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

Response\_Number:

119

Persons\_Name:

Hollie Howe

Representing\_Who?:

St John's College

Respondents\_Comments:

Development should be permitted in the countryside where it is for purposes that are appropriate in the Countryside. This would only include housing which requires a Countryside location, such as that for agricultural or forestry workers.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

120

Persons\_Name:

Hollie Howe

Representing\_Who?:

St John's College

Respondents\_Comments:

We support Option A whereby the most sustainable sites come forward within the site allocations process. This should be in accordance with option A, in respect of the distribution and scale of development.

Officer\_Response:

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.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	121	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Hollie Howe	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	St John's College
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>We support the criteria for allocating sites for development. We also believe that, as part of this, there should be an on-going review of the availability of sites that are proposed for development, allowing for further sites to come forward to meet housing land supply figures, if there is an undersupply in delivery. This will allow for an adequate level of housing land supply to be maintained, in the event that some sites become undeliverable. As part of this, we propose that land off of Barrington Gate, Holbeach and land off off Branches Lane, Holbeach should be considered as suitable sites for residential development. These sites are located within sustainable locations, and meet the criteria for allocating sites for development. The location of these sites can be found on the attached location plans.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>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.</p>
<u>Response_Number:</u>	127	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Freya Trotman	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Herself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Waterways must be maintained properly, also if properly drained this may free up some land for new development on margins of existing settlements.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Comments noted. Sustainable drainage systems and Flood Risk Assessments will be primary considerations in the identification and implementation of sites for development.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>



<b>Response_Number:</b>	139	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J S Birkett	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Himself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>The choice of settlements to be included in each category appears to be arbitrary. No criteria are put forward to define each type of place and it is therefore unclear how the choice has been made. The geographical spread of Main Service Centres is uneven, and there is a case to be made for main service centres to be designated both to the west and north east of Boston (e.g. Swineshead and Old Leake). The notion that very small villages, almost without any services, should be designated as 'service villages', simply because of a low flood hazard, is nonsensical. This is not sustainable. Anyone living in Algarkirk needs to travel for every service (except for an occasional Anglican church service). The choice of service villages should be based primarily on the presence of a (specified) range of services. Some villages could be eliminated from the list if flood risk was particularly acute and rendered development unsustainable. Full support is given to the policy of placing additional development in (genuine) service villages in order to sustain what remains of rural services.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.16 which explains that this approach is required to deliver the 'cap'. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.</p>	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>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.</p>

<b>Response_Number:</b>	140	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J S Birkett	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Himself
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>I would suggest an additional clause: 'the fulfilment of opportunities which are intrinsic to the site, to add to the quality of life in the locality as a whole, through the provision, for instance, of recreational paths, open spaces, landscape features, or other facilities'.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>The objector's suggestions are essentially reflected within the policy and explained in the supporting text. The Development Management Policy is framed to deal with most types of planning applications and a significantly large number would be too small for the Objector's clause to be a material or reasonable expectation.</p>	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>

Response\_Number:

156

Persons\_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Mr S Harris

Respondents\_Comments:

Holbeach Drove is presently treated an 'other rural settlement' in the 2006 Local Plan. This is the same as lying the open countryside. The Local Plan does recognise generally these settlements are well located to a Group Centre, Gedney Hill) , or an Area Centre (Crowland or Holbeach) and will still have access to a range of services.

The settlement is reasonably well connected having a number of bus services, and the classified road , B1166 and A1073 in easy reach.

It is noted that members on the local plan Committee (13 July 2012) were concerned about the absence of allowable growth in smaller settlements, and this leading to their stagnation. 'More emphasis on villages' was called for.

To this end, Holbeach Drove may look very different in sustainability terms if grouped with the services and facilities available at the Gedney Hill group of settlements (i.e. Gedney hill, Holbeach Drove and Whaplode Drove, see Appendix 4) .

Consequently we ask that you review your strategy with a view to giving more emphasis to villages being grouped together to offer services.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

Response\_Number:

157

Persons\_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Mr S Harris

Respondents\_Comments:

Rewrite the last criteria that presently states;  
" sites will not lead to the loss of locally-important open space, other green infrastructure or community facilities, unless adequately replaced elsewhere";  
As written the policy is to open to interpretation and could negate the development of all open land whether of value or not. Use Policy 77 of NPPF as a guide to rewrite.

Officer\_Response:

This Policy has been deleted as it is not required in the draft Local Plan

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change is recommended.

Response\_Number:

168

Persons\_Name:

Gregory Gray Associates

Representing\_Who?:

The Garden Centre Group

Respondents\_Comments:

Q 15 and 16 – The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
Our client supports the preferred policy approach which adopts the PINS model policy.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	169	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Gregory Gray Associates	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	The Garden Centre Group
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q 17 – 20 Spatial Strategy The preferred policy option is supported since it seeks to focus development in non-ROY zones. The settlement hierarchy is considered appropriate as is the extent of development deemed acceptable in each instance.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	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>	170	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Gregory Gray Associates	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	The Garden Centre Group
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Q21- 23 Site Allocations in South East Lincolnshire A criteria-based approach to site allocations is supported however it is consider essential that these criteria encourage the effective use of land by reusing existing brown field sites as advocated by Para. 17 of the NPPF. As a result it is requested that an additional criterion be added to the proposed policy stating “sites which have previously been developed (brown field sites) will be prioritised”.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	This Policy has been deleted in the draft Local Plan	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	171	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Gregory Gray Associates	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	The Garden Centre Group
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Q24 – 26 Development Management Policies. It is recognised that there are operational advantages in terms of having an over-arching development management policy and given the fairly general nature of the preferred policy, no objection is raised. However it is noted that in certain instances, more specialist policies can be of value, particularly in relation to some specialist uses such as garden centres, nurseries or farm shops which might have specific locational requirements.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	The Development Management policy embodies generic policy considerations. Some proposals will have more specific reliance on some of these considerations than others and it is deemed impossible to provide specific policy frameworks for all development and site scenarios. Nevertheless, the consideration of policies dedicated to garden centres, nurseries and farm shops are not issues that has been dealt with directly in the Preferred Options Document. As such, these represent new options for consideration, which will be addressed in the next stage of the plan-making process.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	187	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr G Smith	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr and Mrs Ravell
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Page 76 – Spatial strategy – We support the status given to Moulton Chapel as a service village.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

188

Persons\_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Mr and Mrs Ravell

Respondents\_Comments:

Rewrite the last criteria that presently states;  
" sites will not lead to the loss of locally-important open space, other green infrastructure or community facilities, unless adequately replaced elsewhere";  
As written the policy is to open to interpretation and could negate the development of all open land whether of value or not. Use Policy 77 of NPPF as a guide to rewrite.

Officer\_Response:

This Policy has been deleted and not taken forward in the draft Local Plan

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the Plan is recommended.

Response\_Number:

196

Persons\_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Spalding Lifestyle owners

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the status given to Pinchbeck as a service village.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	197	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr G Smith	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding Lifestyle owners
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>		
Rewrite the last criteria that presently states; " sites will not lead to the loss of locally-important open space, other green infrastructure or community facilities, unless adequately replaced elsewhere"; As written the policy is to open to interpretation and could negate the development of all open land whether of value or not. Use Policy 77 of NPPF as a guide to rewrite.	This Policy has been deleted and is not taken forward in the draft Local Plan		Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.		

<b>Response_Number:</b>	205	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr G Smith	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr S Hatter
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>		
Holbeach Drove is presently treated an 'other rural settlement' in the 2006 Local Plan. This is the same as lying the open countryside. The Local Plan does recognise generally these settlements are well located to a Group Centre, Gedney Hill) , or an Area Centre (Crowland or Holbeach) and will still have access to a range of services. The settlement is reasonably well connected having a number of bus services, and the classified road, B1166 and A1073 in easy reach. It is noted that members on the local plan Committee (13 July 2012) were concerned about the absence of allowable growth in smaller settlements, and this leading to their stagnation. 'More emphasis on villages' was called for. To this end, Holbeach Drove may look very different in sustainability terms if grouped with the services and facilities available at the Gedney Hill group of settlements (i.e. Gedney hill, Holbeach Drove and Whaplode Drove, see Appendix 4) . Consequently we ask that you review your strategy with a view to giving more emphasis to villages being grouped together to offer services.	Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.		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.		

Response\_Number:

206

Persons\_Name:

Mr G Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Mr S Hatter

Respondents\_Comments:

Rewrite the last criteria that presently states;  
" sites will not lead to the loss of locally-important open space, other green infrastructure or community facilities, unless adequately replaced elsewhere";  
As written the policy is to open to interpretation and could negate the development of all open land whether of value or not. Use Policy 77 of NPPF as a guide to rewrite.

Officer\_Response:

This Policy has been deleted and is not taken forward in the draft Local Plan

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.



Response\_Number:

217

Persons\_Name:

Elizabeth Biott

Representing\_Who?:

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer Recommendation:

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust agrees that development must be sustainable and therefore supports this policy approach. The Trust considers that the top priority for achieving sustainable development is that development is carried out within the environmental capacity or limits of the area. It should not compromise the biodiversity and geodiversity resource of South East Lincolnshire. Existing designated sites of nature conservation and geological interest such as Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves, Local Wildlife Sites and Local Geological Sites should be protected and enhanced. Sites of nature conservation interest and other areas of natural green space should be buffered, extended and linked across the landscape to enable species and habitats to adapt to climate change.

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Enlarging and linking habitats to reduce fragmentation is important to provide habitats and species the opportunity to migrate across the landscape in the face of climate change. This is the basis of the Living Landscapes approach advocated by the Wildlife Trusts. A Living Landscapes scheme in South East Lincolnshire is the South Lincolnshire Fenlands ([www.lincsfenlands.org.uk](http://www.lincsfenlands.org.uk)).

Another priority for achieving sustainable development is the provision of a network of natural green space within the green infrastructure of developments for both people and wildlife. There should be sufficient natural green space accessible to residents to meet Natural England's Accessible Natural green space Standards.

---

Response\_Number:

218

Persons\_Name:

Elizabeth Biott

Representing\_Who?:

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Respondents\_Comments:

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust agrees with the proposed criteria, in particular we welcome the fifth and sixth criteria relating to the protection of natural assets, open space and other green infrastructure.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

219

Persons\_Name:

Elizabeth Biott

Representing\_Who?:

Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust

Respondents\_Comments:

The Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust welcomes the last criterion relating to natural habitats. It is important that impacts on natural habitats are assessed prior to the determination of any planning application. Developments that would result in adverse impacts on any designated nature conservation sites, including locally designated Local Wildlife Sites, sites meeting Local Wildlife Site criteria, or protected or important species should not be granted permission.

Biodiversity enhancements should be included within development schemes to ensure that developments result in a net gain for biodiversity.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	236	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Woods Hardwick Planning	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Wheatley PLC
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
These representations fully support the identification of a spatial strategy in the form of a settlement hierarchy for the direction of growth. In accordance with national planning policy and in particular the interests of achieving sustainable development, the housing needs for the Plan Area should be met by allocating development to a range of settlements. The options that have been identified are both considered reasonable in view of the guidance within the NPPF.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	238	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Woods Hardwick Planning	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Wheatley PLC
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
The criteria as specified are supported.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response\_Number:

244

Persons\_Name:

Jonathan Ireland

Representing\_Who?:

Irelands Farm Machinery

Respondents\_Comments:

It is agreed that it is appropriate to produce a policy that sets out the response to the strategic flood risk in the area. In developing such a policy though consideration should be had to ensuring that the patterns of future growth are not inappropriately constrained. Where possible the sustainable nature of existing settlements should be improved and enhanced. Based on the Sustainability of Boston Borough Settlements 2008 three settlements namely Kirton, Butterwick and Sutterton had significantly higher scores than other settlements. Of these only Kirton has been identified as a main service centre. It is considered that further thought should be given to including Sutterton as a main service centre or at least having the potential to become a main service centre. This would provide a basis upon which additional land for both housing and employment could be allocated to encourage this growth.

