CORE STRATEGY AND THE EAST LINDSEY SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT

HEARING STATEMENT – MATTER FOUR

By Neil Kempster



Introduction

This statement has been prepared in response to the Inspectors' Matters, Issues and Questions Stage 2 – Settlement Proposals DPD and Housing Land Supply revised version dated 14th August 2017.

It should be read in conjunction with Chestnut Homes' previous representations to the Local Plan submitted in July 2016 and January 2017.

Hearing Statement - Matter 4 Individual Settlement Proposals

Matter 4 – are the proposals for individual settlements, including certain specific sites, justified, effective and consistent with National Policy.

Alford

We note the proposed approach within the Local Plan to allocate sites through the Neighbourhood Plan and have previously commented on this approach.

We currently have a planning application submitted for a further phase of development of 103 dwellings on land adjacent to our Willoughby Chase development at Alford, application reference N/003/02538/16. This was submitted late last year and is awaiting determination.

The intention is to commence development as soon as all the statutory approvals are in place to provide continuity of development from our existing site.

We have input into the initial Neighbourhood Plan Consultation by Alford Town Council in July 2017.

If allocations were decided to be made within this Local Plan, the application demonstrates this site's clear deliverability and how it is in accordance with current planning policy.

Coningsby/Tattershall (Town)

Chestnut Homes is actively promoting the allocation of site C+T 305 within the Local Plan as it is an on-going housing site now on its third phase. As per the attached plan at Appendix One, the initial two phases have been completed yielding 137 dwellings, with development commenced on Phase 3 late last year for a further 59 dwellings following approval in September 2016. A site layout for Phase 3 is attached at Appendix Two, from which it can be seen that access has been provided to and is now available to facilitate the development of both Phases 4 and 5.

The suggested revision to the boundary of this allocation was made by Chestnut Homes in its representations in July 2016 and was a result of the proposed future expansion of the employment land to make what we believed to be a more logical expansion to the settlement. We therefore believe the amendment is justified in planning policy terms and has not been done to facilitate the development proposed by Chestnut Homes.

Construction is on-going on Phase 3 of the development with over half of the dwellings under construction with the first sales due to complete in September 2017. To date there are 28 dwellings sold including the affordable housing to a Local Registered Provider.

We are forecasting completion of the site by the end of 2018 and hence are in the process of preparing the planning application for Phase 4, with this to be submitted by the end of 2017.

Further applications with be forthcoming in due course for Phase 5 to enable continuity of development of the overall site on a phased basis.

Sibsey

With the constraints on housing within the coastal areas of East Lindsey, settlements such as Sibsey, being a main village, need in our opinion, to accommodate a sizeable housing requirement if the Local Plan is to provide a sound basis for future growth in the district.

From Chestnut Homes' previous experience of developing a site for around 50 swellings in Sibsey at Church Walk, adjacent to SIB 303, there is excellent demand for housing in Sibsey. It is a very popular location acting as a dormitory village to Boston, with a good range of local facilities.

It has seen numerous larger scale housing developments in the last 20 years and we see no planning justification to alter this trend, despite the suggestion in the Village Design Statement (VDS) that developments should be limited to discrete and small scale developments.

We do not have any issues with the design principles advocated within the VDS and duplicated in the text analysis of the Local Plan. We see no reason however why such principles cannot be readily incorporated into larger scale schemes and believe that we have illustrated such concepts in some of our previous developments in the County.

With a proper Masterplanning approach to the development of this site, such design principles can be taken on board to ensure conformity with the design requirements of both the VDS and the Local Plan in general.

In a similar way, the identified constraints of site SIB 303 can be reflected in the Masterplan and site design/layout as suggested by the Local Planning Authority in their responses to the various representations to the Local Plan.

We acknowledge the existence of the listed buildings Sibsey House and Rhodes Mill adjacent to the site but again believe that with careful design and a sensitive approach, development can proceed on SIB 303 without causing substantial harm to either.

There has already been development in close proximity to these, particularly the recent scheme in the grounds of Sibsey House, so there is precedent for developments in their proximity.

It is also notable that Historic England, in their consultee responses, did not seek to query the allocation of this site, but merely requested early engagement with the Council's heritage advisors. As part of our preparation work for the application, there is on-going dialogue with the Council's heritage advisors with further archaeological evaluation work planned in the next couple of months.

With regards to the listed Trader Mill, it is noted that SIB 303 has a minimal effect on the setting of this, particularly when compared to the impact of a number of other allocated/omission sites.

The issue of alternative sites has been raised, with the potential for more land on the western side of the road as an alternative to site SIB 303 to the east.

We believe the Council has undertaken a robust assessment of potential sites as part of the site section process and has concluded that the development of the land to the east of the A16 is the

most appropriate. We accord with this view and strongly believe that SIB 303 is the most logical expansion of the village in spatial planning terms.

It is located close to the core of the village and relates exceptionally well to the existing facilities such as the school, Church and shop/pub.

The recent addition of the pedestrian crossing on the A16 adjacent to the site has only increased connectivity between the two sides of the village. Visual impact has been assessed by the Council to be minimal, with a large enough site to provide appropriate green infrastructure to minimise further any adverse impact of development.

From our observations of alternative sites, we can see no overriding planning reason why they should be allocated instead of SIB 303.

As stated earlier, work is now underway to prepare a planning application which is aimed to be submitted in the next few months.

Consultant's views on planning issues such as ecology, flood risk, drainage, transportation and archaeology have not identified any major constraints to developing the site which we would anticipate could start to be developed towards the end of 2018/beginning of 2019, if all approvals were forthcoming.

With regards to the proposed amendment ADM67, this was suggested in our response to the consultation in July 2016. The rationale for the amendment related to flood risk, is illustrated by the plan at Appendix Three. This is an extract from the Environment Agency website which indicates that part of the site originally allocated is at risk of flooding. We therefore proposed a revised boundary to coincide with the extent of potential flooding.

The revised boundary therefore provides a more logical site in relation to policy constraints and is felt to be justified.

Appendix One

LOCATION PLAN FOR C+T
IDENTIFYING PHASES 3, 4 AND 5

Appendix Two

SITE LAYOUT PHASE 3, CONINGSBY (C+T 305)

Appendix Three

EXTRACT FROM ENVIRONMENT AGENCY WEBSITE OF SIBSEY

