**Examination of the East Lindsey Core Strategy and the East Lindsey Settlement Proposals Development Plan Document**

**Inspector’s Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs)**

**Stage 2 – Settlement Proposals DPD**

**Matter 4 – Individual Settlement Proposals**

**Issue: Are the proposals for individual settlements, including certain specific sites, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

*Alford (Town)*

1. Please refer to MIQs for Stage 1 Core Strategy, Matter 9, Q3 as necessary. What progress has been made with the Neighbourhood Plan for Alford? Does the Council remain confident that the 161 homes required by the Core Strategy will be delivered? In the absence of an analysis table for this town, does the Core Strategy provide sufficient strategic guidance for the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan?

*Alford Town Council and their Neighbourhood Plan Group are working on their plan. At the present moment it is not developed enough for a pre submission consultation. The Council has a memorandum of understanding with Alford Town Council that they have 6 months from the adoption of the Council`s Local Plan to get their plan in place or the Council will allocate the appropriate level of growth to the town. The Alford Neighbourhood Plan is not at a stage yet where the Council can say it provides appropriate strategic policies to deliver the amount of housing it should do.*

*Alford has a minimum target of 161 homes. This should be delivered in their neighbourhood plan. The figure for consistency was worked out exactly the same way as all the other inland towns and large villages. The starting point for the distribution of housing growth in the inland towns and villages is calculated on the number of households in the Parish taken from the 2011 Census divided by the total number of households across the towns and large villages; this is shown as a percentage. This percentage is then multiplied by the District target total, less the existing commitments on the coast. Existing commitments as at February 2016 were then deducted off.*

*The Council has set out in Matter 1 a main modification which sets out that Alford Neighbourhood Plan will deliver 161 homes over the plan period.*

*Burgh Le Marsh (Large Village)*

1. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) indicates that some of the sites proposed to be allocated would have negative impacts upon its various objectives, including biodiversity, landscape, access to services and safe and inclusive communities. Given that Table A requires only 95 homes in this settlement, why is it proposed to allocate land for 200 homes when negative effects are referred to in the SA? How have the conclusions of the SA been taken into account? Please refer to the specific sites to be allocated, particularly BLM320. Were alternative options to allocating several sites around the village considered, such as making a larger allocation at site BLM18?

*In the further commentary box in the Settlement Table of Burgh le Marsh, second paragraph it does state that “because the village lies on the edge of the Coastal Flood Hazard Zone, housing growth in the village will assist with housing supply for the coastal zone, allowing for some residents to choose to live outside the Coastal Zone yet still easily travel into Skegness for employment and leisure.” Therefore it was felt that having slightly higher growth in the plan period could assist with this and to see if this does translate into completions over the period. Looking at the delivery rate since 2007 the settlement has had an average of 9 completions a year, therefore the allocation only raises this to 13 a year, not a significant difference.*

*Of the sites selected three have planning permission already granted after the plan period started;*

*BLM305 – outline for 97 homes*

*BLM313 – permission for 16 with room to move into the rear*

*BLM310 – permission for 8 with room to move into the rear*

*The key issues for Burgh le Marsh as picked up the SA were biodiversity, landscaping, access to services and safe and inclusive communities. When making the selection of sites the Council chose those that were nearest to the centre of the village, but did not choose those that had wildlife implications because of their siting next to wildlife sites, even though they were nearer to the centre. The Council also looked at landscape implications on sites and took that into account on its selection.*

*BLM318 - was only partly allocated because the rear of the site does have wildlife impact implications and it was felt to be inappropriate to allocate all of the site. Whilst the site may not be quite as near to the centre as some of the others it does form a break in the development line and was it was felt that it may come in as a windfall site and therefore setting the scene now in the Local Plan with regard to the frontage only for development would be more appropriate.*

*BLM320 – This site has a site in between it and the nearby Hollies Wildlife site which provides a buffer to the wildlife site and part of it to the east already has planning permission. The site is close to the village centre and would not impact on the wider landscape. There is a tree belt that the Council wants to ensure is kept intact to mitigate any impact on the setting of the Conservation area. The Council is proposing a main modification to the wording of the policy as set out in the answer to Matter 1, to ensure the retention of this tree belt.*

1. Is the proposed Gypsy and Traveller site consistent with policy SP12 of the Core Strategy in respect of safe access to the nearest settlement? Has sufficient account been taken of the effect on the surrounding countryside? Is the site deliverable having regard to the conditions imposed upon the extant planning permission? Have the legal requirements concerning publicity and public consultation been met in respect of the proposal to allocate this site in the plan?