Identifying the settlement for future growth would fit with the overall flood risk approach in that infrastructure improvements would be focussed on settlements providing for greater levels of growth facilitated by infrastructure improvements.

By recognising the potential of the village to act as a main service centre a place specific approach to housing numbers, infrastructure requirements and delivery could be developed. Such an approach would be more likely to create a critical mass that could deliver levels of infrastructure funding to deliver appropriate mitigation to constraints such as flood risk. If it is not considered that Sutterton can be elevated to a main service centre there should be recognition of it's potential to serve as such and the spatial strategy should provide a context and framework to facilitate future growth.

Officer\_Response:

The promotion of Sutterton to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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:

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>	247	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Jonathan Ireland	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Irelands Farm Machinery
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Within the site allocations policy criteria these are generally supported. However, the criteria based approach doesn't overtly refer to the benefits of delivering on Brownfield sites. If this issue is to be addressed in the detail of the sequential approach that should be made clear or otherwise a further criteria should be included. The importance of developing land of lesser environmental value is a core principle of the National Planning Policy Framework and the role of Brownfield sites in meeting this principle should be acknowledged within these criteria.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>This Policy has been deleted and is not being taken forward in the draft Local Plan</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>Objection - No change to the Policy is recommended.</p>
<u>Response_Number:</u>	248	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Jonathan Ireland	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Irelands Farm Machinery
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>It is felt that the overall approach to the development management policy is appropriate.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>

<b>Response_Number:</b>	253	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr A Tunnard	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Himself and Mr C Tunnard
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Support Kirton as a main Service Centre.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	263	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr R Smith	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Pedals
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	The list of sustainable development considerations fails to reflect Strategic Priority 11, and Government policy in relation to sustainable development and sustainable transport.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	The Development Management Policy, as is common with all policies in the Plan is not a "stand alone policy". Reference is made to "access" as a general consideration. Depending upon the the type and scale of development proposals other policies within the plan e.g. Spatial Strategy and/or Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network may apply.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Objection - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

264

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Pedals

Respondents\_Comments:

A further point must be inserted after "• maximising the use of sustainable materials and resources", as follows:  
" • maximising safe, convenient cycling to, from and within the development."

Officer\_Response:

The insertion sought is considered too specific. In assessing "access" all means of transport are considered.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.

---

Response\_Number:

285

Persons\_Name:

Antony Aspbury Associates

Representing\_Who?:

Lincolnshire Diocese

Respondents\_Comments:

Antony Aspbury Associates support the preferred Option B approach to the Distribution of Development between settlements and the Approach to Development in the Countryside. This approach strikes a reasonable balance between accommodating necessary growth in sustainable higher order settlements where there remains a residual flood risk yet at a scale and quantum that the respective settlements can safely identify and accommodate through Flood Risk Assessments.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	286	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Antony Aspbury Associates	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Lincolnshire Diocese
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Antony Aspbury Associates support the hierarchical approach as the method of guiding new development across SE Lincolnshire.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	287	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Antony Aspbury Associates	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Lincolnshire Diocese
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	We support the 'promotion' of specified settlements to Service Villages on the basis of their lower flood category status. These settlements should be supported going forward to allow them to develop as growth locations in the future as an alternative to those larges established Service Villages that are within the ROY zones. Our clients the Lincoln Diocese have landholdings within some of these settlements and wish to positively promote sustainable opportunities for housing growth within them. We do not however support the capping of growth within South Holland service villages to a maximum of 25 dwellings as this appears to be an arbitrary ceiling figure.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	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.

---



Response\_Number:

288

Persons\_Name:

Antony Aspbury Associates

Representing\_Who?:

Lincolnshire Diocese

Respondents\_Comments:

We broadly support the criteria to be taken into account when considering sites to be allocated for development. However in considering public transport accessibility, particularly in respect of the smaller service villages, due account needs to be taken of the relatively limited capacity and/or frequency of public transport availability in certain areas and the general low patronage in any event.

We would also suggest that an additional criterion is added to ensure that the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that sites themselves are genuinely available and developable having due regard to site-specific considerations including ownership. These are factors that are normally picked up through the SHLAA process yet are not reflected in the Site Allocations Criteria as currently drafted. The NPPF puts great weight on sites being deliverable and developable and this must be reflected in the strategic policy formulation.

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 and are also evidenced in the supporting papers e.g. SHLAA and Housing Papers.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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

Response\_Number:

297

Persons\_Name:

Peacock & Smith

Representing\_Who?:

Mr R Hardy

Respondents\_Comments:

Our client, Mr Hardy, is the owner of a substantial quantum of land in the Boston area, including having control over the site to the south of Wainfleet Road, located to the north east of Boston that was considered as a broad strategic location for housing development within the Local Plan Strategy and Policies Preferred Options document (May 2013).

Our client considers that the preferred approach to establishing a spatial strategy for South East Lincolnshire is appropriate and clearly defines a settlement hierarchy commensurate with the type, scale and function of each settlement within the authority area. The identification of Boston as a Sub-Regional Centre is wholly appropriate and indeed should be the main locations for new development.

---

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

321

Persons\_Name:

Mr Neil Osborn

Representing\_Who?:

Larkfleet Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

We note the acknowledgement of the 12 core principles of planning policy set out in the Framework. We do not understand why there is reference to the East Midland Plan at paragraph 5.1.10 without clear explanation that this is now a revoked strategy and that the Local Plan shall set out an appropriate strategic framework determined within the community and for the community.

With regard to Pinchbeck whilst this is a village of distinguishable identity, its proximity and relationship to Spalding suggests that it should be treated separately from other categories of settlement. We therefore OBJECT to the inclusion of Pinchbeck as a Service Village and consider that it should be treated as part of a wider Spalding Policy Area. This is an approach adopted by Huntingdonshire in relation to large villages immediately abutting or conjoined with Huntingdon as a principal urban area and reflects the opportunity to consider the whole of the built up area and its immediately outlying extensions for policy purposes. It provides greater flexibility without subsuming the identity of the associated community into that of the town. It is considered that such an approach – which reflects the historic conjoining of Spalding and Pinchbeck – would be appropriate in this instance.

We SUPPORT the analysis contained at paragraph 5.2.7 that the ROY zones outlined in the Lincolnshire Coastal Study reveals that some settlements are not situated entirely within one or more of the ROY zones and therefore have the potential to provide development opportunities for housing that would not be subject to the 'cap' proposed in the Housing Growth and Flood Risk chapter. In this respect we SUPPORT the identification of Kirton as a Main Service Centre however we would OBJECT to the continued classification of Fishtoft as an Other Village in Boston Borough.

Officer\_Response:

Treating Pinchbeck as an extension to the wider Sub-Regional Centre of Spalding is not an issue that has been adequately addressed 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. Also further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

Examination of the SHLAA information at Appendix 9 indicates 193 dwellings outside the ROY zone whilst it can be expected that a proportion of the 1713 potential capacity within the ROY zone would actually be on land that is developable. Fishtoft is a significant village with capacity and potential to support the growth needed in Boston Borough and accordingly should be reclassified as a Service Village.

We therefore SUPPORT policy Option A albeit that we do not agree the Table 5.1 as we consider that there would be positive benefits arising to communities from the implementation of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and that this would more appropriately reflect the Sustainability Appraisal of the National Planning Policy Framework.

---

Response_Number:	322	Persons_Name:	Mr Neil Osborn	Representing_Who?:	Larkfleet Homes
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
With respect to the policy of distribution (paragraph 5.12.4) we SUPPORT Option B including the increase in the distribution of development including housing to specified villages including Fishtoft for the reasons set out above in relation to the capacity that has been identified that is either not subject to the ROY or that can be accommodated within it. We therefore generally SUPPORT the Spatial Strategy as set out above for the identification of Pinchbeck and Weston We SUPPORT the policy on Site Allocations as set out above.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	323	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr Neil Osborn	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Larkfleet Homes
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	We have no comments on Development Management policies at this time.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	330	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	D Braybrooks
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>We have studied the proposal Options document and Sustainability Appraisal Report, and would like to make a further representation at this stage of the Plan review.</p> <p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Moulton Chapel in particular, has a good and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Butchers, Garage, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House,/Church, and Good Bus service.</p> <p>Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

333

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

D A and N Casswell

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, we consider Gosberton in particular, has a large and varied range of different local services including Local Supermarket/Post Office, Butchers, Garage, Bank, Doctors Surgery/Medical Centre, Fruit Shop, Cafes, Hairdressers, Barbers, Primary School/Play group, Special School, Local Public House, Parish Church, Methodist Chapel, Baptist Chapel, Garage, Dental Surgery, Youth Club Village Hall, Community Centre, Restaurants, Care Homes, and several Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it's need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	337	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs B Blundy
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Gosberton in particular, has an large and varied range of different local services including Local Supermarket/Post Office, Butchers, Garage, Bank, Doctors Surgery/Medical Centre, Fruit Shop, Cafes, Hairdressers, Barbers, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Community Centre, Restaurants, Bus services.</p> <p>Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	341	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs J Tetley
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Whaplode in particular, has a good and varied range of different local services including 2 x Local Shop/Post Office, 2 x Garages, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Restaurant, Cycle Shop, and Good Bus service.</p> <p>Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response\_Number:

344

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

N Ward

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, we consider Crowland in particular, has a good range of local services including Convenience stores, butchers, hairdressers, barbers, cafes, haberdashery, fish and chip shop, restaurants, estate agents, Local Public Houses, Village hall, Church, Youth Club, Village hall, Secondary school (although soon to be closed), Primary school, and Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

---

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.



Response\_Number:

347

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

C Slooten

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.

However, due to the northwards spread of Spalding, Pinchbeck has become more than a village, and has become a major shopping centre and extension of Spalding, towards a Main Service centre. We believe there is a case to support such a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Pinchbeck has a large and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Supermarket, Post Office, Butchers, Bakers, Garage, Doctors Surgery, Pizza Parlour, Flower Shop, Bridal Shop, Hairdressers x 3, Primary School, Play group, Local Public Houses x 2, Church and Church Hall, Village Hall and two Bus services

Officer\_Response:

The promotion of Pinchbeck to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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:

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.

Response\_Number:

351

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

M Fragale

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.

However, due to the northwards spread of Spalding, Pinchbeck has become more than a village, and has become a major shopping centre and extension of Spalding, towards a Main Service centre. We believe there is a case to support such a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Pinchbeck has a large and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Supermarket, Post Office, Butchers, Bakers, Garage, Doctors Surgery, Pizza Parlour, Flower Shop, Bridal Shop, Hairdressers x 3, Primary School, Play group, Local Public Houses x 2, Church and Church Hall, Village Hall and two Bus services

Officer\_Response:

The promotion of Pinchbeck to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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:

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> 362	<u>Persons_Name:</u> Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u> R Bingham
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u> We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Quadring in particular, has an good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Curry house, and Bus service. Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	<u>Officer_Response:</u> Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u> Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u> 368	<u>Persons_Name:</u> Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u> M & J Woodroffe
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u> We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Crowland in particular, has a good range of local services including Convenience stores, butchers, hairdressers, barbers, cafes, haberdashery, fish and chip shop, restaurants, estate agents, Local Public Houses, Village hall, Church, Youth Club, Village Hall, Secondary school (although soon to be closed), Primary school, and Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	<u>Officer_Response:</u> Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u> Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	372	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	R Bennett & M & J Woodroffe
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Crowland in particular, has a good range of local services including Convenience stores, butchers, hairdressers, barbers, cafes, haberdashery, fish and chip shop, restaurants, estate agents, Local Public Houses, Village hall, Church, Youth Club, Village Hall, Secondary school (although soon to be closed), Primary school, and Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	376	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	C Adams
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Crowland in particular, has a good range of local services including Convenience stores, butchers, hairdressers, barbers, cafes, haberdashery, fish and chip shop, restaurants, estate agents, Local Public Houses, Village hall, Church, Youth Club, Village hall, Secondary school (although soon to be closed), Primary school, and Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	380	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs E M H Todoroff
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Gedney Hill in particular, now only has some local services including Local Public House, Village hall, Church and Bus service. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	385	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	C L Cave
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Gedney Hill in particular, now only has some local services including Local Public House, Village hall, Church and Bus service. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	389	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	C A Cave
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Holbeach Hurn in particular, now only has some local services including Local Public House, Village hall, Church and Bus service. Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>				
<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.</p>				
<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>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.</p>				

<b>Response_Number:</b>	393	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr and M Hotchkin
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Whaplode in particular, has a good and varied range of different local services including 2 x Local Shop/Post Office, 2 x Garages, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Restaurant, Cycle Shop, and Good Bus service. Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>				
<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>Support noted.</p>				
<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>				

<b>Response_Number:</b>	397	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mrs M Louis
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>		
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Moulton Chapel in particular, has a good and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Butchers, Garage, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House,/Church, and Good Bus service.</p> <p>Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<b>Response_Number:</b>	401	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	J L Crossland
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>		
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Moulton Seas End in particular, now only has some local services including Local Public House, Church and Bus service. Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>	Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.		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.		