*Policy SP12 at clause 7 states that a site should be in reasonable proximity to the nearest town, large or medium settlements. Burgh le Marsh is a sustainable settlement being a large village in the Settlement Pattern and lies just outside the Coastal Zone, it has a number of services available. Although there is not a public footpath directly linking the site into Burgh le Marsh, there are sections of public footpath available and it would be possible, once the A158 has been crossed to walk into the village along Orby Road (via public footpaths across the fields).*

*Additional caravans have recently been granted at Catchwater Meadows which lies adjacent to the application site and it was considered here that the site lay in a sustainable location for additional tourism development due to the footpath links and short distance into the village centre. The original touring caravan site at Catchwater Meadows was approved by Planning Committee in 2010.*

*The site on the Burgh Bypass has been used informally for a number of years for transit use. The owner of the site submitted a planning application to regularise that use in June 2016. The application had during its determination two rounds of public consultation because it was amended during the determination period.*

*The site was not one which was put forward for overall consideration in the local plan consultation in the summer of 2016 because it was subject to a planning application and the expectation was it was moving toward an approval. In fact the recommendation to Members of the Planning Committee by officers was approval for both applications; however Members of the Planning Committee decided to defer the application for a site visit, so when the matter of Gypsy and Traveller sites came up for discussion at the Planning Policy Committee on the 13th October, the matter had been deferred at Planning Committee and no decision had been reached but the officer recommendation was for an approval.*

*Members of the Policy Committee wanted to include the site because they considered that it provided for a good portion of the transit need, which was a high priority, as set out in the evidence of the Gypsy and Traveller Needs Assessment, also given the District did not have any provision. They were informed that it could only be included because it had already been subject to public consultation through the planning application process and that they must see the same information and be given time to digest it as the Planning Committee. They were therefore given copies of the officer reports, with consultee comments on and time to read them. The Planning Officer dealing with the site came into the meeting and gave them the same presentation as the Planning Committee Members. Policy Committee Members were advised that the site could only be considered on its principle merits and they should not look at the detail, which was for Planning Committee to do but must have regard to the consultee comments, the same as they had done for all the sites discussed.*

*The Members of the Committee resolved that the site was suitable in principle and that the details which appear to be moving toward a solution would be resolved at detailed application stage and through conditions.*

*The site then went forward into the pre submission version of the Local Plan for a final consultation. The Council believes that consultation has been carried out on the site, the site does not impact on the wider District but only has a localised affect and this was taken up through the consultation on the planning application at the time. Since then there has been a further application submitted and another round of consultation has taken place.*

*Burgh le Marsh is a sustainable settlement being a large village in the Settlement Pattern and lies just outside the Coastal Zone, it has a number of services available. Although there is not a public footpath directly linking the site into Burgh le Marsh, there are sections of public footpath available and it would be possible, once the A158 has been crossed to walk into the village along Orby Road (via public footpaths across the fields).*

*Additional caravans have recently been granted at Catchwater Meadows which lies adjacent to the application site and it was considered here that the site lay in a sustainable location for additional tourism development due to the footpath links and short distance into the village centre. The original touring caravan site at Catchwater Meadows was approved by Planning Committee in 2010.*

*The application is already well screened by high native hedging along all boundaries of the site. The only open sections of the boundary are the far western corner and the access into the site. The far western corner of the site does allow some views into the site when approaching along the bypass from the west but any views of the caravans would be at a relatively long distance. However, notwithstanding this it is considered that it would be beneficial for some additional trees to be provided in this western corner of the site to help further screen the site.*

*The existing landscaping helps to assimilate the development into this rural setting and no hard landscaping is proposed. The site is also large enough to enable children to play on the site.*

*It would be possible to see the tops of the caravans at certain times of the year but this is not unusual in this coastal area. There are caravan sites in the vicinity of the application site which have caravans that are more prominent than the caravans on this application site.*

*It is therefore felt that the proposed development will not result in an adverse impact on the character of the area.*

*The conditions on the planning applications have been agreed with the owner of the site and if it had been given approval those would now be being monitored.*

*Coningsby/Tattershall (Town)*

1. C&T305: Does the boundary of this site require amendment to facilitate the development proposed by the site promoters? Would such an amendment be justified?

*Checking the map in the Plan against the representation submitted by the developer it does appear to be correct.* *The Council consider it important that the maps show the site size as set out by the developers or landowners and this was a correction made through the consultation process. The Council would consider the amendment is therefore justified as a main modification.*

*Friskney (Large Village)*

1. FRIS317: Has sufficient account been taken of the potential impact that development might have upon adjacent heritage assets in making this allocation? Will the “policy” ensure that a detailed proposal has regard to this constraint? Is suggested amendment ADM50 necessary to achieve soundness in this respect? Does the amendment itself (as shown in the plan) require rewording to correct a typographical error?