Response\_Number:

405

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

Mr R and Mrs J Warrick

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

However, due to the northwards spread of Spalding, Pinchbeck has become more than a village, and has become a major shopping centre and extension of Spalding, towards a Main Service centre. We believe there is a case to support such a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Pinchbeck has a large and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Supermarket, Post Office, Butchers, Bakers, Garage, Doctors Surgery, Pizza Parlour, Flower Shop, Bridal Shop, Hairdressers x 3, Primary School, Play group, Local Public Houses x 2, Church and Church Hall, Village Hall and two Bus services

Officer\_Response:

The promotion of Pinchbeck to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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:

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.



Response\_Number:

410

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

P Borst

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

However, due to the northwards spread of Spalding, Pinchbeck has become more than a village, and has become a major shopping centre and extension of Spalding, towards a Main Service centre. We believe there is a case to support such a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Pinchbeck has a large and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Supermarket, Post Office, Butchers, Bakers, Garage, Doctors Surgery, Pizza Parlour, Flower Shop, Bridal Shop, Hairdressers x 3, Primary School, Play group, Local Public Houses x 2, Church and Church Hall, Village Hall and two Bus services

Officer\_Response:

The promotion of Pinchbeck to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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:

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.

Response\_Number:

415

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

Mr & Mrs R Hart & the Exors of M W

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, we consider Pinchbeck in particular, has a large and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Supermarket, Post Office, Butchers, Bakers, Garage, Doctors Surgery, Pizza Parlour, Flower Shop, Bridal Shop, Hairdressers x 3, Primary School, Play group, Local Public Houses x 2, Church and Church Hall, Village Hall and two Bus services.

Indeed, due to the northwards spread of Spalding, Pinchbeck has become more of a Main Service centre, and we believe there is a case to support such a re-classification in planning policy terms. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Officer\_Response:

The promotion of Pinchbeck to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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:

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>	430	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Crowland Parish Council	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Themselves
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>		
Spatial Strategy proposals are based upon the premise of sub-regional centres and main service centres in the region . Towns (service centres) on the edges are also heavily influenced by the gravitational pull of nearby cities beyond the boundaries. We (and Sutton Bridge?) may need specific Vision elements and actions to deal with this. Spalding is not automatically our “Centre”. In summary, we support the SELP but expect to see much more what/how/when as the process progresses, otherwise relying on developers to willingly deliver the sustainable development Vision may lead to disappointment.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<b>Response_Number:</b>	450	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	B J Runciman
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Weston, has a good and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office,, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Garden Centre/Restaurant, and a Good Bus service. Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response\_Number:

454

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

M J R Nell

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

However, due to the northwards spread of Spalding, Pinchbeck has become more than a village, and has become a major shopping centre and extension of Spalding,, towards a Main Service centre. We believe there is a case to support such a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Pinchbeck has a large and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Supermarket, Post Office, Butchers, Bakers, Garage, Doctors Surgery, Pharmacy, Pizza Parlour, Flower Shop, Bridal Shop, Hairdressers x 3, Primary School, Play group, Local Public Houses x 2 ,Church and Church Hall, Village Hall and two Bus services .

Officer\_Response:

The promotion of Pinchbeck to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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:

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>	459	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs G Pell
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Gedney Hill in particular, now only has some local services including Local Public House, Village hall, Church and Bus service. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	463	<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>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Spalding Common in particular, has now fewer local services than in the past, but still has a Local Shop and Post Office, Village Hall, Fish and Chip Shop, and a Public House and there are also many businesses located in the settlement., and a good Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.		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>	468	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	T Tyrell
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Cowbit in particular, has an good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, Church, Village Hall and Bus service. However its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	472	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	E A Smith
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Cowbit in particular, has an good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, Church, Village Hall and Bus service. However its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

<b>Response_Number:</b> 476	<b>Persons_Name:</b> Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b> Mrs C Stratton
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b> We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Spalding Common in particular, has now fewer local services than in the past, but still has a Local Shop and Post Office, and a Public House and there are also many businesses located in the village., and a good Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	<b>Officer_Response:</b> Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b> 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> 481	<b>Persons_Name:</b> Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b> I Login
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b> We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4, however consider that to resist any development of land in ‘The countryside’, as Holbeach Drove would be classified, is very restrictive, and will not allow for the growth the village will naturally need. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Holbeach Drove,, now only has some local services including Local Village shop/post office, Local Public House, Village hall, Church and Bus service. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	<b>Officer_Response:</b> Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b> 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.

Response\_Number:

485

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

S Dobney

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4, and in particular the re-instatement of Surfleet to the Service Village category. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, we consider Surfleet, has a good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, 3 x Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Astro turf pitches and Sports field, and local Bus services. However, its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand. West Pinchbeck has a few local services including a Church, Village Hall, and local Bus services. Indeed, its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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>	490	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	D Coxen
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4, and in particular the re-instatement of Surfleet as a Service Village.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Surfleet, has a good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, 3 x Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Astroturf pitches and Sports field, and local Bus services. However, its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	495	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mr and Mrs J Needham
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4, and in particular the re-instatement of Surfleet as a Service Village.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Surfleet, has a good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, 3 x Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Astroturf pitches and Sports field, and local Bus services. However, its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<b>Response_Number:</b>	500	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	C Clark
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>		<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Gosberton in particular, has an large and varied range of different local services including Local Supermarket/Post Office, Butchers, Garage, Bank, Doctors Surgery/Medical Centre, Fruit Shop, Cafes, Hairdressers, Barbers, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Community Centre, Restaurants, Bus services.</p> <p>Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<b>Response_Number:</b>	505	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mrs M Read
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>		<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Quadring in particular, has an good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Curry house, and Bus service.</p> <p>Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

Response\_Number:

510

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

Mr and Mrs G Jacko

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Crowland in particular, has a good range of local services including Convenience stores, butchers, hairdressers, barbers, cafes, haberdashery, fish and chip shop, restaurants, estate agents, Local Public Houses, Village hall, Church, Youth Club, Village Hall, Secondary school (although soon to be closed), Primary school, and Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

---

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

514

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

Mr J Tester

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

However, due to the northwards spread of Spalding, Pinchbeck has become more than a village, and has become a major shopping centre and extension of Spalding,, towards a Main Service centre. We believe there is a case to support such a re-classification in planning Spatial Strategy terms to Main Service Centre. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Pinchbeck has a large and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Supermarket, Post Office, Butchers, Bakers, Garage, Doctors Surgery, Pharmacy, Pizza Parlour, Flower Shop, Bridal Shop, Hairdressers x 3, Primary School, Play group, Local Public Houses x 2 ,Church and Church Hall, Village Hall and two Bus services .

Officer\_Response:

The promotion of Pinchbeck to a Main Service Centre has not been considered 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:

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.

Response\_Number:

519

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs P Thompson

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development, we consider Crowland in particular, has a good range of local services including Convenience stores, Newsagents, Butchers, Hairdressers, Barbers, Cafes, Haberdashery, Fish and chip shop, Restaurants, Estate agents, Local Public Houses, Village hall, Church, Youth Club, Village Hall, Secondary school (although soon to be closed), Primary school, and Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

---

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	523	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	J Whiting
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Crowland in particular, has a good range of local services including Convenience stores, Newsagents, Butchers, Hairdressers, Barbers, Cafes, Haberdashery, Fish and chip shop, Restaurants, Estate agents, Local Public Houses, Village hall, Church, Youth Club, Village Hall, Secondary school (although soon to be closed), Primary school, and Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	527	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	M & J Woodroffe
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Deeping St Nicholas in particular, whilst not having many local services, does have a good Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.</p>		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

<b>Response_Number:</b> 531	<b>Persons_Name:</b> Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b> Roe Family
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b> We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Pode Hole in particular, has now fewer local services than in the past, but still has a Local Shop and Post Office, and a Public House and there are also many businesses located in the village., and good Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.	<b>Officer_Response:</b> Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b> 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> 550	<b>Persons_Name:</b> Mr R Doughty	<b>Representing_Who?:</b> R S Earl
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b> We agree that the Local Plan should be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have no objection to the policy approach set out in 5.5 to 5.10.	<b>Officer_Response:</b> Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b> Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	551	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	R S Earl
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	No changes are suggested.	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	Support noted.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	552	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr R Doughty	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	R S Earl
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>The failure to identify modest development opportunity in villages below the Service Village designation is unacceptable.</p> <p>Smaller villages, such as Weston Hills, can accommodate small scale development that will assist in supporting existing facilities and services. The promotion of a policy that will effectively place a further moratorium on development is untenable.</p> <p>The land shown on the enclosed plan provides an excellent opportunity to develop the village in a planned sustainable pattern.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	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.

---



Response\_Number:

553

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents\_Comments:

The Spatial Strategy broadly reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies, but there should be a further type included, which is villages that fall between the Service Village and Countryside designation, whereby small scale development is accepted without the need to meet the associated countryside criteria that is unduly restrictive when applied to locations such as Weston Hills.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number:

554

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents\_Comments:

A further type of place should be added to the policy to recognise the role of villages, such as Weston Hills, with an allowance for small scale development to support local essential services.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number:

555

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

556

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

557

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

558

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the preferred Option A.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

559

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents\_Comments:

The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

560

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

R S Earl

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

602

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

We agree that the Local Plan should be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have no objection to the policy approach set out in 5.5 to 5.10.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

603

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	604	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr R Doughty	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	A W Tindall
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>We welcome and fully support the identification of Moulton as a Service Village. This will allow much needed housing development to come forward in the village, which has been prevented by negative Development Plan policies in the recent past.</p> <p>The land shown on the enclosed plan provides an excellent opportunity to develop the village in a planned sustainable pattern.</p> <p>Smaller villages, such as Weston Hills, can accommodate small scale development that will assist in supporting existing facilities and services. The promotion of a policy that will effectively place a further moratorium on development is untenable.</p> <p>The land shown on the enclosed plan provides an excellent opportunity to develop the village in a planned sustainable pattern.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.</p>		
		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>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.</p>		

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	605	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr R Doughty	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	A W Tindall
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>The Spatial Strategy broadly reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>Support noted.</p>		
		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>		

---

Response\_Number:

606

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

607

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

608

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

609

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---



Response\_Number:

610

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the preferred Option A.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

611

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

612

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

A W Tindall

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

643

Persons\_Name:

Graham Warren Ltd

Representing\_Who?:

Broadgate Homes Ltd

Respondents\_Comments:

The Plan area is sparsely populated with only the sub-regional centres in Spalding and Boston. Forty percent of the population reside in these towns, with the remainder in the rural areas. It follows that there is an imperative to ensure the Plan has a spatial policy that addresses identified shortcomings in the rural areas, which include the lack of affordable housing, a lack of facilities and poor public transport. While the area centres also provide a focus for the rural area, the smaller villages need to remain vibrant, with a diverse population and the Plan needs to, not only seek to retain, but encourage the provision of new social and community facilities in these settlements.

For example, Option B, under the provision of affordable housing is welcomed in that the provision of market housing, in order to facilitate affordable housing in the rural area, offers a more flexible approach to the delivery of affordable housing across the Plan area and in this respect, develops the policy in paragraph 54 of the NPPF.

The Plan recognises that the principal mode of travel, in the Plan area is the private motor car, with use higher than both the Lincolnshire and National average; which is only to be expected where public transport is poor, or in some settlements, nonexistent.

This has implications for policy, in that many small villages fall into what might be termed the "Sustainability Trap". Here lack of bus service or facilities automatically militates against further development, thereby potentially ruling out affordable housing and causing young people to leave.

Large areas of both authorities and particularly Boston, are vulnerable to flood risk and the Strategy has been

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

developed to take account of this issue.

It is appreciated that the Plan is still cognisant of the now revoked East Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy and one of the key issues identified is now, in the absence of a regionally improved housing target, to identify a housing requirement in the Plan area to 2031. In view of the Flood hazard in S E Lincolnshire and that National Planning Policy that indicates additional housing may be necessary in Flood Risk Areas, there is a need to determine an approach to housing in the Red, Orange and Yellow (ROY) Flood Hazard Zones.

Both Authorities are well versed in the issues surrounding Flood Risk an under the approach to Flood Risk, Broadgate support option B. The Plan notes that in applying Option B, a sequential approach will be applied to selecting the broad locations for development, which is an additional refinement and indeed a conventional one, to the approach taken to assessing whether or not locations are situated in one of the ROY zones. Broadgate's support for the strategic approach to Flood Risk reflects the level of development proposed in the Plan area and its location.

---

Response\_Number:

665

Persons\_Name:

Cllr A Austin

Representing\_Who?:

Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

I agree with the need for sustainable development and that development should be directed to appropriate locations.

The classification of places into sub regional centres and main service centres is acceptable and it is to be expected that these will continue to develop as appropriate.

I do not dispute the concept of a hierarchy of settlements but the choice of additional “service villages” purely on flood risk grounds throws up some anomalies:

In South Holland most of the villages are easily identifiable and quite separate from each other.

Limited development in these is reasonable and should be sustainable.

Many villages within Boston Borough have parish boundaries that have become blurred because they follow historic features that no longer exist and the villages have grown together. It would therefore be quite unreasonable and arbitrary to limit development solely to specific villages on the basis of parish name alone.

An example that I would like to give is Kirton and Frampton where part of Frampton is quite indistinguishable from Kirton and could provide sustainable development with access on foot to the facilities of Kirton.

Similarly there is no clear distinction between Kirton End and part of Frampton West or with Kirton Holme. Development should take place in settlements where there are existing communities. Swineshead Bridge lacks almost all facilities if it were to be used for a substantial amount of housing. It is hard to classify this as a village or potentially sustainable location.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.16 which explains that this approach is required to deliver the 'cap'. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer Recommendation:

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.

Response_Number:	682	Persons_Name:	Bidwells	Representing_Who?:	The Duchy of Lancaster
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
<p>We support the Preferred Option B set out in paragraph 5.16.1 in which the following Villages are promoted to Service Villages due to their locations outside any ROY zones: Algarkirk, Bicker, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Quadring, Surfleet, Swineshead Bridge, Tydd St Mark, Wigtoft and Wrangle. As set out in Chapter 5 there is a need to ensure that the Spatial Strategy is in conformity with the NPPF and the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Through the promotion of the above Villages the Local Plan will ensure that, as far as reasonably possible, development can be distributed across the administrative areas of Boston Borough and South Holland District Councils in the most sustainable locations possible. It will also ensure that there is a supply of market and affordable housing which can meet the needs of the local population and, as set out in the Spatial Strategy, will support and improve the settlements' roles as a focus of social and economic activity.</p>	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response\_Number:

690

Persons\_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

It seems logical to identify Boston and Spalding as the two sub-regional centres for South East Lincolnshire, given their role and function within the plan area. As the main locations for new development, care will need to be taken to avoid harming the many heritage assets contained within and around both towns. We do not have a strong view on the identification of main service centres and service villages, but all of the identified settlements will contain or adjoin heritage assets and again, new development will need to avoid harm to these assets.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

691

Persons\_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

We welcome the recognition in the draft policy that development within the countryside might be acceptable if it results in the preservation of listed buildings and the reuse and adaption of buildings for appropriate purposes. With regards to the latter, it will be important to ensure that the reuse and adaption of historic buildings (including those that are undesignated) does not harm their significance. We feel the policy would be strengthened by referring to heritage assets as a catchall term, so that where countryside development results in the preservation of heritage assets, it will be considered favourably by the local authorities (albeit balancing the conservation benefits against other planning issues). The third bullet point of the policy could be reworded as follows: "the preservation of listed buildings and other heritage assets" The fourth bullet point could also be strengthened by clarifying building reuse and adaption should be sympathetic to the architectural character of the original building: "the reuse and adaption of buildings for appropriate purposes where the architectural character of the original building is safeguarded"

Officer\_Response:

This Policy has been redrafted in the draft Local Plan

Officer\_Recommendation:

These matters have been considered in new draft Policies in the Local Plan.



Response\_Number:

692

Persons\_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

We welcome the inclusion of a bullet point relating to the historic environment, although the term "historic assets" should be reworded "heritage assets" to be consistent with the NPPF. The bullet point currently contains a double negative ("will not" and "cannot"), which might require rewording for clarification purposes.

Officer\_Response:

This Policy has been deleted and is not being taken forward in the draft Local Plan

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.

Response\_Number:

693

Persons\_Name:

Tom Gilbert - Wooldridge

Representing\_Who?:

English Heritage

Respondents\_Comments:

We welcome the inclusion of a bullet point relating to the historic environment, but the terminology needs improvement. "Historical buildings and heritage" should be replaced with "heritage assets" to be consistent with the NPPF. It is also not entirely clear how sustainable development considerations have been defined or how impacts on heritage assets will be assessed when determining planning applications. The policy might benefit from clarification in this respect.

Officer\_Response:

The Policy and text have been re-drafted in the draft Local Plan.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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

<u>Response_Number:</u>	716	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Helen Cattle	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Sport England
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>Site Allocations Criteria (page 78)  The inclusion of the assessment criteria for consideration alongside other plan policies is broadly welcomed, including in particular the criterion requiring the need to demonstrate infrastructure delivery. However, the wording of this requirement should be modified to refer to delivery of necessary infrastructure to meet identified need. The wording of the penultimate bullet point should also be amended to ensure allocations would not lead to the loss of any open space or community facilities (which should also expressly include sports facilities) unless it is first demonstrated that, where there is an identified existing and future need, the loss would be compensated by alternative provision of at least an equal or higher quantitative and qualitative standard.</p>		<p>This policy has been deleted and is not being taken forward in the draft Local Plan</p>		<p>Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.</p>	

<u>Response_Number:</u>	721	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Steve Williamson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Mrs EA Wing, Mr JA Wing, Mrs A For
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
<p>Spatial Strategy  The hierarchical approach and the selection of settlements into the hierarchy is broadly correct. With specific regard to paragraph 5.24.2. It is submitted that a criteria based development land allocation process is the most appropriate (as set out in the table on page 78); but, in later sections of the report this approach is not followed – the pre-emptive allocation of land to the south west of Boston as the only strategic option for housing for the town. This is not a sustainable approach.</p>		<p>Following consideration of the representation, further work will be required on broad locations for housing growth in Boston.</p>		<p>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.</p>	

Response\_Number:

732

Persons\_Name:

Carter Jonas

Representing\_Who?:

RP Worth and Son

Respondents\_Comments:

Approach to the Distribution of Development Between Settlements  
'Option A', a continuation of the current baseline settlement hierarchy, focussing development in the Sub-Regional and Main Services Centres, with restricted growth in the Service Villages and Other Villages is supported. It is appropriate to distribute growth in accordance with the objectives for Sustainable Development; locating proportionate amounts of growth in those settlements which are better served by existing amenities. The Council's preferred option 'B', would by its own omission be deemed as less sustainable, particularly in terms of transport and the provision of infrastructure to support those communities. This will be difficult to achieve in the absence of a critical mass in lower order settlements. The establishment of further services and facilities within the 'Service Villages' is unlikely, and the resulting situation will be increased levels of reliance on the private motor car; a situation which the National Planning Policy Framework seeks to resist. It is more appropriate for the settlement hierarchy and proposed distribution of growth to remain as existing and for the level of growth proposed in each settlement to be judged and determined on its' own merits, taking into account local conditions and capacity. The designation of Long Sutton as a 'Main Service Centre' is strongly supported, taking into account the local amenities and facilities, which are located within the village. It is appropriate that this village will continue to provide for significant housing development to support its current role as a service centre for both the immediate community and the population of the surrounding rural hinterland.  
Approach to Site Allocations  
The establishment of a criteria-based policy to guide

Officer\_Response:

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.

the site allocations process, 'option A', is considered appropriate and is supported. Such a policy will ensure fairness and bring a greater certainty to the site selection process.

---

Response_Number:	766	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
We agree that the Local Plan should be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have no objection to the policy approach set out in 5.5 to 5.10.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response_Number:	767	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer Recommendation:		
No changes are suggested.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response\_Number:

768

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

We welcome and fully support the identification of Surfleet as a Service Village. This will allow much needed housing development to come forward in the village, which has been prevented by negative Development Plan policies in the recent past.

The land shown on the enclosed plan provides an excellent opportunity to develop the village in a planned sustainable pattern.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

769

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

770

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

The promotion of Surfleet to assist in the delivery of housing provision in South Holland District is very much welcomed and supported, as it provides a sustainable location for development outside the ROY zones.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

771

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

772

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

773

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

774

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

775

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the preferred Option A.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---



Response\_Number:

776

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

777

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs Tunnard and Mrs Asprey

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	820	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
We agree that the Local Plan should be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have no objection to the policy approach set out in 5.5 to 5.10.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response_Number:	821	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:	Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:		
No changes are suggested.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response\_Number:

822

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents\_Comments:

We welcome and fully support the identification of Gosberton as a Service Village. This will allow much needed housing development to come forward in the village, which has been prevented by negative Development Plan policies in the recent past.

The land shown on the enclosed plan provides an excellent opportunity to develop the village in a planned sustainable pattern.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

823

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents\_Comments:

The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

824

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents\_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

825

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

826

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

827

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

828

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the preferred Option A.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

829

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem

Respondents\_Comments:

The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	830	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	J Wilson, S Mortimer, A & M Settlem
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No changes are suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	874	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
We agree that the Local Plan should be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have no objection to the policy approach set out in 5.5 to 5.10, albeit reference is made to the Planning Inspectorate model policy without including it within the text.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response\_Number:

875

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

876

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

Holbeach is recognised as a Main Service Centre and this is supported. We agree, therefore, with the appraisal of options and the emphasis on development being directed to the South Holland Sub Regional Centres and Main Service Centres.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---



Response\_Number:

877

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

878

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

879

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

880

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

881

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

882

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the preferred Option A.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

883

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

884

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Bovis Homes, Mr & Mrs Goodley and

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

931

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

We agree that the Local Plan should be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have no objection to the policy approach set out in 5.5 to 5.10, albeit reference is made to the Planning Inspectorate model policy without including it within the text.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

932

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

933

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the preferred Option B in respect of an increase in housing provision in the Service Villages in accordance with paragraph 5.16.1, but subject to recognition that land within the ROY zone may well be deemed safe within site specific flood risk assessments.

The objective is stated to be to enable development to occur in non ROY zone land, but land outside the town of Boston within Boston Borough may well provide a more suitable location for new development.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

934

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	935	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr R Doughty	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Persimmon Homes
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	We do not agree to the promotion of those settlements in Boston Borough, as smaller settlements with little by way of infrastructure or services, such as Algakirk and Swineshead Bridge, are not appropriate locations for development.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	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>	936	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr R Doughty	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Persimmon Homes
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	The list of Service Centres should be limited to those settlements with a range of facilities and services to be specified in supporting evidence. Contrary to the Spatial Strategy wording, many of the 'promoted settlements' do not act as local service centres for the surrounding rural area.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	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.