*The Scheduled Ancient Monument is already screened from view and therefore any development is deemed not to have a significant impact on it. The site is on the opposite side of the road from the listed church and would have to have a setback access because of the existing pattern within the street scene it is also at present, is a disused horticultural site, any development proposed would therefore if well designed be a visual improvement.*

*The Council has proposed as a main modification in answer to question 3, Matter 1 some additional policy wording with regard to FRIS317 around protection of the setting of the listed buildings and ancient monument.*

*ADM50 is considered necessary to achieve soundness of the Plan, it has now been transcribed into the main modification as set out in answer to question 3, Matter 1 and made into a more definitive policy. The typographical error should be corrected as part of the main modification.*

*Hogsthorpe (Large Village)*

1. Was an additional primary school classroom provided in 2015 as suggested in the analysis table? Does sufficient primary school capacity now exist to serve the development proposed in the plan? Should the infrastructure section of the analysis table be updated to reflect this?

*In 2016, an extension was built providing 2 classrooms and a hall built to match the style of the main block. Given this updated information it is proposed as a main modification to amend the text in the box for infrastructure, third paragraph so the sentence would read;*

***Education. The primary school in Hogsthorpe does not have any capacity issues having had a new extension built in 2016 providing 2 classrooms and a hall.***

1. HOG309: Is proposed amendment ADM51 an additional/minor amendment or is it necessary to make the plan sound?

*ADM51 is an additional/minor amendment to provide clarity to the information on the site.*

*Holton Le Clay (Large Village)*

1. Why are site allocations not being delegated to the Neighbourhood Plan in preparation, as they are in Alford?

*Holton le Clay have chosen to do a policy only Neighbourhood Plan and leave the site allocations to the District Council.*

1. Site HLC206: The site owner has not indicated that they wish to develop the site. What steps have been taken to ascertain that it is deliverable?

*There is an error with regard to this site the table should read has indicated that they wish to develop the site. They have in fact had some discussions with the Council recently about the site. The Council would recommend a main modification to the deliverability of the site box so that it reads as follows;*

***The owner of the site has indicated that they wish to develop the site.***

*Legbourne (Large Village)*

1. Is the scale of development proposed sufficient to secure the necessary funds to increase primary school capacity?

*The school as far as the Council is aware has reached capacity. There were three reasons that Legbourne has quite a low allocation, this was one of them and the issues with the Water Recycling Plant and finally it did already have 39 existing commitments. The site off Househams Lane LEG303 could come forward for 66 homes but in order to do this they would have to more than likely resolve the water issues and make an education contribution. The Council believes that the 23 homes proposed would be able to be delivered without implications on infrastructure. Neither the County Council nor Anglian Water objected to this allocation. The front portion of LEG303 now has planning permission for 13 homes granted in October 2016 and there was no objection from either the County as lead flood authority or any other drainage authority, in fact the site worked with the County to unblock one of the drains and replace some pipework which benefitted the rest of Legbourne. County education did not make any comments on the application.*

*Looking at the sites that were put forward in Legbourne there were no suitable large ones that could have been allocated anyway, of the two largest ones they were so disconnected from the village as to be classed in the open countryside.*

1. LEG303: Is the “policy” wording sufficiently detailed to ensure the protection of Grade 1 Listed All Saint’s Church, including the views to it if they are significant?

*The front portion of the site has planning permission granted on the 16th October 2016 for 13 units, this portion would have had the most impact on the listed All Saints Church and it was determined in the planning application that it was not significant enough to warrant a refusal. This therefore mitigates against any change to the policy wording.*

*Louth (Town)*

1. The majority of the proposed development is expected to be delivered during the first five years of the plan period, but there are identified capacity issues in education. How and when will these be resolved? Is it necessary to phase development in Louth so that there are sufficient school places to serve new residents? What impact will development on windfall sites, such as the additional development already proposed on site LO305, have upon the capacity of education?

*It is very unlikely that the proposed development will all come forward in the first five years of the Plan. The developers/land owners have told the Council they are going to bring sites forward but the reality is it will not happen like that, past development trends evidence this. The overall amount of growth to come forward in the town means that a new school is not needed until the end of the plan period. There is a project in the Council`s Economic Action Plan to look at education capacity in Louth and Horncastle in the 5 year review, therefore by the time the Council reaches the review point in the Plan this matter should have been discussed and it is hoped resolved, any alterations in the allocations can then be made at that point.*

*With regard to windfall sites, the large site for 500 homes proposed as an additional to LO305 has been asked by the County to provide a school, they have offered a site for a school and a contribution.*

1. Is the proposed Gypsy & Traveller site on Brackenborough Road deliverable having regard to alternative consented uses on the land?