---

Response\_Number:

937

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

938

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---



Response\_Number:

939

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

We seek a review of the settlements promoted to Service Centre status and wish to see those settlements listed be limited to those that truly are service centres to the surrounding rural area.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number:

940

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the preferred Option A.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

941

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

942

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Persimmon Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

991

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

We agree that the Local Plan should be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and have no objection to the policy approach set out in 5.5 to 5.10, albeit reference is made to the Planning Inspectorate model policy without including it within the text.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

992

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

993

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

We agree with the approach.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

994

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

995

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

No change is suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

996

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

997

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

998

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

No changes are suggested.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

999

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

We support the preferred Option A.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

1000

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Fen Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

The Development Management preferred policy is consistent with other development plan policies and the criteria are acceptable.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response_Number:	1001	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	Fen Properties
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
No changes are suggested.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

Response_Number:	1033	Persons_Name:	Mr R Doughty	Representing_Who?:	K Enderby
Respondents_Comments:		Officer_Response:		Officer_Recommendation:	
Preferred Option B and an increase in housing provision in the Service Villages in accordance with paragraph 5.16.1 is supported, but subject to on the basis that land within the ROY zone may well be deemed safe within site specific flood risk assessments.		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---



Response\_Number: 1034

Persons\_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents\_Comments:

The Spatial Strategy reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number: 1035

Persons\_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents\_Comments:

We do not agree to the promotion of settlements in Boston Borough, as smaller settlements with little by way of infrastructure or services, such as Algakirk and Swineshead Bridge, are not appropriate locations for development.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number: 1036

Persons\_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents\_Comments:

The list of Service Centres should be limited to those settlements with a range of facilities and services to be specified in supporting evidence. Contrary to the Spatial Strategy wording, many of the 'promoted settlements' do not act as local service centres for the surrounding rural area.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number: 1037

Persons\_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?: K Enderby

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

1038

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

K Enderby

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number:

1039

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

K Enderby

Respondents\_Comments:

We seek a review of the settlements promoted to Service Centre status and wish to see those settlements listed be limited to those that truly are service centres to the surrounding rural area.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number: 1053

Persons\_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents\_Comments:

The failure to identify modest development opportunity in villages below the Service Village designation is unacceptable.

Smaller villages, such as Freiston, can accommodate small scale development that will assist in supporting existing facilities and services. The promotion of a policy that will effectively place a further moratorium on development is untenable.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number: 1054

Persons\_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents\_Comments:

The Spatial Strategy broadly reflects an accepted approach to Local Plan policies, but there should be a further type included, which is villages that fall between the Service Villages and the Countryside designation, whereby small scale development is accepted without the need to meet the associated countryside criteria that is unduly restrictive when applied to locations such as Freiston.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number: 1055

Persons\_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents\_Comments:

A further type of place should be added to the policy to recognise the role of villages, such as Freiston, with an allowance for small scale development to support local essential services.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number: 1056

Persons\_Name: Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?: Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents\_Comments:

The approach reflects standard practice in terms of site allocations and it is agreed that option A is the only reasonable option.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Development of small sites in the villages will not require an allocation, but a policy will be required to determine planning applications and their impact on a particular settlement.

Response\_Number:

1057

Persons\_Name:

Mr R Doughty

Representing\_Who?:

Richard Pearson Ltd

Respondents\_Comments:

The criteria are consistent with other development plan policies.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

Response\_Number: 1067

Persons\_Name: Mr B Collins McDougall

Representing\_Who?: Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Service Centres & Service Villages

There is clearly a presumption in favour of industrial, commercial and residential development in the Boroughs of Boston and Spalding, in the Service Centres of Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Kirton, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge and in the Service Villages of Algakirk, Bicker, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonsides, Quadring, Surfleet, Swineshead Bridge, Tydd St Mary, Wigtoft and Wrangle. The so called "Settlement Hierarchy"

The residents of these towns and villages should be consulted with clear and easy to understand information on what these classifications actually mean for their areas. As explained above the full consultation document failed to convey this information in an accessible way. For a proposed change of this type a letter should be sent to every resident of the affected areas letting them know what the classifications will actually mean and the type of development that will or could be permitted. That is the only way a meaningful consultation can take place. This is done by other Local Authorities that have a clearer commitment to participatory democracy.

Under the Localism Act the views of those who live in the areas affected by a development should be sought rather than the decisions being made by planners who do not live locally. After people have been informed they should be given a chance to vote in a referendum on the classification of their areas as service centres for industrial and commercial interests. Only if a mandate is given for allowing almost unrestricted development should these designations of Service Centres & Service Villages be allowed to go ahead.

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. The respondent makes many comments and observations essentially about the plan making system. It is acknowledged that the process is very complicated. However the local plan consultation has been undertaken within an approved Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and has, to all intents and purposes, exceeded the demands of the SCI. As was apparent from both the exhibitions and the comments received members of the public have a broad grasp of the issues and many hold views at variance with the respondent. As regards the "settlement hierarchy" in particular, the majority of settlements have had similar policy approaches to development in the past, this includes Sutton Bridge. As is also apparent from the policies in the Plan there is no intent to promote unrestrained development anywhere.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

While there may be a case for focusing development in certain areas and creating the supporting infrastructure let local people decide on the relative advantages and disadvantages of the proposals. Increased economic development can take many forms some of which will enhance the local environment while others will adversely effect the quality of life of the local communities.

I object to the designation of Sutton Bridge as a Service Centre and to the presumption that development should be allowed to grow around the village in what appears to be an “ad hoc” manner with few if any restrictions on what will be permitted. I regard the designation of the other Service Centres or Service Villages as unacceptable for the same reasons. Why should certain towns and villages be allowed to become dumping grounds for undesirable development while other similar areas are designated as rural – what is the basis and rationale for these designations? Some communities are being favoured and given protection while others ( as always those with a higher incidence of economic deprivation) are signalled out for unrestricted development. At a later date when local communities object to a particular planning application they will be told the time to object was when the area was designated as a service area.

---



<b>Response_Number:</b>	1074	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	O A Taylor Ltd
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>		
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Fleet Hargate in particular, has a good and varied range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Garages, , Local Public House, Church,, and Good Bus services.</p> <p>Therefore its ability to service local needs, and conversely its need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand. The villages of Saracens Head and Holbeach Bank are located well close to the main A17. There are some services in the village.</p>	<p>Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.</p>		<p>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.</p>		

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1079	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	J Grant
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer Recommendation:</b>		
<p>We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 .</p> <p>Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Swineshead particular, has an large and varied range of different local services and therefore has a continued need to service local needs, and conversely it needs to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>		<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>		

Response\_Number: 1105

Persons\_Name: Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?: Mrs R Bridger

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4.

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Holbeach Clough, whilst only having a limited range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Garage, , Local Public House, Church,, and Good Bus services does have a continued need to service local needs, and conversely it need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

Response\_Number: 1110

Persons\_Name: Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?: R C Tinsley

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4

Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Deeping St Nicholas in particular, whilst not having many local services, does have a good Bus services. Its ability to service local needs, and conversely it’s need to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock, go hand in hand.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1115

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

H Nundy

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’ ,in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 .  
Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Swineshead particular, has an large and varied range of different local services and therefore has a continued need to service local needs, and conversely it needs to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock..

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1120

Persons\_Name:

Annabel Parkinson

Representing\_Who?:

J Grant

Respondents\_Comments:

We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 , and in particular the re-instatement of Quadring as a Service Village. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Gosberton in particular, has an large and varied range of different local services including Local Supermarket/Post Office, Butchers, Garage, Bank, Doctors Surgery/Medical Centre, Fruit Shop, Cafes, Hairdressers, Barbers, Primary School/Play group, Special School, Local Public House, Parish Church, Methodist Chapel, Baptist Chapel, Garage, Dental Surgery, Youth Club Village Hall, Community Centre, Restaurants, Care Homes, and several Bus services, and therefore has a continued need to service local needs, and conversely it needs to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock..

---

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1124	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	The Casswell Family
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 , and in particular the re-instatement of Quadring as a Service Village. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Quadring has a good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Curry house, and Bus service, and therefore has a continued need to service local needs, and conversely it needs to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock..	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1128	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Annabel Parkinson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	The Casswell Family
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Sutterton has a good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, , Restaurant and Local Public House, Church , Church Hall, 2 x Business Parks and Good Bus services, and therefore has a continued need to service local needs, and conversely it needs to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1132	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Annabel Parkinson	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	J Grant
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>		
We particularly wish to comment and support the proposed Settlement hierarchy change – Q18s, which we believe will permit housing development in some of the villages which were categorised as ‘Other Rural settlements’, in the current Local Plan. We support the promotion of Option B – 5.12.4 , and in particular the re-instatement of Quadring as a Service Village. Regarding the Distribution and scale of development , we consider Quadring has a good range of different local services including Local Shop/Post Office, Primary School/Play group, Local Public House, Church, Village Hall, Curry house, and Bus service, and therefore has a continued need to service local needs, and conversely it needs to have the support and benefit of a growing housing stock..	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1140	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Anne Casey	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	RSPB
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>		
Question 15 Presumption in favour of sustainable development The RSPB supports the need for there to be local policy included on this topic rather than relying totally on the national policy.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response\_Number: 1143

Persons\_Name: Mrs J M Blundell

Representing\_Who?: Herself

Respondents\_Comments:

Service Centres & Service Villages

There is clearly a presumption in favour of industrial, commercial and residential development in the Boroughs of Boston and Spalding, in the Service Centres of Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Kirton, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge and in the Service Villages of Algakirk, Bicker, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonsides, Quadring, Surfleet, Swineshead Bridge, Tydd St Mary, Wigtoft and Wrangle. The so called "Settlement Hierarchy"

The residents of these towns and villages should be consulted with clear and easy to understand information on what these classifications actually mean for their areas. As explained above the full consultation document failed to convey this information in an accessible way. For a proposed change of this type a letter should be sent to every resident of the affected areas letting them know what the classifications will actually mean and the type of development that will or could be permitted. That is the only way a meaningful consultation can take place. This is done by other Local Authorities that have a clearer commitment to participatory democracy.

Under the Localism Act the views of those who live in the areas affected by a development should be sought rather than the decisions being made by planners who do not live locally. After people have been informed they should be given a chance to vote in a referendum on the classification of their areas as service centres for industrial and commercial interests. Only if a mandate is given for allowing almost unrestricted development should these designations of Service Centres & Service Villages be allowed to go ahead.

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. The respondent makes many comments and observations essentially about the plan making system. It is acknowledged that the process is very complicated. However the local plan consultation has been undertaken within an approved Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) and has, to all intents and purposes, exceeded the demands of the SCI. As was apparent from both the exhibitions and the comments received members of the public have a broad grasp of the issues and many hold views at variance with the respondent. As regards the "settlement hierarchy" in particular, the majority of settlements have had similar policy approaches to development in the past, this includes Sutton Bridge. As is also apparent from the policies in the Plan there is no intent to promote unrestrained development anywhere.

Officer Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

While there may be a case for focusing development in certain areas and creating the supporting infrastructure let local people decide on the relative advantages and disadvantages of the proposals. Increased economic development can take many forms some of which will enhance the local environment while others will adversely effect the quality of life of the local communities.

I object to the designation of Sutton Bridge as a Service Centre and to the presumption that development should be allowed to grow around the village in what appears to be an “ad hoc” manner with few if any restrictions on what will be permitted. I regard the designation of the other Service Centres or Service Villages as unacceptable for the same reasons. Why should certain towns and villages be allowed to become dumping grounds for undesirable development while other similar areas are designated as rural – what is the basis and rationale for these designations? Some communities are being favoured and given protection while others ( as always those with a higher incidence of economic deprivation) are signalled out for unrestricted development. At a later date when local communities object to a particular planning application they will be told the time to object was when the area was designated as a service area.