*The Council believes the site is deliverable. The Council has already started work toward purchasing the site and has engaged the District Valuer to ascertain a fair and transparent valuation in order to make an offer on the site. If meaningful negotiations on the purchase are not forthcoming then the Council will move toward compulsorily purchasing the site. The site has planning permission for permanent Gypsy and Traveller pitches and legal start on site, it is unlikely that the Council will support any application to undertake any other use on the site given the over-riding identified need for Gypsy and Traveller pitches.*

1. Are proposed amendments ADM55, 58 and 59 necessary to make the plan sound?

*ADM55 is considered a main modification. The Council previously resolved that insofar as secondary shopping frontages were concerned there were few locations where there are sufficient retail uses along an unbroken frontage as to warrant a designation. This is now reflected in policy SP14 – Town/Village Centres and Shopping.*

*ADM58 and ADM59 are additional modifications which add overall clarity to the site information.*

*Mareham Le Fen (Large Village)*

1. Site MLF328: is it essential for “major drainage infrastructure changes” to take place before this site can be developed or would it be sufficient for any future scheme to ensure that surface water run off rates did not exceed greenfield rates? It is suggested that the latter was acceptable in a recent planning application for 9 dwellings on the northern part of the site. How has account been taken of the drainage evidence provided by the site promoter in reaching the conclusions in the plan? If major infrastructure works are essential, who is to be responsible for these? When will they occur? Is the site genuinely developable within the first five years of the plan period as stated in the plan? Is proposed amendment ADM62 an additional/minor amendment or is it necessary to make the plan sound?

*The comments were taken from the Witham 4th Drainage Board, there are issues with drainage in Mareham le Fen but it is not totally clear how these are going to affect development coming forward because planning applications, such as one already approved on this site are coming forward with no major objections from the statutory consultees around drainage and solutions are being found for the issues. The Council believes it is right that the comments from the Drainage Board are noted but how they will affect the on the ground delivery is a matter that is going to be monitored in the 5 year review period.*

*ADM62 is considered to be an additional modification, it does not affect the soundness of the Plan but just adds clarity of detail about the site itself.*

1. Site MLF303: Are the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal and/or the Plan correct in respect of the impact of development upon the landscape; greenfield land; employment; and access to services? What status should be afforded to the SA in the assessment of any future planning application and does the plan itself provide an adequate framework for considering the impact of development when applications are submitted?

*The Sustainability Appraisal identifies the impact on landscape overall as positive and states that there is potential for a minor impact on the wider landscape because the southern part of the site would be visible in views when entering the village from the east along the A155. There would also be a slight impact on the historic environment as this view also contains the listed mill tower. However, both these issues could be resolved through layout and landscaping. It is not considered that this assessment is incorrect, as the buildings occupied by Gantspeed Engineering, which form part of the southern part of the site, are clearly visible in views from the A155. In respect of the outcomes on greenfield land and employment, there is some connectivity between these. There is some ambiguity in the submission regarding this site as to whether the whole of the site is to come forward or if the existing Engineering business is to remain .If the engineering business is to remain, the allocation is purely greenfield, as the allocation does not include the conversion of the adjacent chapel which already has planning permission and is not an integral part of the development of MLF303. Even if the Engineering business was to close and this portion of the site be redeveloped for housing, approximately 21.5% of the site is previously used land, leaving by far the majority of MLF303 as greenfield land and this would have to be recognised in the assessment. The allocated site includes the Engineering business, so the assumption has to be that this business will make way for the housing development, hence the negative outcome in the SA for loss of employment. However, if the business is to stay, that would mean that the honest assumption behind the SA’s assessment for employment would be incorrect but this would further reinforce the negative assessment for greenfield land. The fact that it is unclear what the intentions are for the development of the sites makes it difficult to assess either the impact on greenfield land or the outcome for employment. However, given that there are few opportunities for brownfield development in the District, meaning that the majority of allocated sites are greenfield, and the site has been allocated, it is not felt that this reference in the SA has in anyway compromised the future development opportunities of the site. The assessment of the site was carried out on the site in its own right and, in respect of access to services, this is not based on proximity but on the fact that the site has access off a narrow lane with no footways or the opportunity to provide these. If the site is developed in association with MLF201, this can be overcome. However, the site is in separate ownership and this cannot, at the time of the SA, be guaranteed.*

*The SA has been carried out to assist in the selection of sites for the Local Plan. Some of the issues it raises may be addressed at the application stage by appropriate mitigation, such as design, landscaping, section 106 agreements, agreements with other landowners etc. The planning officer will come to a decision based on the more detailed information that is available at the application stage which may overcome concerns raised at a time when such information is not available. The SA is not intended to prejudge a planning application.*

*It is considered that the Local Plan as a whole provides a framework for considering the impact of development as it sets out policies regarding matters such as landscape, biodiversity, accessibility, design and infrastructure necessary to assess the impact of development.*

*Marshchapel (Large Village)*

1. How has the sequential test for flood risk (required by paragraph 100 of the NPPF) been applied in determining that housing development in Marshchapel, stated by the Environment Agency to be in Flood Zone 3, is appropriate? Are proposed changes ADM63, 64, 65 and 66 sufficient to justify the allocations? Should the policy refer to the special provisions which the EA suggests should be applied to single storey development?

*Whilst Marshchapel is covered by flood zone 3 it is also part of the area covered by the more up to date Environment Agency’s Coastal Flood Hazard Maps. This more up to date information was used in assessing whether there should be site allocations in Marshchapel for this plan period. A copy of the paper setting this out for Matter 8 – Core Strategy questions, issues and matters is attached to this paper as an appendix.*

*With regard to the proposed modifications ADM63, 64, 65 and 66. These are setting out the flood risk on the site and advocating a sequential approach to siting any development. This has reduced the capacity on each site because the area to be developed should be in low risk with regard to flood risk. This is not clear in each of the tables and the Council would proposed a main modification which includes ADM63, 64, 65 and 66 and also the additional sentence in each table which would read as follows;*

***Capacity has been reduced on this site because development should take place on the low risk areas of the site with regard to flood risk.***

*The Council has also translated this into the main policy table for the sites as set out in answer to Matter 1, question 3.*

*The Environment Agency have not suggested any special provisions for Marshchapel in terms of property design and if they had this would have been in the tables.*

1. MAR217: Has adequate account been taken of biodiversity, the loss of agricultural land and the residential amenities of neighbouring properties in allocating this site? Have alternative sites been considered?

*Sequentially this area of land is the really the only part of Marshchapel which can be developed outside of flood risk, the need for housing was in this case balanced against the loss of agricultural land and given that this is most likely the last time Marshchapel will get a housing allocation because of the flood risk issues it was felt that this should take priority. The landscape is flat and quite open and therefore any landscaping which can be provided could enhance biodiversity. There will be an impact on wider views of the landscape but once again the need for housing outweighed the impact and the fact that overall it is unlikely that further housing will be allocated in the settlement. There is an area on the northern side of the site which can be used for planting, landscaping and if appropriate SUDs which will mitigate against some of the impact and soften the overall impact of the scheme, as will wider landscaping and good design. It was considered that the impact on residential amenities would be minimal because the site is moving away to the east and is not nestled in with existing housing. There were no objections from residents nor the statutory consultees.*

1. MAR226: Could the presence of heritage assets and/or sites of archaeological interest act as potential constraints upon development of this site? Should this be referred to in the analysis table/policy? Is it sufficient to rely upon the absence of comments from the County Archaeologist and Council’s Conservation Officer to determine that these matters are not constraints?

*There are no heritage assets near this site. The nearest site is 225m away to the south west being St Marys Church which is set in a tree enclosed church yard, the land falls toward the church. There is also a belt of trees which are covered by a TPO which run across the site behind MAR226 providing additional screening. There is therefore considered to be no impact on heritage assets.*

*North Thoresby (Large Village)*

1. NTH308: Should the table/policy provide more direction in respect of the heritage assets likely to be affected by development and how they should be protected?

*The table connected to the site does not indicate that there would be any significant impact on the historic assets around the site. It says “With regard to the historic environment; the setting of Walnut Cottage (listed building) is not affected by this site due to the southerly setting of the building. The impact from the west is already impacted by the modern terraces. The main setting of the Thatched Cottage / The Farmhouse (listed building) is the square and the north of the building therefore this site which lies to the south has no impact on the setting.”*

*The next sentence in the table says “There are views of Lincolnshire Wolds on the western edge of the site therefore development on this site may impact the historic Wolds/Marsh setting when looking down from higher elevations. When the site comes forward the roof tiles should blend in with the surrounding area.” The Council is proposing a main modification with regard to this matter as set out in the answer to Matter 1, question 3.*

*Partney (Large Village)*

1. Given that sites for a small number of dwellings have been allocated in other settlements, why does the plan not allocate a small site for housing in Partney?

*With regard to Partney, whilst Partney is a large village in the Settlement Pattern it is relatively small with its facilities spread out, neither the shop nor the petrol filling station are located in the core of the village, being just off the by-pass. There are also constraints to development to the north and west from flood risk meaning growth would be even further from facilities. Given that the overall allocation was only going to be 7 dwellings and taking the above into account, it was felt that an allocation in this plan period was not necessary, given that the Council could find enough land in other sustainable settlements.*

*Sibsey (Large Village)*

1. What is the status of the Sibsey Village Design Statement? Why does it advocate only small scale development? Why is it “out of conformity” with national policy in advocating this? Has sufficient regard been had to the reasons for advocating only small scale development in setting a requirement for 239 dwellings here?