---



Response\_Number:

1147

Persons\_Name:

Angela Reeve

Representing\_Who?:

Cemex UK Properties

Respondents\_Comments:

Paragraphs 5.11 5.16.1 set out the Joint Strategic Planning Committee s approach to distributing development between settlements. It identifies two policy options: Option A encourages development to continue alongside the current baseline settlement hierarchy, focussing development in Sub-Regional and Main Service Centres; Option B would encourage a more dispersed approach to development, increasing the proportion of development in the Service Villages. Paragraph 5.16.1 identifies Option B as the preferred options policy. Option B is advocated in the DPD on the grounds that it would allow for more development to occur in the non-ROY zones and ensure that housing development in ROY zones can be capped , therefore reducing flood risk. We however consider Option B to be the less sustainable option as the Service Villages (SVs) are unlikely to have sufficient services and infrastructure to accommodate an influx in housing and associated population growth. We propose that a preferred policy option which seeks to maintain the role of the Main Service Centres (MSCs) and provided limited levels of housing to meet needs in the Service Villages would be more sustainable and appropriate. The levels of housing for the SVs proposed in the current version of the Local Plan should therefore be reduced. The MSCs already have a good level of existing infrastructure, services and facilities therefore it is more appropriate for these settlements to receive a significant proportion of the overall housing target for the plan area rather than directing growth to the SVs. Building on the existing provision provided at the MSCs will ensure that the critical mass required to provide and sustain good services and facilities is achieved.

Officer\_Response:

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.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1161	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mrs J Dean	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Anglian Water
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>We support the criteria relating to water and wastewater services (Point 2, 4, 5 and 7) for allocating sites and within Development Management (Point 5, 7 and 8). However, the Development Management policy should cross reference the delivery section regarding the provision of new infrastructure. We also support the reference to protecting 'the quality, quantity and availability of water resource' within the Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy.</p> <p>Boston Sewage Treatment Works (STW) and Spalding STW have current capacity to accommodate the quantum of growth proposed within their catchments. The sewerage infrastructure (sewers) requirement for development is dependent on the scale and location of development. This will need to be explored further when considering specific allocations.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>Comments noted. The Development Management policy will, in its implementation consider all relevant information including infrastructure provision, new and proposed. The supporting text will provide checks with other policy elements of relevance to the implementation of the policy. Infrastructure in its entirety will be comprehensively addressed through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which will inform the next stage of the plan-making process, and will accompany the Submission Version of the DPD.</p>	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan following Whole Plan Viability and Infrastructure Delivery Plan work.</p>

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1166	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	P C Bradshaw	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr and Mrs R Hamilton
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>It is agreed that the development of a Spatial Strategy for the Plan area is best served by the option which recognises the value of the Service Villages. The promotion of these villages through Option B is realistic in its acknowledgement of the community services and resources currently available, and the extent to which housing and population growth will help to sustain them. Such a strategy enables a degree of incremental growth as well as opportunity in providing housing in these established settlements.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>Support noted.</p>	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>Support - No change to the approach is required.</p>

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1167	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	P C Bradshaw	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr and Mrs R Hamilton
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	It is agreed that the proposed criteria are appropriate.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1168	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	P C Bradshaw	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr and Mrs R Hamilton
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	It is agreed that the Development Management criteria identified are appropriate. The final criterion could benefit by being amended by to read 'Impact upon and contribution to areas of natural habitats, and historical buildings and heritage'.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	The Policy has been reviewd and "Impact or enhancement" has been included in the final criterion.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

---

Response\_Number:

1172

Persons\_Name:

Mr J Dadge

Representing\_Who?:

Mrs T Croxford

Respondents\_Comments:

Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
The economic, cultural and environmental dimensions to sustainable development are laudable and the approach set out in the consultation document is generally supported.  
Question 15 we particularly agree with paragraph 5.1.9 that local people should be empowered to shape their surroundings but query whether in some respects the ability to do that is taken away by certain elements of the spatial strategy.  
Spatial Strategy  
Question 18 – we do not agree with the approach in relation to the fourth (bullet 4) of the four types of place for the purpose of guiding new development across South East Lincolnshire.  
We consider that in some areas of the countryside the distribution of scattered smaller settlements and hamlets below the ‘service villages’, means that it would be appropriate to consider some additional forms of development.  
It is noted particularly in the countryside that rural exceptions for affordable housing and new build employment generating proposals are considered appropriate. It is our contention that it would also be appropriate to consider a small scale market housing development particularly when it is aligned with affordable housing or employment uses or where the development would comprise work place homes or live work units.  
By adopting this approach the more sporadic ‘lower order’ settlements or groups of settlements may be able to maintain and enhance the limited services and facilities that exist and function on a shared basis.  
By adopting this approach a balanced community would be maintained and the prospect of

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designated as Service Villages.

Officer Recommendation:

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.

retaining valued local services, for example village schools, pubs and shops would be enhanced.

Response\_Number: 1173

Persons\_Name: Mr J Dadge

Representing\_Who?: Mrs T Croxford

Respondents\_Comments:

Spatial Strategy  
Question 18 – we do not agree with the approach in relation to the fourth (bullet 4) of the four types of place for the purpose of guiding new development across Southeast Lincolnshire. We consider that in some areas of the countryside the distribution of scattered smaller settlements and hamlets below the ‘service villages’, means that it would be appropriate to consider some additional forms of development. It is noted particularly in the countryside that rural exceptions for affordable housing and new build employment generating proposals are considered appropriate. It is our contention that it would also be appropriate to consider a small scale market housing development particularly when it is aligned with affordable housing or employment uses or where the development would comprise work place homes or live work units. By adopting this approach the more sporadic ‘lower order’ settlements or groups of settlements may be able to maintain and enhance the limited services and facilities that exist and function on a shared basis. By adopting this approach a balanced community would be maintained and the prospect of retaining valued local services, for example village schools, pubs and shops would be enhanced.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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>	1174	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Dadge	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mrs T Croxford
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Site Allocations in Southeast Lincolnshire Question 22 – we are generally in agreement with the proposed criteria but having regard to the previous comments we would request a change to the text to read “the site will be located in or adjacent to the existing built up area of the settlement” or settlements where these are closely related geographically and are mutually supportive in cultural, social and economic terms.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	This Policy has been deleted and is not taken forward in the draft Local Plan	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1179	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Angela Newton	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Support your comments.  Re WSN 015 The owners request that the land is brought forward for development now. They are pleased you have classified it as developable but do not want to wait 6-10 years. There is proven case of people wanting dwellings in this location now. WSN 015 meets Sites allocations in your Preferred Options document. It is adjacent to existing built up parts of the village and all mains services are available. Local Primary School is approx 1/4 mile way, village amenities include post Office/Shop. Pub, Church and local bus service. Weston in only a few minutes drive from Spalding an has excellent road/rail links. There is a regular bus services in the village.  We do have a developer interested in developing the land NOW. We understand the developer will begin initial discussions with the Planning Department in the foreseeable future.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Comments noted. It is not the purpose of the Preferred Options Document to assess particular sites, other than those identified as 'Broad Locations for Development'. This is the role of the SHLAA and in due course the Site Allocations DPD.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	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>	1185	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Angela Newton	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Yes	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1186	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Angela Newton	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Support Option B in 5.12.4. Can only speak for the Service villages in South Holland but think 50 houses at least should be allowed in Weston and other villages.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	It is accepted that further work is required on finalising levels of development in the designated 'Service Villages' in South Holland District.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	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>	1187	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Angela Newton	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Mr J and Mr G Eyett
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>		<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	
Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1203	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr and Mrs C Woods	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Themselves
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>		<b>Officer_Response:</b>		<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	
I would not agree to promoting small settlements to service villages on flood risk alone. Lack of other facilities and road access should override this.		This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.16 which explains that this approach is required to deliver the 'cap'. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.		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.	

---



Response\_Number:

1233

Persons\_Name:

Mr J Brown

Representing\_Who?:

Ambrose Lighton

Respondents\_Comments:

Q17 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 5.11 – 5.22 under Approach to the Distribution of Development Between Settlements and Approach to Development in the Countryside in the full consultation document? Please explain your view.

It is considered that Option A represents the correct approach which would maintain the focus on growth at the appropriate focal points for sustainable new growth, namely the sub-regional and main service centres. Option A would be a workable solution provided that the cap on development in ROY zones (if one is ultimately deemed necessary) is set at an appropriate level.

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

Response\_Number: 1234

Persons\_Name: Mr J Brown

Representing\_Who?: Ambrose Lighton

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer Recommendation:

Q19 - The preferred policy approach 'Spatial Strategy' promotes Algarkirk, Bicker, Fishtoft, Kirton End, Leake Commonside, Quadring, Surfleet, Swineshead Bridge, Tydd, St Mary, Wigtoft and Wrangle to Service Villages because they are not in the worst flood hazard zones. Do you agree with this approach?

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.

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

The Boston Borough Interim plan (February 2006) identified the five larger settlements of Kirton, Butterwick, Old Leake, Sutterton and Swineshead as "service settlements" because "they are sustainable villages providing a range of services and facilities for both themselves and nearby smaller settlements. Kirton is a main service centre because of its two schools, the range of shopping, community, leisure and recreational facilities and the diverse range of employment opportunities. The other four service villages, although providing a more limited but valuable range of services and facilities to those in Kirton, each have a school, shopping facilities and places of employment, are also convenient to the main highway network, and are served by public transport to the town of Boston" (paragraph 8.20). Smaller villages were excluded from this list because they were less sustainable.

This is borne out by the Council's most recent assessment of villages' sustainability (13 July 2012 South East Lincolnshire JSPU Committee, Section 7, Appendix). This makes clear that Kirton (116) is the most sustainable location in Boston Borough, but that the other Service Villages of Butterwick (65), Old Leake (69), Sutterton (66), Swineshead (81) score well. Of the additional villages now identified as service villages, some score well (Wrangle (74), Fishtoft (64), Bicker (59)) but the majority score much more poorly and are clearly much less sustainable (Algarkirk (40), Kirton End

(34), Leake Commonside (28), Swineshead Bridge (34), Wigtoft (28)). It appears that they have been promoted to service villages purely on the basis that of the ROY assessment without any consideration given to their sustainability credentials. Their limited capacity for new development is demonstrated by the fact that within all of these villages the Council's own SHLAA only identifies one site for 6-10 dwellings in Swineshead Bridge and three sites for 6-10 dwellings each in Wigtoft.

Thus, rather than direct development towards the most sustainable locations as identified by the settlement hierarchy, this option does the complete opposite and directs development towards less sustainable locations which have poorer access to; transport, facilities, services and local employment. The impact on local infrastructure would be significant. There may also be resistance in smaller communities which could impact on deliverability of housing.

Before committing to this significant level of growth in these locations the impact on these settlements and their realistic capacity for growth must be assessed in detail. Furthermore, this should be appropriately balanced against the merits of taking development from Red, Orange and Yellow flood zones (preferably through a more detailed assessment of flood hazard at the strategic level).

Furthermore, not only is Option B considered less sustainable it is also considered less deliverable and could undermine the core plan objectives of housing delivery and economic growth.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1235	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Brown	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Ambrose Lighton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Q20 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest?	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.		Objection - No change to the approach is required.		

We would suggest that the spatial approach should be adapted to ensure that appropriate provision is made to the main sub-regional centre of Boston as well as the nearby service centre of Kirton. This would thus limit the pressure on smaller settlements which have less scope for accommodating growth sustainably. These changes would need to go hand in hand with adaptations of the approach to strategic flood risk and any cap on ROY zones, as outlined above.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1236	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Brown	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Ambrose Lighton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Q21 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 5.23 – 5.28 under Approach to Site Allocations in the full consultation document? Please explain your view.	This Policy has been deleted and is not being taken forward in the drfat Local Plan		Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.		

It is agreed that a criteria based policy to guide the site allocations process is the appropriate mechanism to ensure that the most sustainable sites come forward. This approach, however, is likely to be at odds with the currently proposed cap on development in ROY zones which will direct development to less sustainable locations which do not have adequate infrastructure and services. It is considered that this policy would be Sound if there was a more rigorous assessment of flooding at the strategic level.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1237	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Brown	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Ambrose Lighton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q22 - The preferred policy approach 'Site Allocations in South East Lincolnshire' highlights the criteria that will be taken into account when allocating sites for development. Do you agree with the proposed criteria?		This Policy has been deleted and is not being taken forward in the drfat Local Plan		Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.	

The site allocation criteria are considered entirely appropriate and reflects logical and clear guidance. It is concerning, however, that these criteria are likely to be unachievable on many of the sites in lower order settlements which would be favoured by the imposition of the cap on development in ROY zones.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1238	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Brown	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Ambrose Lighton
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q23 - What changes, if any, to the preferred policy approach or supporting text in the full consultation document would you suggest?		This policy approach has been reconsidered in the darft Local Plan		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).	

The policy is considered sound other than the recommended shift in the approach to managing growth in areas of coastal flood risk.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1258	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Ms A Hewitson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Environment Agency
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Q17 - Do you agree with the identification and appraisal of reasonable and unreasonable options outlined in sections 5.11 – 5.22 under Approach to the Distribution of Development Between Settlements and Approach to Development in the Countryside in the full consultation document? Please explain your view. We support Option B for a more dispersed pattern of growth, which will support the delivery of housing development outside of the ROY zone and thereby minimise the number of new dwellings being built in an area of highest flood hazard.	Support noted.		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>	1259	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Ms A Hewitson	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Environment Agency
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Q22 - The preferred policy approach 'Site Allocations in South East Lincolnshire' highlights the criteria that will be taken into account when allocating sites for development. Do you agree with the proposed criteria? We support the inclusion of this policy which seeks to ensure that site allocations will not have adverse impacts on the natural assets, existing infrastructure, including green infrastructure, and will be subject to flood risk sequential test and other policy requirements in relation to flood risk.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

Response\_Number: 1268

Persons\_Name: Mr J Hobson

Representing\_Who?: Chestnut Homes

Respondents\_Comments:

Questions 17-18 – Approach to the distribution of development between settlements and approach to development in the countryside.

We consider that the approach to the distribution of development between the settlements and the approach to distribution of housing to be provided within the District are strongly linked so we have addressed them as a single issue.

The options outlined in Section 5.12 relate to: Option A – continuing with the existing baseline hierarchy focusing developments in the Sub-Region Centres and Main Service Centres. Option B promotes a more dispersed approach to development which seeks to accommodate a greater level of development in the Service Villages. Whilst the preferred option has been identified as Option B, it is our opinion that Option A is a more appropriate approach to adopt particular insofar as supporting the role of Boston as a Sub-Regional Centre.

At Paragraph 6.7.1, it is proposed that two thirds of Boston Borough’s dwelling provision (i.e. 2,900 dwellings) will be directed to the town itself. This is based on evidence of historic development rates for housing over the last 35 years which shows the completion in Boston Urban Area have amounted to approximately 65% dwellings built (see Paragraph 6.6.2). In a similar vein to our concerns regarding the overall spatial option of choosing a more dispersed form of development, we are of the opinion that the proportion of the overall housing provision for Boston Borough being directed to the town is too low and should be increased in recognition of Boston’s important role and function as a Sub-Regional Centre.

Officer\_Response:

This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 6.7-6.11.

'At the meeting of the Joint Committee on 25 November, officers updated their response by reporting a new concern about the need to increase housing provision in both Boston Borough and South Holland District in the light of new household projections. As a consequence of this action, it would be necessary to reconsider the nature of the cap on housing development in the ROY zones.'  
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.

It is recognised that the emerging growth policies need to balance the need for a more cautious approach to ensure that on the one hand, future development does not increase the probability and severity of flooding whilst on the other hand, deliver growth that has been objectively assessed in the most sustainable and beneficial locations. As such, we are sympathetic to the approach of setting separate limits on the number of additional dwellings provided in the Red, Orange and Yellow (ROY) flood/hazard zones for Boston Borough. However, the Sub-Regional Centre of Boston is not only the place of choice for a substantial proportion of the plan areas residence and workers but also one of the major economic social and service hubs for South East Lincolnshire. For Boston to realise its economic potential as a 'Sub-Regional Centre' some fundamental shift in its economic profile will be required. The challenge is to create the conditions where future economic development and growth will need to be focused in order to bring the performance of the areas economy closer to the regional and national average. As a consequence, significant new opportunities and investments need to be identified particularly in potential growth areas such as Boston. We therefore consider there is an emphasis of importance to rely on future developments within Boston Town to create a reversal of fortune to improve the overall competitiveness of the Borough. Boston Town must look to build on and maintain existing economic assets as well as developing new assets that would make it an attractive location for new investment and encourage people to live, work and visit. Creating a more dispersed distribution of growth will not achieve a critical mass required to support the regeneration of Boston as a Sub-Regional Centre. Whilst we appreciate directing more growth to Boston would directly conflict with seeking to reduce growth within high levels of flood risk, we consider in overall terms an increased growth to Boston would achieve a more sustainable solution to regenerate the economy.



Paragraph 6.6.2 refers to the historic housing completion rates within the Boston Urban area for the last 35 years amounting to approximately a 65% of the dwellings built. We are of the opinion that only limited weight should be placed on the past completion rates since there is a danger that your authority seeks to plan in the context of the previous performance of the settlement which has been influenced by a whole series of factors such as priority towards developing on previously developed land and identification of unrealistic allocations. In contrast, acknowledgement should be given to the principles of NPPF which seeks to significantly boost housing supply. The historic performance therefore does not reflect the current pro-growth agenda and therefore we recommend approximately 80% of the Borough's housing provision should be directed to Boston town in readiness to respond to an upturn in economic conditions.

---

Response\_Number:

1276

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Coathup

Representing\_Who?:

Lincolnshire County Council

Respondents\_Comments:

The report then sets out policy options for the distribution of development across SE Lincolnshire and the following settlement hierarchy:

- Sub Regional Centres – Boston and Spalding
- Main Service Centres – Crowland, Donington, Holbeach, Kirton, Long Sutton and Sutton Bridge
- Service Villages: 16 settlements
- Other Villages: 22 settlements

The preferred approach is to concentrate development in the main towns of Boston and Spalding, the Main Service Centres and Service Villages, and promote a number of the "Other Villages" to "Service Villages" to take advantage of development land not affected by flood risk. This concentration, particularly in Boston and Spalding, would promote economies of scale in service delivery and allow more effective pooling of developer contributions to essential infrastructure, and is broadly supported by LCC.

The text in section 5.2 describing the inherited and baseline settlement hierarchies can be confusing and the process could be clarified.

5.36 Preferred Policy Approaches – Site Allocations in SE Lincs (p78)

Although it could possibly be taken as implied in the 4th bullet point, a direct reference to being accessible by cycling and walking would be welcomed within this list.

Officer\_Response:

This approach has changed within the draft Local Plan and a different Spatial Strategy is proposed

Officer\_Recommendation:

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

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1291	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	General - Optimistically, we had assumed that the new South East Lincolnshire Local Plan would be more precise and specific in spelling out the local application of the NPPF's general policies – in the way the 1996 South Holland Local Plan was specific in its policies for, for example, advertising and signs, hot food take-aways, security shutters, caravan sites and roadside services, etc. Such policies mean that everybody – applicants, case-officers, elected members, statutory consultees, and the general public alike – know clearly where they stand. It is a pity, therefore, that there are not more policies in the proposed new Local Plan as specific as the one that, rightly, protects the visual dominance of Boston Stump over the Boston skyline or that which sets out the exact, different, percentages of affordable housing for Boston Borough and South Holland.	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Comments noted. It is acknowledged that the Preferred Options Document does not provide all the detailed policy considerations of previous Local Plans. The NPPF tries to steer policy plans away from the detailed and prescriptive considerations of previous Local Plans. Nevertheless, in the next stage of the plan-making process further consideration will be given to the need for additional policies.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	These considerations have been taken forward in the draft Local Plan where new policies and amendments have been proposed.

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1301	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Question 15 Yes	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1302	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	Question 16 – P.74, Blue Box, Para. 1, second sentence – Strengthen. Replace start of sentence with: “Pre-application discussion is expected, so that applicants and Council can work jointly to find ...”	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	This Policy is a standard policy recommended by the Planning Inspectorate. The policy wording would encompass the Objector's promotion of pre-application discussion and is by no means a policy that only applies when a registered application is being considered.  Pre-application discussions are encouraged in practice.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - NO change to the policy is recommended.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1303	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr J Charlesworth	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	See comments for Qus 18 - 20	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	These comments will be taken into account in the next stage of the plan-making process.	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).

---

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1304	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>Questions 18 &amp; 20 – We believe the service village concept may well be harmful. To forbid further housing or shops in non-service villages risks the closing of their schools, withdrawal of bus services and general stagnation. Applications for housing and other development should be considered individually on their merits, subject to strict control on numbers, location, appropriate design, etc. – there must be no dumping of large suburban estates on the edges of villages. Such a revision would produce four types of place: Sub-Regional Centres, Main Service Centres, Villages and Open Countryside (i.e. everywhere outside the development boundaries of the other three types).</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically in sections 5.11 - 5.16. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be designation as Service Villages.</p>	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>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.</p>

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1305	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>Question 19 – No. It produces all sorts of anomalies of settlement size, coherence, etc. (Swineshead Bridge and Deeping St Nicholas, for example), excluding other villages that would have equal or greater claim just because they are in flood hazard zones.</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.16 which explains that this approach is required to deliver the 'cap'. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.</p>	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	<p>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.</p>

<b>Response_Number:</b>	1306	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	<p>Questions 20 – P. 76, Blue Box, Countryside Section, Opening sentence – Strengthen. Replace “in accordance with” by “provided it accords [complies?] with”</p> <p>P. 76, Blue Box, Countryside Section, bullet point 1 – add “and horticulture”</p> <p>P. 76, Blue Box, Countryside Section, bullet points 13 and 15 – We feel the potential degradation of the open countryside through development for “recreation and tourism” and “transport” (e.g. petrol stations, eateries and fast food cafes, go-kart racing, etc., etc.) is too great for the quoted items to figure in the list without explicit qualification of some sort. And what about grid transmission lines and telecommunication masts?</p>	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	The Policy approach has been amended in the draft Local Plan.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).
<b>Response_Number:</b>	1307	<b>Persons_Name:</b>	Mr J Charlesworth	<b>Representing_Who?:</b>	Spalding and District Civic Society
<b>Respondents_Comments:</b>	Question 21 – Yes	<b>Officer_Response:</b>	Support noted.	<b>Officer_Recommendation:</b>	Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response_Number:	1308	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Yes - with the modifications referred to under Q23.	Officer_Response:	This policy has been deleted and has not been taken forward in the draft Local Plan	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.

---

Response_Number:	1309	Persons_Name:	Mr J Charlesworth	Representing_Who?:	Spalding and District Civic Society
Respondents_Comments:	Question 23 – P.78, Blue Box, Bullet Point 6 – Strengthen. Delete “adequately replaced elsewhere” and substitute: “replaced by equal or enhanced provision nearby” P.78, Blue Box, Extra Bullet Point – Insert “sites will have been subject to appropriate sequential testing and other planning policy requirements in relation to the preferential use of brown field land”	Officer_Response:	This policy has been deleted and has not been taken forward in the draft Local Plan	Officer_Recommendation:	Objection - No change to the policy is recommended.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1310	<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 24 – Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1311	<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>	
Yes subject to the comments made to Q26		This Policy has been amended in the draft Local Plan		Objection - A minor change to the approach may be required (e.g. detailed policy wording/SA scoring).	

---



Response\_Number:

1312

Persons\_Name:

Mr J Charlesworth

Representing\_Who?:

Spalding and District Civic Society

Respondents\_Comments:

Question 26 – P.79, Blue Box, Bullet Point 2 – insert after “design”:”, landscaping.”  
P.79, Blue Box, Bullet Point 6 – After “noise” amend to read: “, odour, disturbance, visual intrusion or loss of view or visual closure.”