*The Village Design Statement does not have any status in term of being part of the Development Plan and therefore does not carry any weight. However the Council does look at Town and Parish Plans and any design statements when making planning decisions to see if there is anything materially relevant in them that could assist in the decision making process. The Council believes that having only small scale, discreet housing would not significantly boost the supply of housing in the District and the need for Sibsey would in all likelihood not be delivered.*

*As the starting point for the distribution of housing growth in the inland towns and villages is calculated on the number of households in the Parish taken from the 2011 Census divided by the total number of households across the towns and large villages; this is shown as a percentage. This percentage is then multiplied by the District target total, less the existing commitments on the coast. Existing commitments as at February 2016 were then deducted off. It would be almost impossible to deliver this amount of housing on small scale sites. It would also mean that the chances of the village obtaining any meaningful S106 contributions toward infrastructure would be significantly reduced.*

1. Where is the listed Trader Mill in relation to the sites proposed to be allocated in this settlement? Do any of the sites represent one of the surrounding fields historically associated with the working of the mill? If so, would their development for housing affect the significance of the asset? How has the significance of this asset been taken into account in preparing the plan for this settlement? Is proposed amendment ADM68 necessary to make the plan sound?



*For ease the Council has annotated a map above pinpointing the location of the Sibsey Trader Mill. As you enter Sibsey from the north the view of the Mill is seen across the flat open fields. It is not known by the Council whether the field system was part of the mill`s workings. Below is a screen shot of the view across the fields.*

**

*Sibsey Trader Windmill is one of the few six-sailed mills remaining in England and is a working mill open to the public. The two sites that were affected by it were not moved forward for an allocation, both of them would have blocked the views of the Trader Mill, careful design could have mitigated against this partially but development would still have had some impact and certainly the wide open view of the Mill from the A16 would have been lost. SIB406 was deemed not to have an impact on the views across to the Trader Mill it being sited nearer to the centre of Sibsey.*

1. SIB304: Why has the estimated capacity of this site been reduced from 34 to 5 dwellings? Does this reduction have the potential to prejudice the comprehensive development of the wider site or adjacent land if this is needed after the present plan period? Has consideration been given to whether improvements are needed to highways and drainage infrastructure and whether this could be achieved by the allocation of a larger site or sites?

*The land owner has informed the Council that they only wish to put 5 dwellings on the site. The Council was going to have to reduce the site size down anyway because the access is not very wide to the site. There are other ways into the land at the back either off the A16 or a connection through Millers Gate, so future planning would not be prevented.*

*The Council in its assessment of the settlement felt that the site to the east of the village was better placed overall to provide housing in this plan period and it may be that in the next plan period the Council will consider development to the west of Sibsey. At that time consideration will be given to improvements to the access and site size.*

1. Was consideration given to allocating more land on the western side of the road as an alternative to site SIB303 to the east? Would there be any benefit in such an approach?

*There is no evidence of the need for more land to come forward to the west of Sibsey in addition to what is proposed. When looking at the sites that were put forward overall the site to the east fitted in with the urban form and character of the settlement, it was slightly nearer to services and facilities, it butts up to the school and therefore could easily, if necessary provide some additional facilities or land, was of a size that could achieve this if necessary. The site was also large enough to provide a good level of landscaping, and a buffer between the heritage assets.*

1. SIB303: Does the boundary of this site require amendment as suggested by the site promoter? Is the proposed amendment (ADM67) justified?

*The development is now shown in the Plan as the developer set out in their representation. The Council consider it important that the maps show the site size as set out by the developers or landowners and this was a correction made through the consultation process. The Council would consider ADM67 is therefore justified as a main modification.*

*Spilsby (Town)*

1. How much housing is expected to be delivered in Spilsby during the plan period? The sum of the allocations proposed amounts to 431 dwellings, but the commentary suggests that Site 310 (comprising sites 301, 303, 304, 305 and 306) could deliver 600. How does this compare to the requirement for development in the settlement? The commentary suggests that the need is for 229 homes, while Table A gives the need as 264. Is it justified to allocate more development than is needed in this settlement to achieve a comprehensive development when no similar approach has been taken elsewhere (e.g. as suggested in Sibsey?). Has the impact of this additional development, together with any other development coming forward as windfalls, been taken into account in Sustainability Appraisal and infrastructure planning?

*The Council believes that in this case it is justified to allocate more development than is needed in Spilsby. There is really only one direction that Spilsby can grow in the future and that is out to the east. To the west the A16 creates a natural boundary and to the north the industrial estate lies in the way and would separate any development beyond it from the main body of the town. To the north the land rises and is not connected to the town in a meaningful way.*

*The eastern side of Spilsby as shown in SPY310 is the whole site as put forward by the single developer who is bringing the site forward. The total to be delivered will eventually be 600 homes. This though is going to go beyond the plan period. The Council believed it was better to show this now on the maps and in the wording as it sets out the future direction of growth for the town and provides more certainty for the residents.*

*Having one developer come forward on one site has allowed the Council to plan for Spilsby in a more comprehensive way, this is very rare in East Lindsey which predominately has smaller sites come forward. Larger sites of this type tend not to be suitable for a variety of reasons, but mostly the impact on character and setting of the settlements. This is because they are green field and located on the edge of settlements. Also the way the population grows, through the in migration of older persons, means that the Council favours spreading its growth out across the towns and large villages, which it considers the most sustainable settlements. This is because the Council does not know where the in migrants are going to want to live and needs to provide a choice of sites across a choice of settlements. Having one large site in the District would probably not undermine this policy. Also on the Spilsby site the Council had already entered into negotiations with the developer who is Lincolnshire based and therefore certainty of delivery is as assured as can be on the site.*