Officer\_Response:

This Policy has been amended in the draft Local Plan

Officer\_Recommendation:

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

---

Response\_Number:

1362

Persons\_Name:

Mr J Charlesworth

Representing\_Who?:

Spalding and District Civic Society

Respondents\_Comments:

We should like to see specific policies introduced to cover the following matters.  
Housing and the seasonal workforce.  
At 14,000 the South East Lincolnshire economy is clearly dependent on its annual seasonal workers in horticulture and crop processing. The particular housing concerns such numbers create are complicated by the seasonal workers who opt to stay longer. There are two major problems.  
The first is the distortion of the local housing market. The small houses in the district suitable for first-time buyers have been increasingly bought up by gang master organisations and buy to let landlords to house seasonal workers or medium sized older properties have been converted into HMOs or flats, resulting in a shortage of housing for young families, with the consequent inflation of house prices further exacerbating the problem (and incidentally leading to tensions and resentment of “immigrants”).  
The second problem is the almost inevitable deterioration of the street scene where a number of such ‘taken-over’ properties are clustered together. Flat conversions and multi occupied premises exacerbate on-street and front garden parking problems, and gang master and absentee landlords all too often do not bother about the increasingly run down appearance of their properties, while short-term tenants have no incentive to look after the gardens or frontage of somewhere they will only be in for a few months. Some premises can become quite squalid in appearance. Family owners or long term residents then tend to move out when streets start to go downhill. (The sad deterioration of the northern leg of St Thomas’s Road, for example, during the last 10 years is a clear example.) It raises the question of whether hostel accommodation (with integral leisure facilities) might not be part of the answer.

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. It is acknowledged that the Preferred Options Document does not provide all the detailed policy considerations of previous Local Plans. The NPPF tries to steer policy plans away from the detailed and prescriptive considerations of previous Local Plans. Nevertheless, in the next stage of the plan-making process further consideration will be given to the need for additional policies.

Officer Recommendation:

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

The South Holland Local Plan had/has several specific policies: Accommodation for Transient Agricultural Workers, Change of Use to HMO Use, Residential Flat Conversion. There is no equivalent in the proposed South East Lincolnshire Local Plan. The situation will not go away. Or solve itself. It is a consequence of the local economy.

It is essential therefore that the new local plan contains a robust policy to deal with it.

Advertising, signs and blanked out shop windows

This is another crucial area the proposed Local Plan does not address. The photographs on the next two pages speak for themselves of the degradation of town centres and conservation areas by uncontrolled adverts, signs, banners and blanked out windows. We can find no relevant policy in the Environment section or anywhere else. A reference to protecting “general amenity” does not begin to be robust or specific enough to deal with the problem – or its equivalent in the countryside. Efforts to regenerate the high street and town centres by upgrading street furniture and so on will be largely wasted without clear control over proliferating advertising and signs etc.

Other Omissions.

We feel that specific policies are also required for home extensions (after the expiry of the new 3 year free fro all), Shop Fronts, Security Shutters and Hot Food takeaways, as they do not seem to be sufficiently covered by the proposed policies.

---

Response\_Number: 1384

Persons\_Name: Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?: Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Officer\_Response:

Officer\_Recommendation:

Q 15 There should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development that is in conformity with the Local Plan which in turn must be in broad conformity with the NPPF .

The emphasis on the sustainability of national and local economies underpins a sustainable society and provides the resources to protect the environment. My concern is that the definition of sustainability places insufficient emphasis on the need to minimise the consumption of the planets resources and that the developed world will have to consume less so as to extend to others the opportunity to enjoy a higher but sustainable standard of living.

This will mean substantial changes in the way we do things. Sustainable agriculture / horticulture can only be maintained in the longer term if households are to waste less food and are willing to pay more for their food.

The modes of transport will are beginning to change in larger urban areas (Boris bikes ) Personal transport is an essential in rural communities but using a low carbon fuels .

In innovation lies the key and the must positively welcome innovation .

---

Support noted.

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1385

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Q 16 The presumption in favour of approval for sustainable economic or social development on sites within an agreed settlement development envelope should be emphasised in the Plan unless the development proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of nearby properties. The focus should be on odour , noise pollution at unsocial hours and excessive traffic movements . Local parish or neighbourhood subordinate Plans could identify locations with rural settlements suitable for employment purposes.

Development proposals to benefit the wide public interest in the open country side should be supported if the benefits from such proposals significantly and demonstrably outweigh the adverse impact on the local community's amenity or adequate compensation for the loss of any amenity is agreed.

---

Officer\_Response:

Support noted.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Support - No change to the approach is required.

Response\_Number:

1386

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Q17 The arrangement of settlements into a base line hierarchy primarily on the basis of that on the existing local Plans for Boston Borough and South Holland is in my judgment unsatisfactory.  
The classification of small residential clusters of housing devoid of any significant facilities as open countryside is sensible.  
The fact that Boston Borough established a development envelope boundary around such isolated clusters of dwelling and South Holland did not, is not a justification for not treating such small isolated settlements devoid of services as anything other than settlements in the open countryside.  
Development envelope boundary carries an assumption that appropriate development for a site within the envelopment boundary should only be refused if there are significant relevant material planning considerations with sufficient weight to justify a refusal.  
All such isolated clusters of dwellings should be treated equally in the Plan.

These small dwelling clusters will relate to a larger settlement which in fact serves as a village service centre even if not defined as such.  
The snap shot assessment measures settlements against essential sustainability themes, access to services, public and commercial, public transport services and access to employment opportunities.  
The draft reports concede that the information from these assessment criteria can provide only a broad indication of a settlement's sustainability.  
The current schedule of service village settlements include some that have very limited facilities no shop / post office, no pub no garage limited public facilities , rundown community halls and occasional spiritual relief.

Officer\_Response:

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.

The criteria of sustainable facilities threatens many rural schools because mixed age teaching does not offer the stimulating learning environment available in larger nursery or primary schools and are expensive to run.

Rationalisation of primary education provision is educationally and financially justifiable.

The commercial viability of shops pubs etc depends on the demographic zone of potential customers.

Only by considering village service centres as the focus or a cluster of small, more isolated dwelling clusters will the Plan reflect rural sustainability.

One of the criteria is access to public transport.

The school bus run does not constitute public transport which in rural Lincolnshire is characterised by its infrequent, inconvenient service expensive to provide.

A review of the membership of the hierarchy of settlement evaluated against realistic sustainability criteria must be a priority. (As it stands the classification could be said to be based more of the ability to build new dwellings that meeting the needs of local communities.

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1387	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q18 Equality in treatment for small residential clusters in the countryside. In South Holland such clusters are treated as countryside and subject to constraints on development. In Boston such clusters are treated as settlements within a development boundary with fewer constraints on further development, why ?? The existence of clusters or rural dwellings is merely an administrative / historical quirk. Piece meal development will not create sustainable communities out of clusters of dwellings in the open countryside. Permitting such development simply because some of these clusters happen to be in lower flood risk locations is contrary to the intention to build sustainable communities.</p> <p>The classification should be Sub Regional Centres, Main Service Centres , Village Service Centres and Other Rural Settlements.</p> <p>The latter should all be treated as open countryside.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>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.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>Objection - No change to the approach is required.</p>

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1388	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<p>Q19 Just because a settlement is not located in the worst flood hazard zone is in itself not a sufficient justification for classifying settlement devoid of or with very few services as service villages. The existence of a development boundary for a settlement implies that some development would if appropriate be permitted. Some restriction on developments in zones with high flood risk potential is necessary particularly in Boston Borough. Any disparity in the ease with which planning consent can be secured for development in the open countryside will be exploited by the development industry. Promoting unsustainable settlements to service village status is a contradiction to much of the policy thrust in the Plan.</p>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>	<p>This issue has been adequately addressed in the Preferred Options Document, specifically section 5.16 which explains that this approach is required to deliver the 'cap'. However, further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.</p>	<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	<p>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.</p>



Response\_Number:

1389

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Q20 See above responses. Revisit criteria for evaluating rural settlements as Service Villages and eliminate some settlements from that list. Emphasise the clustering of other rural settlements with a village centre. Classify all other rural settlements as open countryside.

Officer\_Response:

Further work in respect of the provision of services and facilities is required in finalising the list of settlements which are to be promoted to designation as Service Villages.

Officer\_Recommendation:

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.

---

Response\_Number:

1390

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Q21 I am not persuaded that an open invitation for land owners to nominate land they own for development is constructive or amounts to consultation. It resolves some of the issues relating to availability but at a price.. The criteria used to determine which of the proffered sites are most suitable for development are appropriate and reasonable. The thrust behind the policy for allocating land for residential development in large greenfield urban extensions does raise a concern, for example, the large urban extension west of Pinchbeck could eventually house up to 10000 residents who will all need access to commercial and public services. The incremental extension of road infrastructure during the course developing the site will inevitable inhibit access to the services they require in the settlement, if such provision is not phased in during the site development time schedule. Local / neighbourhood retail services should be small scale and phased in and planning consent conditions should require such phased service development to be provided when a specified number of dwellings are occupied, The same approach should be applied to the provision of public services (primary education). The large urban extensions are of sufficient size to make a number of small neighbourhood retail service centres commercially viable. The skeleton outline of the main transport infrastructure ought to be in place early in early stages the development (distributor roads and cycle ways) to facilitate access to services in Spalding and Pinchbeck.

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. Seeking the cooperation of landowners in determining what land might be available for development is a necessary step in delivering a plan and meeting future development needs. What has taken place through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment is nothing more, at this stage, than establishing what potential sites might support a sustainable strategy for development. Full consultation on proposed allocated sites, in the light of a reviewed and approved Strategy and Policies DPD, will follow in the Site Allocations DPD. The Preferred Options Document is only consulting on broad locations for development (in respect of Boston and Spalding) which have any implications for specific sites. It is acknowledged that large scale development proposals will require specific delivery mechanisms to ensure a sustainable sequence of development with minimal impacts.

Officer Recommendation:

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>	1391	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q22 Yes		Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.	

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1392	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>		<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>	
Q23 Sequential testing of potential development sites on the agreed criteria could establish multiple appropriate sites. Not all will be available or achievable. The Planning Authority could evaluate the potential of sites against these agreed criteria and periodically update the map and locations of possible allocation sites. Whenever possible potential sites should lie within the development envelope or be adjacent to the development envelope boundary. This would enable the Development Plan process to retain some flexibility while meeting the requirement to meet anticipated demand for at least 5 years. The Planning Authority is the guardian of the public interest. Potential sites would remain those the profession planners deem most suitable. Whether sites become available is determined by third parties. This makes for greater transparency in the process of plan formulation and decision making.		Comments noted. It is agreed that to deliver the plan the Planning Authority will need to monitor and evaluate potential sites and maintain a five year supply of land, particularly to meet housing needs. The current SHLAA is the starting point for this but it should be noted that the SHLAA has no status with regard to what planning decisions will be made on specific sites or which sites will help deliver the Strategy and Policies DPD. This matter will be considered through the Site Allocations DPD.		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>	1393	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Delays in the Development Management Process can be addressed through a positive pre-application dialogue between the developer and interested third parties particularly those directly affected by a development proposal or the outcomes of a continuing review of a development Plan policies and proposed site allocations. Guidance on the Planning Authorities expectations of outcomes from the development management process expressed in general terms through published guidance notes will help developers / applicants and objectors concentrate on those planning considerations that are significant, relevant and material. The decision makers can then concentrate on those planning considerations that carry sufficient weight to influence their decision. I am supportive of the overarching development management policy.	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

<u>Response_Number:</u>	1394	<u>Persons_Name:</u>	Mr P Walls	<u>Representing_Who?:</u>	Himself
<u>Respondents_Comments:</u>	<u>Officer_Response:</u>		<u>Officer_Recommendation:</u>		
Q25 Yes	Support noted.		Support - No change to the approach is required.		

---

Response\_Number:

1395

Persons\_Name:

Mr P Walls

Representing\_Who?:

Himself

Respondents\_Comments:

Q26 Only to suggest that the overarching statement of policy must be available to applicants, developers and third party objectors.

Officer\_Response:

Comments noted. It is intended that all material considerations pertaining to making Development Management decisions whether, at the strategic plan making level or at the planning application stage, will be available to all parties.

Officer\_Recommendation:

Objection - No change to the approach is required.

---