*The last time a suitable site like the Spilsby site came forward was during the 1995 Local Plan when the largest site so far in the District came forward in Skegness. The Council also has to have a regard to what the residents of the District have to say and the larger sites tend to attract many material objections, many of them justified.*

*The Council has been informed by the developer that the site can deliver approximately 30 homes a year, with the application coming in by the end of 2017. Therefore even if work on site does not start until the end of 2018 the site could deliver 390 homes. This provides a buffer to the 264 allocated which is only a minimum number.*

*The Council is seeking two main pieces of infrastructure with regard to this development, a new doctor’s surgery and a road running through the entire development linking the B1195 and Ashby Road, this would assist traffic flow through the town centre. The main priority for the Council though is the doctor’s surgery, the need for that is immediate with the existing premises being too small, badly located and with no room for expansion either out or upwards. The developer with the Council is having meaningful and positive talks with the NHS who want to bring a new surgery forward and is moving toward a resolution so that the surgery can be provided. The developer is also aware that there will be the need for an education contribution. There has so far been no opposition to this project from residents, which is most likely because they also see a new doctor`s surgery as a top priority.*

*With regard to windfall development, there are not many sites in Spilsby that could come forward, it has no apparent brownfield land available and the impact of any windfall development will the Council believes be negligible and confined to very small sites, given the eastern side of the town is allocated and the restriction/constraints on the other directions out of the town.*

1. Has the potential effect of development across site 310 upon the area’s archaeological interest been assessed? Can the Council be confident that the extent of the proposed allocation is justified and deliverable in this respect?

*The developer has been undertaking work to assess the site, though the Council has not seen that work, there is no indication from them that there are any issues with the site in regard to any material consideration which would prevent it coming forward. The Council is expecting an application in by the end of 2017 and is confident that the site is deliverable.*

1. Is it intended that any of the sites forming part of site 310 could come forward alone? It is specifically stated that sites 301; 304 ad 306 could not. On this basis, why are the sites treated individually, with separate housing capacity figures, rather than as a single allocation? Will this approach be effective in achieving a comprehensive development?

*It is intended that the site will come forward as a comprehensive package and that the sites as individuals will not be brought forward separately. The Council debated how this was going to be shown in the Plan and in the end decided to leave the individual sites in with their tables because they form the jigsaw pieces that make up the whole site and it was felt the individual owners of the sites could then see clearly that their site was allocated.*

*The Council can through a main modification now merge the sites into one SPY310 with one table and one set of information, it would also mean amending the map to only show one site. The modification proposed would be as follows;*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Site Reference*** | ***SPY310*** | ***Promoter: Owner is known to the Council***  |
| ***Site Location*** | ***Land between B1195 and Ashby Road, Spilsby******(eastern side of Spilsby)*** |
| ***Site Description*** | ***Agricultural fields*** |
| ***Site Area*** | ***1.17 ha*** | ***No of Dwellings******600 (site is expected to deliver 30 homes per year and will be developed beyond the Plan period)*** | ***Capacity 30*** ***Potential affordable housing 30% - 180 (for 600 homes)*** |
| ***Suitability of the site in broad planning terms*** | ***Yes the site is suitable. The site is not in flood risk. The site is an agricultural fields with boundary treatment of hedges. There are ponds to the north of the site which could be incorporated into a SUDs scheme and enhance landscaping and biodiversity. There could be some impact on the wider landscape but that could be mitigated against through extensive planting and new landscaping, the site is large enough to accommodate this. There is no impact on the townscape. There is no impact on the Conservation area or setting of the Church. ‘Potential Medieval Field System’ comments raised by Historic England will need an Archaeological Assessment to determine whether a medieval field system exists and to what extent. There were no adverse comments from Lincolnshire County Archaeology Service. The site is close to services and facilities. There are a number of footpath connections leading to the town centre. The site could form an urban extension scheme which could mirror development in Lady Franklin Drive/Woodland View opposite which would link directly to the town centre. A site of this size would be expected to provide green space/open space and it is proposed that a substantial portion will be given over to this. There is a public footpath leading to the open countryside and back into the town which could encourage walking. A site of this size could provide greater collective opportunities for greenspace, biodiversity and species adaptation and migration. A vehicle link connection between Ashby Road and the B1195, relieving traffic pressure from the town centre could be formed. The site should bring forward a mix of homes including varying home sizes and types.******The development is expected to deliver a new doctors surgery and this should be part of the first phase of the development.*** |
| ***Infrastructure*** | ***No major infrastructure constraints to the development of the site.*** |
| ***Deliverability of the site*** | ***The owner of the site has informed the Council that they are going to bring the site forward*** |
| ***Viability of the site*** | ***No indication of any constraints that could affect viability.***  |
| ***Phasing*** | ***The start of the delivery of the site is expected within the first five years of the plan period, as indicated by the landowner. The delivery will extend across the whole plan period.*** |
|  |

*To ensure consistency in the Plan, the Council is also proposing a main modification to the last paragraph of the settlement text box – further commentary, which would delete the paragraph and replace it with the following;*

***SPY310, the land between the B1195 and Ashby Road on the east side of Spilsby is anticipated to come forward as a single site and will be developed beyond the present Plan period. This will create economies of scale and assist in the provision of community infrastructure in the settlement particularly a doctor’s surgery and green space. It will also enable the creation of road around the settlement on the east side easing traffic through the centre of the town. The total approximate amount of housing to be delivered on the eastern side of Spilsby could eventually be a minimum of 600 homes. It is anticipated from information received from the development that this would be delivered at 30 homes per annum.***

1. Is it intended that a new doctors’ surgery will be delivered as part of the overall scheme represented by Site 310? When is this likely to be delivered and how? Should the development be phased to ensure that this facility is in place to serve the housing development? Should the table/policy be more specific about the mix of housing types, facilities and infrastructure that this large site is expected to deliver?

*The new doctor`s surgery is essential to the delivery of the site. The Council have informed the developer that this should be developed as part of the first phasing of the development and they have confirmed that this will happen. All the negotiations with the NHS have this as the starting point. In order for this to be clearer in the Plan it is proposed as a main modification shown in the answers to Matter 1 at question 3 that the site should bring forward a doctors surgery during the first phase.*

*Amendments to the table with regard to this set as set above in answer to question 29 now does include that the site should provide a mix of homes of different sizes and types.*

1. What will be done to address the shortage of primary school places? In light of the present shortfall, is the scale of development proposed deliverable within the timeframe suggested by the plan i.e. all within the first five years of the plan period?

*The developer is aware that they will have to provide an education contribution, any phasing of this will be negotiated during the determination of the planning application and with Lincolnshire County Council Education.*

*Tetford (Large Village)*

1. Is proposed amendment ADM71 necessary to make the plan sound?

*The Council believes that this adds clarity to the Plan with regard to the settlement description and is just additional information and therefore an additional modification.*

*Tetney (Large Village)*

1. Site TNY320: What is proposed to resolve the access issue to this site? In the absence of a resolution, is the site deliverable within the first five years of the plan period as the plan suggests?

*The Council owns the site adjacent to TNY320 and is willingly to allow access through their site, this will resolve the issue. The site in the Council`s proposed trajectory is not set to come forward until the second phase of the plan.*

*Woodhall Spa (Large Village)*

1. Is proposed amendment ADM156 necessary to make the plan sound?

*The Council does believe ADM156 is required to make the Plan sound and has now in its proposed main modification suggested transposing this modification into the policy section of the Plan so that it is clear to developers what is expected of them. This is set out in Matter 1 in the answer to question 3.*

**COASTAL SETTLEMENTS (no Table A housing allocations)**

*Mablethorpe/Sutton/Trusthorpe (Coastal Town)*

1. Is the proposed allocation of a Gypsy & Traveller site on an unused part of the Industrial Estate compatible with that adjacent use?

*The Council believes that the use is compatible. The industrial estate has been allocated since the 1995 Local Plan and a large part of it has not been taken up for industrial use despite marketing by the Council`s property section over a number of years and relatively low land values compared to the say the Louth Industrial Estate. If the site can be well managed then there is no reason to suppose that there will be incompatibility with adjacent uses, especially given that there is housing around the estate and there appears to be no issue with that use. The section of the industrial estate chosen for this use is set away from the existing businesses and whilst the business use could extend nearer if plots can be taken up, design of development of the plots could then incorporate landscaping to mitigate against any impacts.*

*The site has been used informally for a number of years and this year in particular the Council has tolerated that use. In the main the two uses have been quite compatible, and that’s without any services or facilities as yet provided. Any anti-social behaviour has been dealt with by the Council using its power as landowner. The Council want to put this on a firmer footing and once the Examination is over will put in train the process to do this. This gives the Council more formal control over the operation of the site.*

1. Is proposed amendment ADM76 necessary to make the plan sound?

*No the Council believes the modification is just an additional one which better describes the character of Sutton on Sea.*

*Skegness (Coastal Town)*

1. Is proposed amendment ADM79, regarding secondary shopping frontages, necessary to make the plan sound?

*ADM79 is considered a main modification. The Council previously resolved that insofar as secondary shopping frontages were concerned there were few locations where there are sufficient retail uses along an unbroken frontage as to warrant a designation. This is now reflected in policy SP14 – Town/Village Centres and Shopping.*